



General Assembly

Seventy-fourth session

First Committee

24th meeting

Tuesday, 5 November 2019, 10 a.m.
New York

Official Records

Chair: Mr. Llorentty Solíz (Bolivia (Plurinational State of))

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

Agenda items 89 to 105 (continued)

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

The Chair: The Committee will continue to take action on all draft resolutions and draft decisions submitted under the agenda items before it. We will be guided by the same procedure that I explained last Friday. I trust that Committee members all have a copy of the ground rules for reference. If not, please request a copy from the secretariat.

We will begin by hearing from the remaining delegations that requested the floor to speak in explanation of vote after the voting on cluster 2, “Other weapons of mass destruction”, as contained in informal paper No.1/Rev.3, and those who requested the floor in exercise of the right of reply. Thereafter, the Committee will take up the draft resolutions and draft decisions under cluster 3, contained in informal paper No.2/Rev.1, which has been circulated to delegations electronically. Information on additional requests for votes that may have been made since the issuance of informal paper No.2/Rev.1 will be posted on the southern wall of the conference room, to the left of the podium.

Mr. Jiménez (Nicaragua) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation would like to explain its vote after the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.10, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use

of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction”. Regrettably, our country had to vote against that draft resolution, despite the fact that we are a State party to the Convention, do not possess chemical weapons and are committed to the full, effective and non-discriminatory implementation of the Convention. Furthermore, we support the destruction of all categories of remaining chemical weapons. We condemn their use by anyone, under any circumstances. We reject decision C-SS-4/DEC.3, adopted at the fourth special session of the Conference of States Parties to the Chemical Weapons Convention, which was held on 27 June 2018. The decision goes beyond the prerogatives granted to the Technical Secretariat of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons and attempts to modify the mandate of the organization.

We also reject the politicization of a draft resolution adopted by consensus last year and that contains elements that discriminate against a country, in a text that lacks balance. We hope that in future we can reach consensus after consultations, taking into account the concerns of all parties.

Mr. Bravaco (United States of America): I invoke my delegation’s right of reply in response to the comments made yesterday by the representatives of the Russian Federation and Syria (see A/C.1/74/PV.23).

With regard to the comments made by the representative of Russia, we repeat that Russia needs to change its own behaviour and abide by its obligations under the Chemical Weapons Convention. A year ago, Russia used chemical weapons in a brazen assassination attempt in the United Kingdom that ultimately resulted

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>).



in the death of a British citizen, significant injuries and the endangerment of countless others. We would like to repeat that for the record. We also call on Russia to take a more active and constructive role to dissuade the Al-Assad regime from using chemical weapons, rather than enable it, and to stop shielding the Syrian regime from accountability.

With regard to Syria and the Al-Assad regime, we can say only this. They must reverse their pattern of destructive behaviour against their own people and take tangible steps towards peace and stability.

Mr. Cleobury (United Kingdom): I would like to exercise my right of reply to respond to comments made by my colleague from the Russian Federation yesterday about the incident in Salisbury (see A/C.1/74/PV.23). As has just been said by our United States colleague, on 4 March last year a Novichok nerve agent was deployed in Salisbury by the Russian military intelligence service, the GRU, which, tragically, led to the death of Dawn Sturgess, left four others fighting for their lives and endangered the lives of many more.

The United Kingdom has no doubt as to who was responsible for that attack. As we have said from the beginning, only the Russian State had the technical means, operational experience and motive to carry out that attack. It was not a rogue operation. It was an attack that was almost certainly authorized by the senior levels of the Russian State.

The use of a Novichok nerve agent on British soil was a sickening and despicable act and a clear violation of the Chemical Weapons Convention.

Mr. Belousov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): I would like to respond to the statements just made. I will reiterate that more than one and a half years have now passed since the incidents that occurred in the United Kingdom, with the use of toxic substances. To date, no evidence has been put forward with regard to the involvement of the Russian Federation or its citizens in those incidents. All we hear are statements in the vein of “highly likely”. Statements such as “we have no doubt” are not evidence. What serves as proof are concrete facts, which were, by the way, fully destroyed by Great Britain, and that is preventing the truth from being uncovered about the events that occurred in Salisbury and Amesbury last year.

With regard to the statement made by my colleague from the United States, we call on the United States

to stop manipulate the facts, exert pressure on the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) and advance baseless accusations against both the Russian Federation and the Syrian Arab Republic. Enough is enough. We are being called upon to increase our cooperation with the OPCW regard to resolving the issue relating to the use of chemical weapons in Syria. However, the United States itself is helping to ensure that incidents such as those that occurred in Douma are not duly considered by the OPCW and there is no doubt as to their occurrence, even though there is convincing proof and evidence showing that the incidents that occurred in Douma were staged. Regrettably, our American colleagues do not wish to see or hear about that evidence. They remain completely mistaken about the use of chemical weapons in Syria and by the Syrian authorities.

Mr. Hallak (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): I would like to begin by thanking all delegations that voted against separate paragraphs of draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.10, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction”, as well as against the draft resolution as a whole. We also thank all the delegations that abstained in the voting on separate paragraphs and on the entire draft resolution. That sends a clear message that this draft resolution is politicized and does not represent the real situation on the ground. Indeed, it targets a specific State, namely, my country, Syria.

It is no surprise that the representative of the United States regime is attempting to distract us from the crimes committed by successive United States Administrations, in which they used all kinds of weapons of mass destruction (WMDs), namely, nuclear, biological and chemical weapons. The implications of the use of WMDs by the United States regime remain visible today in Viet Nam, Iraq, Japan and other States.

The United States should eliminate its stockpile of chemical weapons and stop requesting time extensions for implementing its obligations. We are confident that the current United States Administration or subsequent ones will continue requesting more time extensions because they do not wish to eliminate their stockpile of chemical weapons. The United States Administration must also stop developing biological weapons outside of its territories.

With regard to the comments made by the representative of the Turkish regime yesterday (see A/C.1/74/PV.23), we would like to reaffirm that the Turkish regime is one of the sponsors of the terrorist organizations Da'esh and the Al-Nusra Front. It is the one mainly responsible for all incidents involving the use of using toxic chemical substances in my country, because it supports, sponsors, supplies and trains terrorists from those organizations and allows other States to conduct training on Turkish territories to assist terrorists in preparing WMDs, including the mixing of chemical weapons.

Mr. Bravaco (United States of America): I will try to be brief. It is really amazing that in this day and age, a large, sophisticated country such as the Russian Federation would engage in brazen assassination attempts on the territory of its neighbours. Later this week, on 9 November, the world will commemorate the fall of the Berlin Wall. There are few geopolitical events in history more significant than that. I recall those days, as I am sure that many of us do. It was a heady time of optimism that, perhaps, there would be a community extending from the Atlantic to the Urals. There would be a collection of nations, including the Russian Federation and all of the nations that represented Eastern Europe at the time, and Western Europe, together, at peace with themselves, their neighbours and the world.

It was not to be because, unfortunately, the Russian Federation turned away. Now it is in a geopolitical netherworld of its own making — a box. It is neither West nor East. That is why it lashes out with brazen assassination attempts such as the one mentioned earlier. It has nowhere to go, neither East nor West, only down. It has been forced into a junior partnership with a senior partner to its East. That is a difficult position to be in. I certainly do not envy the position of the Russian Federation, but it is one of its own making.

With regard to the Al-Assad regime, when we think about the loss of life, including as a result of the chemical-weapons attacks perpetrated by the Syrian regime, it staggers the imagination. All of those people, all of those lives, swept away like they never even existed or did not matter. Well, they did exist and they do matter. There will be a calling to account, in this life and, hopefully, God willing, in the next.

Mr. Yakut (Turkey): I wish to exercise my right of reply in response to the remarks made by the representative of the Syrian regime.

We would again like to underline that the Syrian regime is trying to divert attention from the crimes it has committed against its own innocent people. However, those attempts to distract us are useless; the Syrian regime will eventually be held to accountable.

The Chair: We have heard from the last speaker under cluster 2, “Other weapons of mass destruction”.

The Committee will now turn to informal paper No.2/Rev.1, beginning with cluster 3, “Outer space (Disarmament aspects)”. As members know, there are no amendments under this cluster. I would like to inform the Committee that at the request of the sponsoring delegations, action on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.55/Rev.1, contained in cluster 3, has been postponed to a later stage of the Committee’s work.

First, I shall give the floor to delegations wishing to make either a general statement or to introduce new or revised drafts under cluster 3, “Outer space (Disarmament aspects)”. Statements are limited to five minutes.

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

Ms. Vlădulescu (European Union): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the States members of the European Union (EU).

Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Iceland, North Macedonia, Norway and the Republic of Moldova align themselves with this statement.

I take the floor to reiterate our positions on this cluster, in particular on A/C.1/74/L.58/Rev.1, entitled “Further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space” and A/C.1/74/L.59, entitled “No first placement of weapons in outer space”. We are not in a position to support draft resolutions A/C.1/74/L.58 Rev.1 or A/C.1/74/L.59.

The European Union and its member States have long advocated the preservation of a safe and secure space environment and the peaceful uses of outer space on an equitable and mutually acceptable basis. Strengthening the safety, security and long-term sustainability of activities in outer space is a key priority for us and in our common interest.

We believe that it is important to develop initiatives that will increase confidence and mutual trust among current and future space actors. In that regard, we would like to highlight the importance of transparency and confidence-building measures, which can make a

contribution to the security, safety and sustainability of activities in outer space. That is why some years ago the EU proposed an international code of conduct for outer space activities. We encourage further international cooperation to elaborate agreed principles of responsible behaviour in outer space and underline the need to advocate responsible behaviour in outer space, notably in the United Nations framework.

