



General Assembly

Seventy-sixth session

First Committee

16th meeting

Tuesday, 2 November 2021, 3 p.m.
New York

Official Records

Chair: Mr. Hilale(Morocco)

The meeting was called to order at 3 p.m.

Agenda items 92 to 107 (continued)

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

The Chair (*spoke in French*): This afternoon the Committee will continue to take action on all draft resolutions and draft decisions submitted under agenda items 92 to 107. We will be guided by the same procedure that I explained at our meeting on 27 October (see A/C.1/76/PV.13).

Before the Committee proceeds to take action on the draft resolutions and draft decisions submitted under cluster 4, as contained in informal paper No.2/Rev.5, we will continue to hear from delegations wishing to explain their positions or votes on them.

Mr. Eberhardt (United States of America): My delegation intends to join the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.43, entitled “The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects”. However, I would like to express certain concerns with respect to its substance and process.

Over the past 20 years, the delegation of the United States has continually repeated at every meeting related to the United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects (UNPOA) that the issue of ammunition is outside the Programme of Action’s scope. In fact, the inclusion of ammunition language did not achieve consensus when

the Programme of Action was adopted in 2001, and the United States voted against the inclusion of ammunition in the outcome document (A/CONF.192/2018/RC/3, annex) of the third Review Conference in June 2018.

We strongly and unequivocally opposed the inclusion of ammunition language in the final outcome document of the third Review Conference, which is why we opposed the inclusion of language that lauded the outcome document in the past three draft resolutions on small arms and light weapons. At the seventh Biennial Meeting of States to Consider the Implementation of the United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, the United States supported the inclusion of paragraph 24 in the final outcome document (A/CONF.192/BMS/2021/1, annex), regarding the Group of Governmental Experts on Problems Arising from the Accumulation of Conventional Ammunition Stockpiles in Surplus. We begrudgingly did not oppose the inclusion of paragraph 36 in the outcome document in order to work towards consensus.

We are disappointed to see that paragraph 36 of the outcome document has been included in this year’s draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.43, on small arms and light weapons. The United States continues to believe that the recently concluded Group of Governmental Experts and its anticipated follow-up process remain the appropriate forums in which to discuss measures regarding conventional ammunition. We continue to oppose the inclusion of ammunition in all aspects of the Programme of Action.

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>).



Finally, my delegation must express its sincere disappointment that draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.43 triggered a programme budget implication and that delegations were not informed until 18 October, at which point negotiations on the draft resolution had nearly concluded. Next year's eighth Biennial Meeting of States has been planned since at least 2018. We urge the Secretariat to ensure proactive budget planning for subsequent meetings on the UNPOA. We recall rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, which requires the consideration of expenditures. We expect information on expenditures to be provided in a timely fashion.

Mr. Balouji (Islamic Republic of Iran): I take the floor to explain my delegation's position on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.43, entitled "The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects".

The Islamic Republic of Iran believes that the goals pursued by the United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects (UNPOA) cannot be achieved until and unless the necessary strong political will and means of implementation are secured. Regrettably, the outcome document of the seventh Biennial Meeting of States to Consider 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 contains provisions, including the establishment of an open-ended expert group, that are incompatible with the mandate and powers of the Biennial Meeting of States, as envisaged in the Programme of Action. In fact, the UNPOA gives such authority only to the Review Conference. I would therefore like to emphasize that Iran's decision to join the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.43 does not imply that we agree with operative paragraph 8 or any other paragraph about which my delegation has expressed reservations.

Having adopted a constructive approach during the informal consultations, my delegation suggested that the draft resolution utilize language capable of garnering consensus. Yet the final version of the text has replicated the paragraphs of the final outcome document of the seventh Biennial Meeting of States. Repeating those paragraphs and highlighting controversial issues are not productive, and replicating those controversial elements serves only to drive us further from consensus. We strongly believe that the language used to recognize and endorse the outcome

document of the seventh Biennial Meeting of States does not reflect the facts that were presented during the meeting, which was held in July. The outcome document was adopted by a vote, but the language chosen for draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.43 cannot echo that fact, which should be taken into consideration and acted upon determinedly.

Turning to draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.46, on the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT), my delegation will abstain in the voting for the following reasons.

First, with regard to the ATT, the political and commercial interests of certain arms-exporting countries are given greater priority than the observance of the fundamentals of international law. The international prohibition of the use of force by one State against another is the most fundamental principle of modern international law. However, the ATT has failed to uphold that principle or to prohibit the transfer of arms to countries that commit acts of aggression, including foreign occupation. That is a significant loophole and a major legal deficiency of the Treaty.