The EU and its member States remain committed to the prevention of an arms race in outer space. Therefore, all EU member States will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.3, entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space".

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.59, on "No first placement of weapons in outer space", we are concerned that that particular initiative does not adequately respond to the objective of strengthening trust and confidence among States but could, rather, increase the risk of conflict in space. The no-first-placement initiative does not address the difficult issue of defining what a weapon in outer space is, which could lead a State to mistakenly assess that another State has placed weapons in outer space. Without a common understanding of what constitutes a weapon in space, a State could inadvertently put an object in space that another State considers to be a weapon.

We remain concerned about the continued development of all anti-satellite weapons and capabilities, including terrestrially based weapons, and underline the importance of addressing such developments promptly and as part of international efforts to prevent an arms race in outer space.

Rather than introducing a no-first-placement pledge, the EU and its member States believe that it would be more useful to address the issue of behaviour in, and use of, outer space in order to advance meaningful discussions and initiatives on how to prevent space from becoming an arena for conflict and to ensure the long-term sustainability of the space environment.

Mr. Hassan (Egypt): It is regrettable to see that all five proposals under this cluster are being put to the vote, including a genuine, balanced attempt sponsored by 40 States, as contained in document A/C.1/74/L.3, to bridge the gaps and address the threats that are fully recognized by all States. That situation clearly indicates an intention by some States to turn outer space into another scene for military conflicts and an

arena for an arms race in a manner that could have catastrophic consequences.

Given the fragility and volatility of the outer space environment, we believe that it is more necessary today than ever for the United Nations to clearly express its resolve to address the alarming security threats to a strategic domain that has a strategic impact on almost all aspects of life.

It is also regrettable to witness the calls for separate voting on preambular paragraphs such as the fourth preambular paragraph of A/C.1/74/L.58 and the fifth preambular paragraph of A/C.1/74/L.59, which contain generic terms that have been repeatedly used for years in multiple United Nations resolutions, treaties and reports, pointing to a simple shared hope of the international community.

We hope that we can all rise above such narrow conference-room politics so that the relevant proposals can be adopted by consensus at future sessions of the Committee, with a view to preserving international security and the security of future generations by preventing an arms race in outer space.

Mr. Belousov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): Preventing an arms race in outer space has become a top priority in the maintenance of international peace, the strengthening of global security and strategic stability. It is still possible for the international community to take political and diplomatic preventive measures to protect outer space from the placement of weapons before the plans of certain States to place combat-strike systems in near-Earth orbit reach their final stages.

However, if those plans were to be fully realized in the foreseeable future, we would face a threat of an entirely different nature. Our legitimate concerns with regard to the possible placement of weapons in outer space will be a thing of the past. We will instead all have to discuss when, how and which objects will be the targets of destructive strikes, using weapons systems placed in outer space. We will all find ourselves held hostage to those countries that, contrary to the views of the vast majority of the States Members of the United Nations, decided to gain an advantage in outer space by setting up force capacities. It is clear that such force capacity would be used not only against space objects but also against any other vital infrastructure objects on the surface of the Earth.

Instead of promoting joint efforts to prevent an arms race in outer space and the placement of weapons in outer space, the United States is seeking to impose on us all its rules and ideas on its domination in space. To carry out its ambitious plans, Washington does not exclude the possibility of using any means, including direct force and taking the space objects of other States off orbit, under convenient pretexts, such as combating space debris. It is clear that no sovereign State would agree with the vision of the United States of ensuring security in outer space.

Russia, in close cooperation with other States, is making genuine efforts to prevent the most negative scenario — in which peaceful outer space would become an arena of armed confrontation — from taking place. Like all other responsible States, we are convinced that preventing an arms race in outer space and, therefore, ensuring an outer space free from any type of weapons, can be achieved only by developing and adopting a multilateral legally binding agreement. The draft of that agreement, prepared by Russia and China, has been under consideration in the Conference on Disarmament for more than 10 years now.

Transparency and confidence-building measures, agreed by the international community, could be important complements to a legally binding instrument. They could be applied independently or included in the relevant provisions of legally binding agreements. Two conditions are vital. Transparency and confidence-building measures implemented in outer space should genuinely contribute to the goal of preventing an arms race in outer space and be agreed by all participants in space activities. At the same time, we are convinced that transparency and confidence-building measures cannot replace a legally binding instrument that contains reliable assurances against the weaponization of near-Earth space. The only feasible practical measure to prevent an arms race in outer space would be an initiative of or political commitment to no first placement of weapons in outer space.

Every year, an increasing number of States demonstrate the highest level of State responsibility and, in their national capacity, pledge not to be the first to place weapons in outer space. When all space-faring nations have done so, there will be a global political commitment to no one ever placing weapons in outer space. The draft resolutions submitted by Russia and like-minded countries reflect approaches to preventing

an arms race in outer space that are shared by the vast majority of the States Members of the United Nations. Our documents have been drafted in a balanced manner, contain no elements of confrontation, and are aimed at building unity, supporting international peace and strengthening global security. They were drafted to build on the traditional draft resolutions on the prevention of an arms race in outer space and should be considered in relation to that resolution.

Ms. Sánchez Rodríguez (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*):

The threat of an arms race in outer space and the continued development and upgrade of space weapons are at odds with achieving the aspirations of people, in particular those of the smallest countries, with respect to using space technology to their advantage in the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Cuba supports the legitimate right of all States to enjoy equal access to outer space, without discrimination. It is of particular concern that space technology is being used to the detriment of the security of nations, including the vast network of reconnaissance satellites, which, in addition to being at variance with peace and development, continues to saturate the geostationary orbit with significant amounts of space debris. It is also alarming that space has become a new area for warfare and that the United States armed forces has established a Space Force.

We must stop the militarization of outer space as soon as possible. We must strengthen the existing legal architecture to prevent an arms race in space. That is why Cuba supports the adoption of a legally binding treaty for the prevention and prohibition of the placement of arms in outer space and deplores the fact that one State has blocked consensus in adopting the final report of the Group of Governmental Experts on the Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space, established by the General Assembly to make recommendations on the substantive elements of a legally binding instrument for the prevention and prohibition of an arms race in outer space.

It is for those reasons that the Cuban delegation sponsors and supports draft resolutions A/C.1/74/L.3, entitled “Prevention of an arms race in outer space”; A/C.1/74/L.58/Rev.1, entitled “Further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space”; A/C.1/74/L.59, entitled “No first placement of weapons in outer space”; and A/C.1/74/L.60, entitled “Transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities”. We call on member States to

vote in favour of those draft resolutions, as a whole, and of specific paragraphs on which action will be taken.

Mr. Rodrigo (Sri Lanka): I have the honour to introduce document A/C.1/74/L.3, entitled “Prevention of an arms race in outer space”, under this cluster, on behalf of Egypt, Sri Lanka and some 40 sponsors and counting.

It is in the common interest of all humankind to explore and use outer space for peaceful purposes. Outer space is part of the common heritage of all humankind. We all, regardless of our levels of economic and scientific development, should have an equal opportunity to explore it for our own common benefit. We would like to underscore that outer space is our global commons. We all have a shared responsibility to ensure that it is free of conflict and to prevent the militarization and weaponization of space.

It is for those reasons that the draft resolution has been adopted annually since 1982 — close to 40 years — calling for multilateral instrument on the prevention of an arms race in outer space at the Conference on Disarmament. We hope that this year’s draft resolution will bridge gaps and provide common ground for further progress. We look forward to continued support for this important draft resolution.

Mr. Bravaco (United States of America): Before we begin the voting on the draft resolutions related to outer space, I would like to reiterate some of the points my delegation has made on the issue during this session.

First, the United States believes that there is a common interest in maintaining peace and security in outer space for the benefit of all, but we also recognize that there are different views on how to achieve that. There also remain significant differences regarding important fundamental issues, such as defining what a weapon in outer space is or is not. I would like to make clear that the United States fully supports existing international law in that area, in particular the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, and the Charter of the United Nations, which continue to serve as an essential framework of principles, ensuring that all nations benefit from outer space. We do not seek any changes to those foundational documents.

Instead, space is becoming more congested and contested. We believe that the best way to address the

complex risks posed to objects in space is through the development of non-legally-binding standards, as well as transparency and confidence-building measures, including by improving communication, enhancing situational awareness and reaching a common understanding of some basic operational behaviours. In order to do that, we seek to advance the promotion of multilateral transparency and confidence-building measures, which build upon the 2013 report of the Group of Governmental Experts on Transparency and Confidence-Building Measures in Outer Space (A/68/189) in order to reduce the risk to spacecraft and are complementary to the existing legal regime. To that end, we wanted to include new ideas in the draft resolution on transparency and confidence-building measures, which has been submitted annually to the First Committee for some time.

Unfortunately, we could not reach an agreement on a merge proposal. How were we to present new ideas on those issues to the Committee? That is why we found ourselves in the position of having to run our own draft resolution on advancing space transparency and confidence-building measures, as contained in document A/C.1/74/L.55/Rev.1.

We held extensive consultations on our text with many delegations, in particular the primary sponsor of A/C.1/74/L.58/Rev.1, to try to find a mutually acceptable compromise on a unified resolution on transparency and confidence-building measures. Despite our best efforts, our calls for compromise were rebuffed by the primary sponsor of A/C.1/74/L.58/Rev.1.

After careful consideration, and to slightly correct the notice that the Secretariat issued at the start of our session, we are, in fact, withdrawing draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.55/Rev.1, with a view to continuing consultations on the text and to consider follow-on action at a future session of the Committee. We would also very much like to thank the sponsors of our draft resolution, which is also their draft resolution. We look forward to working with them and all other delegations on, hopefully, a compromise and consensus way forward on transparency and confidence-building measures.

Ms. Zuo Rui (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Chinese delegation would like to elaborate on its position on draft resolutions A/C.1/74/L.58/Rev.1, entitled “Further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space” and A/C.1/74/L.59, entitled “No first placement of weapons in outer space”.

Outer space is the common heritage of all humankind. With the development of outer space and progress in space science and technology and their extensive application, the relationship between outer space and a community of shared future for humankind will increasingly become the common interest of all countries.

The fourth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.58/Rev.1 and the fifth preambular paragraph of A/C.1/74/L.59 describe outer space accurately and appropriately as a community of shared future for humankind, reflecting the core ideas embodied in the two draft resolutions. That characterization flows from the spirit of the draft resolution on the prevention of an arms race in outer space, which the United Nations has adopted for 40 consecutive years. It also reflects the goal of securing our common future, as set out by the Secretary-General's Agenda for Disarmament.

Those two paragraphs reflect the language in previous resolutions and constitute an integral part of both draft resolutions. Some countries proposed, for the very first time, that separate votes be taken on specific paragraphs — a move designed to undermine the voting on the draft resolutions, as a whole, with a view to creating international divisions. We deplore that approach, as it is not constructive. We call upon all countries that supported the two draft resolutions to continue to support them, as a whole, and, at the same time, support the original wording of the fourth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.58/Rev.1 and the fifth preambular paragraph of A/C.1/74/L.59. We call on them to vote in favour of those two paragraphs.

The Chair: Before the Committee proceeds to take action on the draft resolutions and draft decisions in cluster 3, we will hear from delegations wishing to speak in explanation of vote or position on those drafts.

Mr. Bravaco (United States of America): I take the floor to deliver explanations of vote before the voting on draft resolutions A/C.1/74/L.3, entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space", and A/C.1/74/L.60, entitled "Transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities".

Although the delegation of the United States will vote against those draft resolutions, our vote in no way detracts from our long-standing support for voluntary transparency and confidence-building measures for outer space activities. The national space strategy

of the United States seeks to foster a conducive international environment through bilateral and multilateral engagements.

As part of those efforts to strengthen stability in outer space, the United States will continue to pursue bilateral and multilateral transparency and confidence-building measures to encourage responsible actions in and the peaceful use of outer space. We have repeatedly noted in this and other forums that clear, practicable and confirmable transparency and confidence-building measures, implemented on a voluntary basis, have the potential to strengthen the safety, stability and sustainability of outer space activities for all nations.

In particular, the United States continues to note the importance of the consensus report of the 2013 Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) on Transparency and Confidence-Building Measures in Outer Space (A/68/189). We encourage all nations to continue to review and implement, to the greatest extent practicable, the proposed transparency and confidence-building measures contained in the 2013 GGE report through the relevant national mechanisms on a voluntary basis and in a manner consistent with their national interests.

The United States also encourages member States to take advantage of forums such as the Conference on Disarmament, the United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC) and the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (COPUOS) to make real progress on transparency and confidence-building measures. In particular, we call for all space-faring nations to begin the practical implementation of the 21 guidelines endorsed in June 2018 by COPUOS on the long-term sustainability of outer space activities. However, our support for voluntary guidelines for the safe and responsible use of space and other transparency and confidence-building measures ends when such efforts are tied to proposals for legally binding space arms-control constraints and limitations.

The United States will vote against the two draft resolutions because it believes that they make an unacceptable linkage between proposals for voluntary, pragmatic transparency and confidence-building measures and the commencement of futile negotiations on fundamentally flawed arms-control proposals. In particular, we note the draft resolution's references to the draft treaty proposal put forward by Russia and China, included in 2014 at the Conference on Disarmament, which the United States opposes. Our recent critique of

their space arms-control treaty — the draft treaty on the prevention of the placement of weapons in outer space and of the threat or use of force against outer space objects — is included in Conference on Disarmament document CD/2129, of 2018.

The United States would prefer that the space domain remain free of conflict. However, as Vice-President Mike Pence recently noted, both China and Russia have been aggressively developing and deploying technologies that have transformed space into a war-fighting domain. Therefore, hollow and hypocritical efforts such as the draft treaty on the prevention of the placement of weapons in outer space and of the threat or use of force against outer space objects, which cannot be confirmed or verified by the international community, are not the answer. Despite this disappointment, the United States will seek to continue to support the practical implementation of space transparency and confidence-building measures by Member States and the relevant entities and organizations of the United Nations system. We will also continue to take a leading role in substantive discussions on space transparency and confidence-building measures at the Conference on Disarmament, the UNDC and in COPUOS.

Turning now to further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space, I would like to deliver the following explanation of vote before the voting. The United States deeply regrets that the Committee must spend time debating paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.3. We will not solve the challenges facing the outer space environment by singling out one expert's professional position in the Group of Governmental Experts. It is unprecedented to do so. We also cannot support certain language in the fourth preambular paragraph that lacks an agreed-upon definition in the United Nations system. In place of this problematic language, we supported the calls of other States to utilize well-known language drawn from the Outer Space Treaty.

The United States intends to vote against the draft resolution. We have long been opposed to negotiating a legally binding agreement based on the Russian and Chinese draft treaty on the prevention of the placement of weapons in outer space and of the threat or use of force against outer space objects in the Conference on Disarmament because of our fundamental concerns with the draft treaty. These concerns are as follows. The draft treaty on the prevention of the placement of weapons in outer space and of the threat or use of

force against outer space objects would not effectively prohibit the development of the threats to outer space systems today, including terrestrially-based and orbital anti-satellite weapons. As my delegation has noted to the Committee, the authors of the draft treaty are developing capabilities that are designed to attack satellites in space, the very thing that they claim to seek to prohibit. The draft treaty also fails to resolve definitional problems of what constitutes a weapon in outer space, given the dual-use nature of many space technologies. Furthermore, the draft treaty fails to address the challenges of creating an effective verification regime.

The United States participated constructively in the GGE on the prevention of an arms race in outer space to guide discussions on space security away from the fundamentally flawed draft treaty on the prevention of the placement of weapons in outer space and of the threat or use of force against outer space objects and towards more practicable and productive approaches to enhanced space security. We applaud the professional approach taken by Ambassador De Aguiar Patriota of Brazil, the Chair of the GGE on the prevention of an arms race in outer space, and appreciated his efforts to conduct a balanced assessment of the full range of options to enhance security and stability in outer space. The United States would prefer that the space domain remain free of conflict. As Vice President Pence noted, and as I mentioned earlier, both China and Russia have been aggressively developing and deploying technologies that have transformed space into a war-fighting domain. The United States looks forward to continuing to engage constructively and pragmatically with other States Members of the United Nations in order to strengthen the safety, stability, security and sustainability of outer space activities.

Mr. Hwang (France) (*spoke in French*): I would like to speak in explanation of vote before the voting, on behalf of the United Kingdom, the United States and my own country, France, with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.59, entitled "No first placement of weapons in outer space". We will vote against the draft resolution and strongly encourage all delegations to do the same.

The United States of America, the United Kingdom and France are willing to continue to constructively and pragmatically cooperate with other States Members of the United Nations in order to strengthen security, stability, safety and viability of space activities. The security and safety of outer space are under threat, and all

nations must move towards the development of effective transparency and confidence-building measures. Our national experts have actively contributed to the work of the Group of Governmental Experts on the prevention of an arms race in outer space. We also encourage all countries to participate in forums, such as the United Nations Disarmament Commission and the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (COPUOS) in order to make genuine progress on transparency and confidence-building measures, including the tangible implementation of the 21 guidelines approved by the COPUOS for long-term sustainability of space.

However, we believe that Russia's draft resolution on the no first placement of weapons in outer space highlights important issues and that an arms race and anti-satellite activities, including those that are terrestrially-based, are not in line with certain diplomatic rhetoric. First, the no first placement of weapons initiative does not provide an adequate definition of what constitutes a weapon in outer space. In space, all objects with manoeuvre capability could, in theory, be used for offensive purposes. Without a common understanding of what is meant by a weapon in space, the draft resolution will increase mistrust and the number of misunderstandings with regard to the activities and intentions of States in outer space.

Secondly, there are limits to verifying objects that are launched into space and the provisions of the no first placement of weapons initiative do not allow for the effective confirmation of a State's political commitment to not being the first to place weapons in outer space.

Thirdly, we cannot support the reference made in the fourth preambular paragraph to the idea of a "common effort towards a community of shared future for humankind". That phrase was inserted by China to promote its own vision of multilateralism and global geopolitics in the international system. None of us should support the inclusion of language in multilateral documents that supports specific national interests.

Lastly, systems in outer space can also be damaged from Earth. The draft resolution does not take into account the short-term threat posed by other anti-satellite weapons, such as lasers or systems that are launched from Earth. Such weapons pose a serious threat to outer space, including by producing, for hundreds of years, considerable debris, which remain in orbit, such as the ASAT test, conducted in 2007.

All States must take concrete measures to strengthen the security, stability and viability of space. The no first placement of weapons initiative is not the right mechanism for achieving those objectives. We must seek to reduce operations in space in order to create the conditions for a safe, stable and viable outer space at the operational level. Our nations support the development of transparency and confidence-building measures, which take into account better ways of communicating, explaining our intentions and demonstrating good conduct. Such measures must be clear, practical and verifiable. It is therefore vital to clarify what constitutes acceptable or unacceptable conduct, while taking into account the threats to outer space, including those posed from Earth. There are genuine threats to outer space but the no first placement of weapons initiative is not the solution to them.