Secondly, we have strong reservations about the notion of complementarity with other instruments, as mentioned in the text of draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.46. Furthermore, the draft resolution calls on non-parties to accede to the Treaty. Calling for the universalization of the ATT is unacceptable because it was not adopted by consensus owing to its substantive flaws and disregard for the concerns and interests of some of the States that participated in the negotiations process. Moreover, some States parties to the Treaty are committing major violations of its provisions, including by exporting billions of dollars of arms to Israel, where they are being used by aggressors to cause death and destruction in occupied Palestine, to give just one example of such violations.

Lastly, I would like to put it on record that our position on the ATT applies to all paragraphs referring to it in the draft resolutions and draft decisions adopted or to be adopted by the First Committee this year. My delegation therefore dissociates itself from all such references. I should also like to mention that, although we will join the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.15, entitled "Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons and collecting them", our position on the ATT — be it in that or any other draft resolution — is the same as explained with respect to draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.46.

Finally, we will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.47. In line with the position outlined in the relevant consultations process, my delegation believes that the suggestion to establish an open-ended working group without Member States first giving appropriate consideration to the 2021 report (see A/76/324) of the Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) on Problems Arising from the Accumulation of Conventional Ammunition Stockpiles in Surplus is a hasty decision. There was no pressing need to take such a step, and we were not convinced about that proposal. We also believe that, as stated in the relevant briefings, the GGE has acted outside of its mandate —

The Chair (*spoke in French*): I am sorry, but the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran is out of time.

Mrs. Romero López (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): As in previous years, the Cuban delegation will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.5, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction”.

The ongoing policy of hostility and aggression imposed more than 60 years ago by the United States against Cuba persists. Our country therefore cannot renounce the use of anti-personnel mines in our efforts to preserve our sovereignty and territorial integrity, in accordance with the legitimate right to self-defence enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.

Cuba is a State party to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, including its original Protocol II, and fully complies with the prohibitions and restrictions on mine use established in the Convention. We reaffirm our commitment to the implementation of a strict policy to guarantee the responsible use of anti-personnel mines for exclusively defensive purposes and to safeguard the national security of Cuba.

We fully share the legitimate humanitarian concerns associated with the indiscriminate and irresponsible use of anti-personnel mines and will continue to support all efforts that, while maintaining a necessary balance between humanitarian issues and national security issues, seek to eliminate the terrible effects of the indiscriminate and irresponsible use of anti-personnel mines on the civilian populations and economies of many countries.

The Cuban delegation will also abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.46, entitled “The Arms Trade Treaty” (ATT).

The Treaty, which was adopted prematurely, at a time when the negotiations had yet to be concluded, does not enjoy international consensus. It is an instrument plagued by ambiguities, inconsistencies, vague definitions and legal loopholes that undermine its effectiveness and efficiency. It is an unbalanced Treaty that favours the arms-exporting States. The parameters established for those States to evaluate the approval and denial of arms transfers are subjective and can be easily manipulated for political reasons, which hinders the right of States to acquire and possess weapons for their legitimate defence, as enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.

The Arms Trade Treaty cannot be considered effective given that it does not prohibit, and therefore legitimizes, arms transfers to unauthorized non-State actors — the primary source of illicit arms trafficking. We reject claims to establish synergies between the ATT and other instruments that do enjoy universal acceptance and that are totally different with respect to their legal nature, membership, scope and the category of weapons that they cover.

Our delegation disassociates itself from all paragraphs that refer to the ATT in the various draft resolutions on which the First Committee will take action.

Mr. Hegazy (Egypt): I take the floor to explain my delegation’s vote before the voting on the proposals contained in documents A/C.1/76/L.46, A/C.1/76/L.41 and A/C.1/76/L.5.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.46, entitled “The Arms Trade Treaty”, and the references to that Treaty in other proposals submitted 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 that led to the adoption of the Arms Trade Treaty.

Nevertheless, motivations relating to the desire of some States to manipulate and politicize the legitimate arms trade led to several shortcomings and loopholes in the Treaty, especially its deliberate lack of several necessary definitions and clear criteria, which make the implementation of the Treaty selective and

subjective and allow the arms-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. My delegation will therefore continue to abstain in the voting on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/76/L.46, entitled “The Arms Trade Treaty”, as well as on paragraphs that refer to the Treaty in the draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/76/L.15 and A/C.1/76/L.43.