Mr. Belousov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The Russian Federation welcomes the decision of our United States colleagues to withdraw draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.55/Rev.1, as well as their aim to continue seeking compromise with regard to the issue of transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities. Over the past few years, that is perhaps the first constructive step made by the United States in terms of the activities of the First Committee.

In conclusion, I would like to emphasize that, as part of the United Nations disarmament machinery, including the First Committee of the General Assembly, transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space should be considered exclusively from the perspective of how they are applied to the goal of preventing an arms race in outer space and ensuring that outer space remains free of weapons of any kind.

Mr. Robotjazi (Iran): I have taken the floor to explain the position and vote of my delegation with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.60, entitled "Transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities".

Ensuring that outer space is maintained for peaceful exploration and use and preventing an arms race in outer space are two fundamental and long-standing objectives of the international community. Iran considers transparency and confidence-building measures (TCBMs) as a means for contributing to the achievement of these objectives, particularly the prevention of an arms race in outer space. There is no

doubt that TCBMs cannot be a substitute for a legally binding instrument for the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.60 affirms the importance of preventing an arms race in outer space and puts the TCBMs in the right context, namely, as a means of reinforcing the objective of preventing an arms race in outer space. Moreover, for many years, draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.60 has served as a point of convergence for the international community on the application of TCBMs in outer space. It has helped to harmonize views and contributed to building an international consensus on TCBMs for outer space. Building cooperation and confidence is essential if we are to succeed in safeguarding outer space for peaceful purposes and in bringing the benefits of space technology to all States. It is for these reasons that Iran will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.60.

Ms. Rodríguez Martínez (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): For Venezuela, outer space is the shared heritage of humankind. Therefore, the efforts of the First Committee to prevent it from becoming a stage for confrontation or an arms race are essential. Accordingly, my delegation is sponsoring and will vote in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/74/L.3, "Prevention of an arms race in outer space", A/C.1/74/L.58/Rev.1, "Further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space", A/C.1/74/L.59, "No first placement of weapons in outer space" and A/C.1/74/L.60, "Transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities". All of these draft resolutions provide balanced and constructive support in the quest for achieving the overall objective of preventing an arms race in outer space, while seeking to take concrete steps and practical measures to prevent an arms race, offering viable and necessary options and reflecting on the existing concerns of the majority of the international community on this subject with a view to ensuring a peaceful outer space worthy of the coexistence and shared development of humankind.

In that regard, Venezuela deplores the destructive tendencies of certain countries, which, instead of finding viable solutions to that major concern, ground their actions in division and the erosion of the progress made on the issue, as they unilaterally make weapons- and war-mongering proclamations and statements in this context. My delegation therefore rejects the gradual trend of putting to a vote draft resolutions and

paragraphs that should be adopted by consensus, as they are based on actions and principles on the subject that were agreed many years ago. Such actions are not to the detriment of a State or a group of States, but rather to the work of the First Committee, as a whole, and the security of future generations.

Mr. Khan (Pakistan): This is Pakistan's explanation of vote on the draft resolution, entitled "Further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space", contained in document A/C.1/74/L.58/Rev.1, and the draft resolution, entitled "No first placement of weapons in outer space", contained in document A/C.1/74/L.59.

While supporting those two important draft resolutions, as a whole, my delegation will also vote in favour of the fourth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.58/Rev.1 and the fifth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.59, which contain references to the objective of shaping a community of shared future for humankind. This noble goal is valid in all spheres of international relations, in particular for seeking a just and stable world order. In the domain of outer space, it assumes added relevance because the 1967 Outer Space Treaty already recognizes that the exploration and use of outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, shall be carried out for the benefit and in the interest of all countries, irrespective of their degree of economic or scientific development and shall be the province of all humankind.

Such references to a common or shared future emphasize the aspirations and collective interests of humankind in shaping a future in which outer space is preserved as a peaceful realm for international cooperation and the common benefit of all, free from any arms race or destabilizing activities.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.3, entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space".

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

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.3 was submitted by the representatives of Egypt and Sri Lanka on 5 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/74/L.3. The list of additional sponsors is available through the e-deleGATE portal of the First

Committee. Equatorial Guinea, India and Malawi have also become sponsors.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.3 was adopted by 175 votes to 2.

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

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.58/Rev.1, entitled "Further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space".

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

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.58 was submitted by the representative of the Russian Federation on 17 October. Subsequently, a revised draft resolution, contained in document A/C.1/74/L.58/Rev.1, was submitted on 30 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are contained in document A/C.1/74/L.58/Rev.1. The list of additional sponsors is available in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Armenia and Uzbekistan have also become sponsors.

The Chair: Separate, recorded votes have been requested on the fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.58/Rev.1. I shall now put those paragraphs to the vote, one by one.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada,

Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, North Macedonia, Poland, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Côte d'Ivoire, Haiti, Japan, Malawi, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Republic of Korea, Switzerland, Turkey

The fourth preambular paragraph was retained by 111 votes to 40, with 12 abstentions.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Barbados, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Burundi, Cameroon, China, Congo, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Guatemala, Guinea,

Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Maldives, Mauritania, Mongolia, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Panama, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, North Macedonia, Norway, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belize, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Yemen

Operative paragraph 3 was retained by 55 votes to 50, with 48 abstentions.

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

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.58/Rev.1, as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Japan, Malawi, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Switzerland, Turkey

Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.58/Rev.1, as a whole, was adopted by 124 votes to 41, with 10 abstentions.

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

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.59, entitled "No first placement of weapons in outer space".

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

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.59 was submitted by the representative of the Russian Federation on 17 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/74/L.59. The list of additional sponsors is available in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee.

The Chair: A separate, recorded vote has been requested on the fifth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.59. I shall put that paragraph to the vote now.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan,

Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, North Macedonia, Poland, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Côte d'Ivoire, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Republic of Korea, Switzerland, Turkey

The fifth preambular paragraph was retained by 114 votes to 42, with 10 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.59, as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico,

Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Australia, Estonia, France, Georgia, Haiti, Israel, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kiribati, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey

Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.59, as a whole, was adopted by 123 votes to 14, with 40 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.60, entitled "Transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities".

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

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.60 was submitted by the representative of the Russian Federation on 17 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/74/L.60. The list of additional sponsors is available in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Malawi, South Africa and Venezuela have also become sponsors.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, 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, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Israel, United States of America

Abstaining:

Australia, Georgia, Palau, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.60 was adopted by 166 votes to 2, with 5 abstentions.

The Chair: I now call on delegations that wish to speak in explanation of vote after the voting.

Mr. Mohd Nasir (Malaysia): I take the floor to deliver Malaysia's collective explanation of vote for all draft resolutions presented under cluster 3, "Outer space (disarmament aspects)".

Malaysia voted in favour of all draft resolutions under cluster 3, which were considered today, namely, draft resolutions A/C.1/74/L.3, A/C.1/74/L.58/Rev.1, A/C.1/74/L.59 and A/C.1/74/L.60.

Malaysia recognizes that access to outer space is an inalienable right of States. We believe that the exploration and use of outer space should be for exclusively peaceful purposes and that it should be for the collective benefit of humankind. Malaysia emphasizes the need for secure access to space, which has also been recognized as one of the important aspects of space security and a precursor to the sustainability of future space activities. It is therefore imperative that all activities in outer space be conducted in accordance with international law and the principle of the non-appropriation of outer space.

Malaysia welcomes the establishment of the Group of Governmental Experts (GGE), pursuant to resolution 72/250 on the subject, in which Malaysia participated. Malaysia takes note of the substantive progress made during discussions of the GGE in August 2018 and March this year. However, the failure of the GGE to reach consensus on a final report is regrettable. Nevertheless, we hope that the substantive progress made by the GGE could serve as a good basis for further negotiations towards adopting a legally binding international instrument on preventing an arms race in outer space.

Malaysia remains committed to the implementation of international treaties governing the use of outer space that uphold the legal principles adopted by the General Assembly in resolution 2222 (XXI) in 1966. Moving forward, the use and exploration of outer space by the international community must be undertaken in an exclusively peaceful manner. Accordingly, Malaysia

recognizes the significant progress made by the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space and the United Nations Office for Outer Space Affairs in promoting international cooperation on the peaceful uses of outer space.

Malaysia takes note that Member States were required to deliberate on two draft resolutions — on the elements of transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities, first, in draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.55/Rev.1, entitled “Advancing transparency and confidence-building measures for outer space activities”, and secondly, in draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.60, entitled “Transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities”. Malaysia voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.60 and intends to support and vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.55/Rev.1.

We would have preferred for the Committee to focus its attention on only one draft resolution on the matter, which would have encouraged a convergence of views of Member States. Nonetheless, these two draft resolutions can provide a basis for Member States to carry on with constructive deliberations in future. The Committee can be assured of Malaysia’s continued commitment and steadfastness moving forward.

Ms. Jáquez Huacuja (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): Mexico voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.59, entitled “No first placement of weapons in outer space”. We agree on the importance and urgency of preventing an arms race in outer space, in line with our commitment to ensuring that space is used exclusively for peaceful purposes. Nonetheless, we would like to clarify that this support should in no way be understood as tacit endorsement or acceptance of a putative right to place weapons in outer space or launch them from Earth if another State does so first or in response to an attack. Mexico will continue striving to ensure that no actor, under any circumstances, places weapons in outer space. Similarly, Mexico reiterates that all nuclear weapons should be banned and eliminated, regardless of their type or location.

Mr. Nakai (Japan): This is Japan’s explanation of vote after the voting on the draft resolutions on which we just took action.

To promote the long-term safety, sustainability, security and stability of outer space, it is becoming increasingly important to develop initiatives to ensure confidence and mutual trust among space

actors, in particular through transparency and confidence-building. We therefore voted in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/74/L.3, entitled “Prevention of an arms race in outer space”, and A/C.1/74/L.60, entitled “Transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities”. However, we have a small concern about the ninth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.60, as we believe that it is not constructive or appropriate to include references to the most recent session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission in the draft resolution, while regretting that it was not convened this year. Based on the draft resolutions, we hope that the discussion on transparency and confidence-building measures will be further promoted.

We abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.59, as a whole, entitled “No first placement of weapons in outer space” for the following reasons. We are witnessing the increasing threat to the stable use of space and it is becoming more important to ensure confidence and mutual trust among space actors, in particular through transparency and confidence-building. However, the draft resolution does not adequately deal with the question of what constitutes a weapon in outer space. Given the dual nature of many space objects, this initiative could increase mistrust and misunderstanding on the activities and intentions of other nations, thereby decreasing transparency and trust in the domain of outer space. In this regard, we would like to take this opportunity to express our concerns about certain activities in outer space that are being undertaken without transparency, which could lead to mistrust or misunderstanding or both.

Secondly, with regard to verification, we do not believe that the no first placement of weapons in outer space initiative will be effective or verifiable.

Thirdly, the draft resolution focuses solely on space-based weapons and therefore does not address the entire list of outer space activities, including ground-based activities.

Japan has serious and real concerns about the development and deployment of anti-satellite weapons capabilities, including those that are terrestrially-based, which are not addressed in the draft resolution.

We abstained in the voting on the fifth preambular paragraph because it contains language that does not enjoy consensus in the General Assembly. Japan reiterates the need to implement principled and

responsible behaviour for outer space activities, which could be an important step for international rulemaking. We encourage all member States to refrain from any action that increases mistrust or misunderstanding with regard to outer space activities or leads to, whether directly or indirectly, the damage or destruction of space objects. We abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.58/Rev.1, entitled "Further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space", as a whole, for the same reason. We abstained in the voting on the fourth preambular paragraph for that reason as well: it does not contain language that enjoys consensus in the General Assembly.

We voted against operative paragraph 3. In our view, it was the Group of Governmental Experts (GGE), as a whole, that did not reach consensus. It is therefore not appropriate to single out an expert who broke the consensus. Furthermore, it should be recalled that it was a United Nations resolution that decided that the GGE should operate by consensus. We are concerned that the paragraph in question is worrisome to States engaging in future meetings of the GGE and any other discussions whose outcomes are consensus-based, thereby discouraging active discussion.

Mr. Pilz (Germany): I take the floor on behalf of a group of States that includes Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and, my own country, Germany.

I take the floor to explain the reasons why the aforementioned group of States, including my own, abstained in the voting on the proposal in document A/C.1/74/L.59, regarding the no first placement of weapons in outer space. Our group of States continues to promote the preservation of the safe, secure and sustainable space environment and the peaceful use of outer space. We remain strongly committed to the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

Our group of States is concerned about the increasing development of various counter-space capabilities, including by the very sponsors of the draft resolution. Against this background, we are of the opinion that draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.59 on the no first placement of weapons in outer space does not adequately respond to the short-term objective of strengthening trust and confidence among States. Due

to mounting ambiguities and shortcomings, it could rather increase the risk of conflict in space.

The Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) on the Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space illustrated that the international community is facing a broad spectrum of space-related threats, namely, space-to-space attacks, space-to-ground attacks and ground-to-space attacks. These threats are not sufficiently reflected by the no first placement of weapons in outer space initiative, including by the draft treaty on the prevention of the placement of weapons in outer space, the threat or use of force against outer space objects. In particular, we wonder how the initiators of the draft treaty intend to reconcile their approach with the fact that they already possess and are further developing capabilities, including ground-based anti-satellite capabilities, which are not explicitly included in the scope of the draft treaty but, nevertheless, constitute significant and serious threats to space systems and the space environment. Furthermore, the no first placement of weapons in outer space initiative fails both to acknowledge and address the challenge of sufficiently defining weapons in outer space, in particular with respect to dual-use technologies, which could lead to misinterpretations, misunderstandings and miscalculations.

Notwithstanding the goal of a comprehensive and legally binding framework that complements the Outer Space Treaty, we believe that it would be more useful to strengthen space-faring nations' due regard to the corresponding interests of all other space-faring nations, in particular through transparency and confidence-building measures and consensus-building with regard to responsible behaviour in outer space. We encourage the two initiators of the draft resolution to facilitate a relaunch of arms control efforts with regard to all relevant threats to space systems arising from irresponsible behaviour in outer space.

Strengthening the safety, security, sustainability and peaceful nature of outer space activities can be achieved only through international cooperation. We need to continue to search for common ground. We are fully supportive of a resumption of the substantive work of the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva and continue to actively contribute to the discussions and negotiations within the ad hoc working group to negotiate the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

I would also like to make a few comments on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.58/Rev.1. My country would like to explain why it has changed the way it votes on this draft resolution. My country voted against the draft resolution and therefore changed its voting pattern because the main sponsors of the draft resolution chose, in operative paragraph 3, to single out an expert who was working in full accordance with the rules of procedure of the GGE on the Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space. It was clear to everyone that the GGE operated under the rule of consensus. Accordingly, we could no longer support the draft resolution and voted against it.

Ms. Lal (India): I requested the floor to explain my delegation's votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/74/L.58/Rev.1 and A/C.1/74/L.59.

With respect to A/C.1/74/L.58/Rev.1, entitled "Further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space", India has always voted in favour of the draft resolution because we share its goal of taking practical steps to prevent an arms race in outer space. We therefore again voted in favour of it, as a whole. However, India decided to vote against the fourth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution due to the inclusion of a new phrase — "a community of shared future for humankind". At present, there is no clear understanding of its implications. Various civilizations and countries have their own vision for the future for humankind. For example, since Vedic times, Indian civilization has considered the world to be a family, consistent with the concept of *vasudhaiva kutumbakam*. As a civilization, we have always called for the welfare of all of humankind, which is reflected in the ancient Vedic mantra *om sarve bhavantu sukhinah*, which can be translated into English as "May all be prosperous and happy, may all be free from illness, and may all see what is spiritually uplifting — and may no one suffer."

India voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.59, entitled "No first placement of weapons in outer space". As a major space-faring nation, India has vital development and security interests in space. The draft resolution states that the legal regime applicable to outer space needs to be consolidated and reinforced. India supports this objective, as well as the strengthening of the international legal regime to protect and preserve access to space for all and to prevent, without exception, the weaponization of outer space.

We support the substantive consideration of the subject of the prevention of an arms race in outer space in the Conference on Disarmament. While not a substitute for legally binding instruments, transparency and confidence-building measures can play a useful and complementary role to legally binding instruments. We see the no first placement of weapons in outer space initiative as a useful initiative and not as a substitute for substantive legal measures to ensure the prevention of an arms race in outer space, which continues to be a priority for the international community.

We voted against the fifth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.59, for the same reason that we voted against the fourth preambular paragraph of A/C.1/74/L.58/Rev.1, mentioned previously.

Mr. Masmejean (Switzerland) (*spoke in French*): I take the floor to explain our delegation's vote on two draft resolutions on the issue of outer space.

First, we abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.59, entitled "No first placement of weapons in outer space". We welcome the fact that the draft resolution expresses the concern that outer space is turning into an arena for military confrontation. Nonetheless, we remain concerned about the fact that the draft resolution does not take into consideration important aspects linked to the issue. The draft resolution does not clearly define what constitutes a weapon in outer space and does not address the development of ground-based systems that can attack or damage satellites, including the testing of such systems, although these capacities are a source of immediate concern. The draft resolution does not address the potential second placement of weapons in outer space. In this regard, the draft resolution does not appear to be complete.

Secondly, I would like to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.58/Rev.1, entitled "Further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space". We abstained in the voting on this draft resolution, as a whole, and voted against operative paragraph 3. While we deplore the fact that the Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) on the Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space, established by the previous version of the draft resolution, could not reach consensus on a substantive report, we welcome the fact that all of the major space Powers took part and had in-depth discussions on several issues.

We believe that it is essential for such efforts to be monitored. In this regard, we strongly deplore some elements of the draft resolution, in particular operative paragraph 3, which, not only breaks with the practice established in the Committee but could also complicate the future work of the GGE.

Lastly, we continue to have questions with regard to the concept of the will to shape a community of shared future for humankind, which is referenced in the fourth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.58/Rev.1 and the fifth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.59. We therefore abstained in the voting on those two paragraphs.

The Chair: We have heard from the last speaker in explanations of vote after the voting on cluster 3, “Outer space (disarmament aspects)”.

The Committee will turn now to cluster 4, “Conventional weapons”. First, I shall give the floor to delegations wishing to make either a general statement or to introduce new or revised drafts under cluster 4. As members know, statements are limited to five minutes.

Ms. Claringbould (Netherlands): The Netherlands is pleased to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.30 on transparency in armaments. This triennial draft resolution aims to support the effective operation and development of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms. The register is an important instrument in the promotion of transparency in military matters and therefore contributes to confidence-building and security among States. The Register was established 28 years ago and, despite the concerns of low reporting numbers, it plays an important role in recording, inter alia, the transfers of conventional arms in the seven-plus-one categories.