Egypt will continue to abstain in the voting on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/76/L.41, 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 certain States.

Egypt will continue to abstain in the voting on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/76/L.5, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction”. Egypt has expressed its reservations on several occasions 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 Convention was concluded.

We believe that the Convention lacks balance between humanitarian concerns relating 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 for States to remove the anti-personnel mines they have placed on the territory of other States, thereby making it almost impossible for many States to meet their demining requirements on their own. That is particularly the case for Egypt, which is one of the most affected countries, as it still has around 22 million landmines that were placed on its territory during the Second World War.

Mr. Knyazyan (Armenia): I take the floor to explain the position of the delegation of Armenia on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.46, 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 the trade in conventional arms and prevent and eradicate their diversion into illicit markets or their use for illegitimate purposes, in particular when such use results in serious violations of human rights. Armenia reiterates its concerns regarding the “preamble” and “principles” sections of the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT). We have continually 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 and may hinder legitimate access to relevant technologies. The key objective of the Treaty, namely, to encourage and enforce the regulations of the conventional arms trade through strong national control systems, could have been upheld more strongly.

Armenia will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.46. Armenia’s position concerning the ATT is applicable to all other draft resolutions of the First Committee that contain a reference to the Treaty. We therefore disassociate ourselves from those paragraphs.

Mr. Dandy (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation would like to explain its vote before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.43, entitled “The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects”. My delegation will join the consensus on the draft resolution as a whole, as we believe in the need to combat the illicit trafficking in small arms and light weapons. However, my delegation disassociates itself from operative paragraph 13 of the draft resolution, which copies elements of paragraph 92 of the outcome document of the seventh Biennial Meeting of States to Consider 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 (A/CONF.192/BMS/2021/1, annex). We wish to recall that paragraph 92 did not enjoy consensus in that regard.

As for the twenty-second preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.43, the delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic will abstain in the voting on it, based on our well-known position on the Arms Trade Treaty. Our position also applies to all First Committee draft resolutions that refer to that Treaty.

Mr. Edu Mbasogo (Equatorial Guinea) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation takes the floor to explain why it will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.47, entitled “Problems arising from the accumulation of conventional ammunition stockpiles in surplus”.

We ask ourselves, if the nuclear-weapon States do not recognize their stockpiles in surplus to be excessive, how can small countries like ours that have conventional weapons be considered to have excessive stockpiles? And who has the authority to make that decision? Our small nations see everyday farmers and fishers waking up one day to find themselves armed with modern and sophisticated war material without knowing how it has been financed or who has provided it to them, leading to great instability in our small nations. Africa in particular suffers the most from those consequences. How can we protect ourselves against insurgency if our small armies are considered to have excessive conventional ammunition stockpiles, while the great nuclear-weapon Powers do not recognize their weapons stockpiles to be excessive? Our country will therefore abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.47.

The Chair (*spoke in French*): We have heard from the last speaker in explanation of position or vote before action is taken on items under cluster 4, “Conventional weapons”.

(*spoke in English*)

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.5, 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.1/76/L.5 was submitted by the representatives of the Netherlands and the Sudan on 1 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/76/L.5.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, 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, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zambia

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Egypt, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, Palau, Republic

of Korea, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Syrian Arab Republic, United States of America, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Zimbabwe

Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.5 was adopted by 162 votes to none, with 20 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Haiti 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.1/76/L.12, 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.1/76/L.12 was submitted by the representative of the Netherlands on 6 October. The sponsor of the draft resolution is listed in document A/C.1/76/L.12.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.12 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.15, entitled “Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons and collecting them”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.15 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 7 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/76/L.15. The additional sponsors are listed in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee.

The Chair: A separate vote has been requested on the sixteenth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.15.

I shall first put that paragraph to the vote.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, 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, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Serbia, 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, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Armenia, Belarus, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Djibouti, Egypt, Guinea-Bissau, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Nicaragua, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen

The sixteenth preambular paragraph was retained by 150 votes to none, with 19 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Algeria informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain; the delegation of Haiti that it had intended to vote in favour.]