The Group of Governmental Experts met three times this year for the duration of a week and produced a consensus report (A/74/211), which was submitted to the General Assembly by the Secretary-General. Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.30 aims to endorse the report and its recommendations. It also sets out a way forward, providing for the next Group of Governmental Experts to convene in a few years to assist the Secretary-General in reporting on the continuing operation and relevance of the Register, including by exploring the relationship between the participation, scope and use of the Register and its further development. We call on Member States to support the draft resolution and, with that, United Nations Register of Conventional Arms.

Mr. Diarra (Mali) (spoke in French): The delegation of Mali has the distinct honour of introducing the annual draft resolution, entitled “Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons and collecting them”, contained in document A/C.1/74/L.27, on behalf of the 15 member States of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) — Benin, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Côte d’Ivoire, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo and, my country, Mali.

With regard to the form of the draft resolution, apart from the necessary technical updates, the draft resolution under consideration uses exactly the same terms as that adopted by consensus last year (resolution 74/51). With respect to its substance, the draft resolution seeks to strengthen stability in West Africa by improving regional security and strengthening regional initiatives and efforts to reduce proliferation and the trafficking of small arms and light weapons.

Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.27 encourages the international community to support the effective implementation of the ECOWAS Convention on Small Arms and Light Weapons, Their Ammunition and Other Related Materials. In addition, the aforementioned draft resolution also invites the international community to provide technical and financial support for capacity-building for civil society organizations involved in combating the illicit trafficking of small arms and light weapons and collecting them.

Beyond West Africa and the Sahel, the draft resolution reflects the willingness of several countries around the world to combat the illicit trafficking of small arms and light weapons, which, today, have the lamentable reputation of being some of the most dreaded weapons. On behalf of the member States of ECOWAS, I take this opportunity to thank all the countries that co-sponsored the draft resolution and encourage those that have not yet done so to support it.

I note that, thus far, the draft resolution has 76 sponsors. There is still space, using the e-deleGATE portal, for additional sponsors. The authors of the draft resolution note with regret that a separate vote was requested on the sixteenth preambular paragraph. We recall that this annual draft resolution has been adopted by consensus in its entirety since 1997. To that end, the sponsors the draft resolution call upon all Member

States to kindly vote in favour of the current text and to support the traditional consensus.

In conclusion, the delegation of Mali again thanks all ECOWAS member States and our technical and financial partners for their support in adopting the draft resolution.

Ms. Quintero Correa (Colombia) (*spoke in Spanish*): Colombia, Japan and South Africa are the authors of draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.43, entitled “The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects”, which has 84 sponsors.

The illicit trade in small arms and lights weapons, unbridled in many areas of the world, has humanitarian and socioeconomic consequences and poses a serious threat to peace, reconciliation, security, stability and sustainable development at the individual, local, national, regional and international levels. The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons is closely linked to other criminal activities, such as, inter alia, drug trafficking, terrorism and organized crime. These criminal activities all have the same transportation infrastructure and strategic corridors, which makes it easy for terrorist and organized crime groups to gain access to small arms and light weapons at low prices. The scope of the problem demonstrates that the situation in each country is influenced by regional and global flows and variables. That is why it is urgent to maintain and improve national control measures so as to prevent, combat and eliminate the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons, including their diversion to illicit trade, illegal armed groups, terrorists and other non-authorized recipients.

Cooperation and international assistance are essential and complement national and regional measures for the full and effective implementation of the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects and its International Tracing Instrument. The draft resolution therefore seeks to boost collective national, regional and international efforts on the issue and to continue strengthening them, in order to implement the Programme of Action and the Tracing Instrument.

Colombia thanks all sponsors and invites all delegations to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.43, as a whole, without a vote.

The Chair: Before the Committee proceeds to take action on the draft resolutions and draft decisions in cluster 4, we will hear from delegations wishing to explain their vote or position on those drafts.

Ms. Sánchez Rodríguez (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): As in previous years, the Cuban delegation will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.25, entitled “The Arms Trade Treaty”. This Treaty was adopted prematurely, as negotiations on it had not even been concluded and no consensus was reached. It contains considerable ambiguities, inconsistencies, a lack of clear definitions and legal gaps, which all undermine its effectiveness and efficiency. The Arms Trade Treaty cannot be effective if it does not ban, but, in fact, legitimizes the transfer of weapons to unauthorized non-State actors — the main source of the illicit arms trade.

The Treaty is an instrument that lacks balance and serves the purposes of arms-exporting countries. The parameters established to regulate the process by which those States evaluate the approval and denial of transfers are subjective. They can therefore be easily manipulated for political purposes. That hinders the right of States to acquire and possess arms for their legitimate defence, which is recognized in Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations. The delegation of Cuba, in line with its position on the instrument, will abstain in the voting on operative paragraphs 4 and 9.

With regard to operative paragraph 9, we reiterate our concern about claims of the synergies among the Arms Trade Treaty and other instruments that are universally accepted. We reject the acknowledgement of artificial synergies among legal instruments, membership, scope and category of arms, which are totally different elements. In addition, we underscore the fact that, because of the profound differences among Member States, no consensus has been reached on the synergies between the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects and the Arms Trade Treaty in the final document of the third Review Conference on the Programme of Action. Our delegation will disassociate itself from all paragraphs related to the Arms Trade Treaty contained in the various draft resolutions on which the First Committee will take action.

The delegation of Cuba will also abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.30, entitled

“Transparency in armaments”, whose negative tone we deplore. Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.30 lacks balance as a result of its unwarranted focus on small arms and light weapons, to which explicit reference was made in various paragraphs. No other category of weapons enjoys such treatment. We reject double standards and manipulation in addressing the issue of conventional weapons. We do not support partial analyses that disregard serious problems related to the production, modernization, use and trade of highly sophisticated conventional weapons, whose effects are considerably more devastating. We do not support the fact that the draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.30 mentions the entry into force of the Arms Trade Treaty or that it endorses the 2019 report of the Group of Governmental Experts, to which we have important objections.

We do not support expanding the scope of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms beyond the seven categories of weapons to include small arms and light weapons. The issue of expanding the scope of the Register must be resolved through a comprehensive and transparent discussion among Member States and a decision by the General Assembly. Any attempt to expand the Register must begin with the inclusion of weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear weapons. Additional information from States on other issues, including procurement through national production and the existence of war materials, must be provided voluntarily. We do not support the convening of a new group of experts in 2021-2022, as proposed in the draft resolution. The mandate of the group and the number of its participants are not specified. A topic of such relevance for all States cannot continue to be discussed or decided upon in a group with restricted membership.

The delegation of Cuba will also abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.45, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction”. We fully share the legitimate humanitarian concerns related to the indiscriminate and irresponsible use of anti-personnel mines. Our country is a State party to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, including its original Protocol II, and fully adheres to the prohibitions and restrictions on the use of mines outlined in the Convention.

For six decades, Cuba has been subjected to an ongoing policy of hostility and aggression on the part

of the United States. Because of that, our country has been unable to renounce the use of mines in an effort to preserve its sovereignty and territorial integrity, in line with the legitimate right of self-defence, stipulated in Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations. We will continue supporting all those efforts that, while maintaining the necessary balance between humanitarian issues and national security issues, seek to eliminate the reprehensible effects of the indiscriminate and irresponsible use of anti-personnel mines on the civilians and economies of several countries. Similarly, we call on all States in a position to do so to provide the financial, technical and humanitarian assistance necessary to clear mines and ensure the social and economic rehabilitation of victims.

We will join the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.54, entitled “Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects”, with the understanding that the issue of mines that are different from anti-personnel mines is not on the agenda of the Meeting of the High Contracting Parties to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, as decided at the meeting held in 2018.

The Chair: We have a long list of speakers. I would like to encourage delegations to consider explaining their votes after the voting to allow us to be able to start action on the draft resolutions and draft decisions at 12.15 p.m. If we are still hearing statements at that time, action will be postponed until tomorrow.

Mr. Grigoryan (Armenia): I would like to deliver an explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.25, entitled “The Arms Trade Treaty”.

Armenia strongly advocates a robust and legally binding conventional arms control regime, be it at the regional or international level, that would enable the efficient regulation of trade in conventional arms and prevent and eradicate their diversion into illicit markets or their use for illegitimate purposes, in particular serious violations of human rights. Armenia reiterates its concerns with regard to the preamble and principal section of the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT). We have continuously stressed the need for balanced and non-restrictive references to the principles of international law, including the principle of equal rights and the self-determination of peoples, in accordance with Article 1 of the Charter of the United

Nations. We reaffirm our position that the Treaty, in its current shape, may be interpreted as limiting the exercise of the sovereign right to self-defence, as well as hindering legitimate access to relevant technologies. The key objective of the Treaty, the encouragement and enforcement of regulations of the conventional arms trade, through strong national control systems, could have been upheld more strongly.

Therefore, Armenia will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.25. Armenia's position on the ATT is applicable to all other draft resolutions of the First Committee containing a reference to the Treaty. Therefore, we disassociate ourselves from those paragraphs.

Mr. Ahmed (Pakistan): I would like to offer Pakistan's explanation of vote on the draft resolution entitled "Transparency in armaments", contained in document A/C.1/74/L.30.

Pakistan supports the broader objectives of pursuing transparency in armaments, including through reporting on the exports and imports of arms, in particular procurement through national production. Such measures have the potential to serve as early warning systems to assess armament accumulation trends and a means to put moral pressure on States responsible for destabilizing arms transfers, production and stockpiling. Pakistan has also been regularly reporting to the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms.

However, there can hardly be a one size fits all approach for all regions and subregions. For transparency measures to gain broader traction and acceptance, the recognition of different political and security conditions in various regions is essential. Those measures also need to be pursued in tandem with others, such as confidence-building measures and conflict resolution. We acknowledge the recognized value of voluntary measures outlined in the draft resolution and, therefore, will vote in its favour.

Transparency is a means to an end, not an end in itself. The ultimate objective should be to seek restraint, promote confidence-building measures, ease tensions and resolve disputes through negotiations and mediation at the regional, subregional and global levels. With regard to the Group of Governmental Experts to be convened in 2021 and 2022 to explore the relationship between participation, use and scope of the United Nations Register, we share the broad

expectation that its composition and, indeed, the composition of all groups of governmental experts established within the United Nations in the area of disarmament, shall strictly conform to the principle of equitable geographic representation, in particular from developing countries. We recognize the financial constraints faced by the United Nations system but they should not limit opportunities for participation, in particular from diverse regions and perspectives.

Mr. Elhomosany (Egypt): I take the floor to explain my delegation's vote before the voting on the proposals contained in documents A/C.1/74/L.25, A/C.1/74/L.45 and A/C.1/74/L.46.

With regard to A/C.1/74/L.25, entitled "The Arms Trade Treaty", and the references to that Treaty and other proposals presented to the Committee, Egypt continues to be at the forefront of any genuine effort aimed at combating the illicit trafficking in arms and eradicating any arms transfers to terrorists and illegal armed groups. We also actively and constructively participated in the negotiations leading to the adoption of the Arms Trade Treaty.

Nevertheless, motivations related to the desire of some States to manipulate and politicize the legitimate arms trade led to several shortcomings and loopholes in the Treaty, in particular its deliberate lack of several necessary definitions and clear criteria, which make the implementation of the Treaty selective and subjective and allow exporting States to abuse its provisions. The Treaty also completely ignores the prohibition of the intentional State-sponsored supply of weapons to unauthorized recipients, including terrorists and illegal armed groups, which represent the main real threat in that domain. Therefore, my delegation will continue to abstain in the voting on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/74/L.25, entitled "The Arms Trade Treaty", as well as on paragraphs that refer to the Treaty in the draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/74/L.27 and A/C.1/74/L.43.

Egypt will continue to abstain in the voting on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/74/L.45, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction". On several occasions, Egypt has expressed its reservations about the imbalanced nature of that instrument, which was developed and concluded outside the framework of the United Nations. Mindful

of the humanitarian considerations associated with landmines, Egypt has imposed a moratorium on its capacity to produce and export landmines since the 1980s, long before the conclusion of the Convention. We believe that the Convention lacks balance between humanitarian concerns and those related to anti-personnel landmines and their possible legitimate military uses, especially in countries with long borders, facing extraordinary security challenges. Furthermore, the Convention does not establish any legal obligation on States to remove the anti-personnel mines they have placed in the territory of other States, making it almost impossible for many States to meet the demining requirements on their own. That is particularly the case of Egypt, which is one of the most affected countries, as it still has more than 22 million landmines that were placed on its territory during the Second World War.

Egypt will continue to abstain in the voting on draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/74/L.46, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions”, in the light of the selective and imbalanced nature of that instrument, which was developed and concluded outside the framework of the United Nations and lacks an equitable and clear definition of cluster munitions in a manner that was deliberately designed to fit the specific production requirements of some States.

Mr. Robotjazi (Islamic Republic of Iran): Since we are approaching 12.15 p.m., in the interest of having sufficient time to take action on the draft resolutions, I will refrain from speaking in explanation of vote before the voting and do so after the voting. I hope that you, Mr. Chair, will be kind to us in allocating more time, given the length and number of our explanations of vote.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.25, entitled “The Arms Trade Treaty”.

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

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.25 was submitted by the representative of Argentina on 14 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/74/L.25. The additional sponsors are listed in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Antigua and Barbuda, Eswatini, Malawi and Seychelles have also become sponsors.

The Chair: Separate, recorded votes have been requested on the ninth preambular and operative paragraphs 4 and 9 of draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.25. I shall therefore put those paragraphs to the vote, one by one.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, 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, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania,

Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Armenia, Azerbaijan, Egypt, Iraq, Israel, Kuwait, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, United States of America, Yemen, Zimbabwe

The ninth preambular paragraph was retained by 155 votes to none, with 15 abstentions.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Canada, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia,

Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Zambia

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

Algeria, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cambodia, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libya, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zimbabwe

Operative paragraph 4 was retained by 137 votes to 1, with 31 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 9.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru,

Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Zambia

Against:

Israel, United States of America

Abstaining:

Algeria, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Libya, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zimbabwe

Operative paragraph 9 was retained by 136 votes to 2, with 31 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.25, 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, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan,

Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Latvia, Lebanon, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Zambia

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.25, as a whole, was adopted by 150 votes to 1, with 26 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.27, entitled "Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons and collecting them".

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

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.27 was submitted by the representative of Mali, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Economic Community of West African States, on 15 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document

A/C.1/74/L.27. The additional sponsors are listed in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Antigua and Barbuda, Botswana, Djibouti, Malawi and Maldives have also become sponsors.

The Chair: A separate, recorded vote has been requested on the sixteenth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.27. I shall first put that paragraph to the vote.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Canada, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Latvia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cambodia, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kuwait, Lebanon, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen

The sixteenth preambular paragraph was retained by 149 votes to 1, with 20 abstentions.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.27, as a whole, was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.30, entitled “Transparency in armaments”.

I now give the floor the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.30 was submitted by the representative of the Netherlands on 15 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/74/L.30. The additional sponsors are listed in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Brazil and Seychelles have also become sponsors.

I shall now read out the present oral statement, in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.30, the General Assembly would reaffirm its decision, with a view to further development of the Register, to keep the scope of, participation in and the use of the Register under review, and to that end request the Secretary-General, with the assistance of a group of governmental experts to be convened for a week each at the end of 2021 and the beginning and in the middle of 2022, within existing resources, with the broadest possible participation, and on the basis of equitable geographical representation, to prepare a report on the continuing operation and relevance of the Register, including by exploring the

relationship between the participation, scope and use of the Register, and its further development, taking into account the work of the Conference on Disarmament, relevant deliberations within the United Nations, the views expressed by Member States and the reports of the Secretary-General on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development, with a view to taking a decision at its seventy-seventh session.

With regard to operative paragraph 6 of the draft resolution, it is understood that issues related to the meetings of a group of governmental experts at the end of 2021 and the beginning and in the middle of 2022, including the date, format and scope, are yet to be determined. Accordingly, in the absence of modalities for the meetings, it is not possible at the present time to estimate the potential cost implications of meetings and documentation requirements. Upon the decision on the modalities of the meetings, the Secretary-General will submit the relevant costs of such requirements, in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. Accordingly, at this time, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.30 would not give rise to any programme budget implications.

The Chair: A separate, recorded vote has been requested on the seventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.30. I shall therefore put that paragraph to the vote now.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius,

Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Zambia

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Nicaragua, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen

The seventh preambular paragraph was retained by 138 votes to 1, with 26 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.30, as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia,

Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Djibouti, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Nicaragua, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen

Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.30, as a whole, was adopted by 154 votes to none, with 23 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on action A/C.1/74/L.43, entitled "The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects".

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

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.43 was submitted by the representative of Colombia on 16 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document

A/C.1/74/L.43. The additional sponsors are listed in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Brazil, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Malawi and Seychelles have also become sponsors.

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

Under the terms of paragraphs 7 and 8 of draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.43, the General Assembly would decide, pursuant to the schedule of meetings for the period from 2018 to 2024 agreed upon at the third Review Conference, to convene a one-week biennial meeting of States from 15 to 19 June 2020 to consider key challenges and opportunities relating to the implementation of the Programme of Action and the International Tracing Instrument at the national, regional and global levels for the purposes of preventing and combating the diversion and the illicit international transfer of small arms and light weapons to unauthorized recipients, as well as a one-week biennial meeting of States in 2022; and also decide to convene the fourth United Nations Conference to Review Progress Made in the Implementation of the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects in 2024, to be preceded by a preparatory committee meeting in early 2024 of not more than five days.

With regard to paragraph 7 of the draft resolution, it is understood that issues related to the one-week biennial meeting of States in 2022, including the format, scope and modalities, are yet to be determined. Also, with regard to paragraph 8 of the draft resolution, it is understood that issues related to the fourth United Nations Conference in 2024 and the preparatory committee meeting in early 2024, including the format, scope and modalities, are yet to be determined. Accordingly, in the absence of modalities for the meetings, it is not possible at the present time to estimate the potential cost implications of meetings and documentation requirements. Upon the decision on the modalities of the meetings, the Secretary-General will submit the relevant costs of such requirements, in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. Furthermore, the dates of the meetings will have to be determined in consultation with the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management.

Accordingly, at this time, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.43 would not give rise to any programme budget implications.

The Chair: Separate, recorded votes have been requested on the seventh and twenty-second preambular paragraphs and operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.43. I shall put those paragraphs to the vote, one by one.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Israel, United States of America

Abstaining:

none

The seventh preambular paragraph was retained by 170 votes to 2.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote the twenty-second preambular paragraph.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, 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, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra

Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cambodia, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Myanmar, Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe

The twenty-second preambular paragraph was retained by 151 votes to 1, with 16 abstentions.

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

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, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia,

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

Against:

Israel, United States of America

Operative paragraph 6 was retained by 169 votes to 2.

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 that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.43, as a whole, was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.45, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee) Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.45 was submitted by the representative of Norway on 17 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/74/L.45.

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

Under the terms of paragraph 10 of draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.45, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General, in accordance with article

12, paragraph 1, of the Convention, to undertake the preparations necessary to convene the eighteenth Meeting of the States Parties to the Convention and, on behalf of the States parties and in accordance with article 12, paragraph 3, of the Convention, to invite States not parties to the Convention, as well as the United Nations, other relevant international organizations or institutions, regional organizations, the International Committee of the Red Cross and relevant non-governmental organizations, to attend the eighteenth Meeting of the States Parties as observers.

In accordance with article 14 of the Convention, the cost of the eighteenth Meeting of the States Parties would be borne by the States parties and States not parties to the Convention participating therein, in accordance with the United Nations scale of assessments, adjusted appropriately. Preliminary cost estimates for servicing the 2020 eighteenth Meeting will be prepared by the Secretariat and submitted for the approval of the States parties at their fourth Review Conference, to be held in Oslo during the week of 25 November.

It is recalled that all activities related to international conventions or treaties, which, under their respective legal arrangements, ought to be financed outside the regular budget of the United Nations, may be undertaken by the Secretariat only when sufficient funding is received, in advance, from States parties and States not parties participating at the meetings.

Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.45, no additional requirements would arise under the proposed programme budget for 2020.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Malawi, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, Palau, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, United States of America, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam

Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.45 was adopted by 161 votes to none, with 19 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.46, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.46 was submitted by the representative of Switzerland, on behalf of the 17 members of the Coordinating Committee of the Convention on Cluster Munitions, on 17 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/74/L.46.

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

Under the terms of paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.46, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to convene the second Review Conference of the States Parties to the Convention on Cluster Munitions and to continue to render the necessary assistance and provide such services as may be necessary to fulfil the tasks entrusted to him by the Convention and by the relevant decisions of the Meetings of States Parties and the first Review Conference.

In accordance with article 14 of the Convention, the costs of the Meetings of the States Parties, the Review Conferences and the Amendment Conferences shall be borne by the States parties and States not party to the Convention participating therein, in line with the United Nations scale of assessments, adjusted appropriately. Preliminary cost estimates for servicing the second Review Conference were prepared by the Secretariat — document CCM/MSP/2019/9 — and approved by the States parties at the ninth Meeting of States Parties, held in September.

It is recalled that all activities related to international conventions or treaties that, under their respective legal arrangements, ought to be financed outside the regular budget of the United Nations, may be undertaken by the Secretariat only when sufficient funding is received, in advance, from States parties and States not parties participating in the meetings.

Accordingly, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.46 would not give rise to any programme budget implications under the proposed programme budget for 2020.

The Chair: A separate, recorded vote has been requested on the fourteenth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.46.

I shall therefore put that paragraph to the vote now.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Canada, 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, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zambia

Against:

none

Abstaining:

Armenia, Bahrain, Egypt, Israel, Kuwait, Malawi, Oman, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United States of America, Viet Nam, Zimbabwe

The fourteenth preambular paragraph was retained by 147 votes to none, with 16 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.46, as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Tuvalu, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Russian Federation

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Bahrain, Belarus, Brazil, China, Cyprus, Egypt, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Greece, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Kuwait, Latvia, Malawi, Morocco, Myanmar,

Nepal, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United States of America, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Zimbabwe

Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.46, as a whole, was adopted by 138 votes to 1, with 39 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.54, entitled “ Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.54 was submitted by the representative of Latvia on 17 October. The sponsor of the draft resolution is listed in document A/C.1/74/L.54.

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

Under the terms of paragraphs 15 and 16, respectively, of draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.54, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to render the assistance necessary and to provide such services as may be required for the annual conferences and expert meetings of the High Contracting Parties to the Convention and of the High Contracting Parties to Amended Protocol II and Protocol V, as well as for any continuation of the work after the meetings; and also request the Secretary-General, in his capacity as depositary of the Convention and the Protocols thereto, to continue to inform the General Assembly periodically, by electronic means, of ratifications and acceptances of and accessions to the Convention, its amended article 1 and the Protocols.

It is recalled that all activities related to international conventions or treaties that, under their respective legal arrangements, ought to be financed outside the regular budget of the United Nations, may be undertaken by the Secretariat only when sufficient funding is received, in advance, from the States parties to the Convention.

Accordingly, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.54 would not give rise to any programme budget implications under the proposed programme budget for 2020.

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 shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.54 was adopted.

The Chair: I shall now call on those representatives who have requested to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I would like to remind all delegations that the first intervention is limited to five minutes and the second to three minutes.

I give the floor to the representative of China.

Ms. Zuo Rui (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): In the statements related to outer space draft resolutions, the United States attacked China's policies on outer space and arms control. A few other countries questioned the concept of shaping a community of a shared future for humankind in outer space. The Chinese delegation firmly opposes that practice.

With regard to our views and proposals concerning outer space security, as well as the draft treaty on the prevention of the placement of weapons in outer space and of the threat or use of force against outer space objects and whether or not it can resolve the issue of terrestrially based anti-satellite weapons, our delegation has made its views very clear multiple times during discussions in the First Committee and will not repeat them. Building a community of a shared future for humankind in outer space embodies the increasing link between outer space and the common future for humankind. It also expresses the concept of all peoples sharing outer space. It also shows the common aspiration to safeguard outer space security. It should not be viewed as a proposal by any particular State.

It is worth underscoring that a certain country, out of strategic considerations for seeking outer space dominance, and with disregard for the common interests of humankind, has planned to introduce weapons systems into outer space. It has long obstructed the process for outer space arms control. Who is manipulating outer space and turning it into a battleground? Which country places its national interests ahead of the common interests of the international community? We believe that countries will draw their fair conclusions. We hope that that country will take effective measures to safeguard the common future of humankind by addressing outer space security and earnestly remaining committed

to preventing the weaponization of, and an arms race in, outer space so as to restore peace and stability in that domain.

The Chair: We will now hear from delegations that wish to speak in explanation of vote or position after the voting.

I give the floor to the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Mr. Robatjazi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I would like to explain the position of my delegation with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.25, entitled "The Arms Trade Treaty" (ATT). My delegation abstained in the voting on the draft resolution on the ATT for the following reasons.

First, with respect to the ATT, the political and commercial interests of certain arms-exporting countries have higher priority than observing the fundamentals of international law. The international prohibition on the use of force by one State against another State is the most fundamental principle of modern international law. However, the ATT failed to uphold that principle and to prohibit arms transfers to countries that commit acts of aggression, including foreign occupation. That is a significant loophole and a major legal deficiency in the ATT.

Secondly, the draft resolution calls upon non-parties to accede to the Treaty. Such a call for the universalization of the ATT is unacceptable because the Treaty was not adopted by consensus, due to its substantive flaws and disregard for the concerns and interests of some States participating in the negotiation process. Furthermore, some States parties perpetrate major violations of the provisions of the ATT, exporting billions of dollars in arms to Israel and certain countries in the Persian Gulf. Such arms are used to sow death and destruction by occupiers in Palestine and aggressors in Yemen. Those are only two examples of the violations perpetrated. I would like to put on record that our position on the ATT applies to all paragraphs in the draft resolutions and draft decisions that are to be adopted by the Committee this year. Therefore, my delegation disassociates itself from all such references.

My delegation also abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.30, entitled "Transparency in armaments". We have repeatedly stated that the existing United Nations mechanism for transparency in conventional arms, without transparency in weapons of

mass destruction, is not balanced or comprehensive, in particular given the situation in the volatile region of the Middle East, where the Israeli regime continues to develop nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction and has remained outside of all international instruments banning weapons of mass destruction.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.45, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction”, anti-personnel mines have been used irresponsibly during civil wars in certain regions of the world and, consequently, have claimed a great number of innocent lives, in particular among women and children. We welcome every effort to stop that trend. However, the Convention focuses mainly on humanitarian concerns and does not adequately take into account the legitimate military requirements of many countries, in particular those with long land borders, for the responsible unlimited use of mines to defend their territories.

Because of the difficulties related to monitoring extensive sensitive areas by established and permanent guard posts and effective warning systems, unfortunately, anti-personnel mines continue to be an effective means for those countries to ensure the minimum security requirements of their borders. While that defensive device should be used under strict established rules to protect civilians, more national and international efforts should also be made to explore new alternatives to such mines. My delegation appreciates the objectives of the draft resolution. However due to

our particular concern and considerations, we abstained in the voting on the draft resolution.

My delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/74/L.46, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions”, because, first, we did not participate in its negotiations and are neither a signatory nor a party thereto. Secondly, we cannot support an instrument negotiated outside the United Nations, in disregard for the concerns and the interests of many States. As a general principle, we believe that negotiations on the subject of disarmament, due to their nature — as they address important issues, such as the concerns of the Security Council and the interests of States — require a balanced and comprehensive approach, a progressive, transparent and all-inclusive process and a consensus-based decision-making procedure. That is essential to ensuring the right of each State to security and that no individual State or group of States may obtain advantages over others at any stage.

As stressed in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (resolution S-10/2), we continue to share the view of many delegations that the Convention on Cluster Munitions was negotiated and concluded in an exclusive process outside of the United Nations disarmament machinery, thereby disregarding the interests of many States. Circumventing the United Nations disarmament machinery should not be allowed. Such a process should not be encouraged or promoted by the General Assembly.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.