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.15, as a whole, was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.41, 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.1/76/L.41 was submitted by the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, on behalf of a group of States, on 13 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/76/L.41.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, 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, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Tuvalu, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Russian Federation

Abstaining:

Argentina, Bahrain, Belarus, Brazil, Cyprus, Djibouti, Egypt, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Greece, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Kuwait, Latvia, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Somalia, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United States of America, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zimbabwe

Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.41 was adopted by 140 votes to 1, with 39 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Haiti 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.1/76/L.43, entitled “The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.43 was submitted by the representative of South Africa on 13 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/76/L.43. A statement on the programme budget implications of the draft resolution has been issued as document A/C.1/76/L.65 and placed on the e-deleGATE portal. The additional sponsors are listed on the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Sri Lanka has also become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

The Chair: A separate vote has been requested on the twenty-second preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.43.

I shall first put that paragraph to the vote.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, 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, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Serbia, 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, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Algeria, Armenia, Belarus, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Djibouti, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Nicaragua, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

The twenty-second preambular paragraph was retained by 152 votes to none, with 17 abstentions.

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

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.43, as a whole, was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/76/L.45, entitled "Countering the threat posed by improvised explosive devices".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/76/L.45 was submitted by the representative of France on 13 October. The sponsor of the draft decision is listed in document A/C.1/76/L.45.

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

Draft decision A/C.1/76/L.45 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.46, entitled "The Arms Trade Treaty".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.46 was submitted by the representative of Germany on 13 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/76/L.46. The additional sponsors are listed in the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Sierra Leone and Uruguay have also become sponsors of the draft resolution.

The Chair: Separate votes have been requested on the ninth and tenth preambular paragraphs of

draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.46. I shall now put those paragraphs to the vote, one by one.

I first put to the vote the ninth preambular paragraph.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, 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, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, 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, Zimbabwe

Against:

Russian Federation

Abstaining:

Armenia, Djibouti, Egypt, Eritrea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Kuwait, Libya, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab

Republic, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen

The ninth preambular paragraph was retained by 149 votes to 1, with 17 abstentions.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, 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, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Algeria, Armenia, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Eritrea, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kuwait, Libya, Mauritania, Nicaragua, Oman, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen

The tenth preambular paragraph was retained by 143 votes to none, with 23 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.46, as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Ukraine,

United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Armenia, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libya, Nicaragua, Oman, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Uganda, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen

Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.46, as a whole, was adopted by 151 votes to none, with 27 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Algeria informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain; the delegation of Haiti that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.47, entitled "Problems arising from the accumulation of conventional ammunition stockpiles in surplus".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.47 was submitted by the representatives of Germany and France on 13 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/76/L.47. A statement on the programme budget implications of the draft resolution has been issued as document A/C.1/76/L.66 and placed on the e-deleGATE portal. The additional sponsors are listed on the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Guinea has also become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria,

Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, 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, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.47 was adopted by 167 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.

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

The Chair (*spoke in French*): We will now hear from delegations wishing to speak in explanation of vote or position after action.

Ms. Fitri (Indonesia): Our delegation takes the floor to explain its position on the draft resolutions relating to small arms submitted under cluster 4. Our position regarding the Arms Trade Treaty is well known. We support the Treaty's objective, but we are of the view that the Treaty should not create hindrances or generate potential restrictions, especially for developing countries, in the development of their own capabilities. Indonesia therefore abstained in the voting on all paragraphs and draft resolutions that made reference to the Treaty, particularly draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.46, on the Arms Trade Treaty itself.

On draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.43, entitled "The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects", Indonesia welcomes the outcome of the seventh Biennial Meeting of States to Consider 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, which was held in July, while reserving our views with respect to interpreting certain aspects of the outcome. We look forward to the upcoming eighth Biennial Meeting of States to further discuss the implementation of the Programme of Action and the International Tracing Instrument. We hope that we will continue to take steps that bring us closer to solving the problems relating to small arms and light weapons.

Mr. Mohd Nasir (Malaysia): Malaysia supported and voted in favour of all draft resolutions on which the First Committee took action under cluster 4, "Conventional weapons". While maintaining our efforts to eradicate all weapons of mass destruction, we should not disregard the devastating consequences caused by conventional weapons. Malaysia commends the Secretary-General for placing particular emphasis on that subject in his Agenda for Disarmament.

Malaysia joins members of the international community in calling for further action to reduce the serious humanitarian impacts caused by conventional weapons, especially on the lives of civilians. As a State signatory to the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT), Malaysia reiterates its commitment to international efforts aimed at preventing, combating and eradicating the illicit trade in conventional arms. Malaysia believes that the ATT will help to strengthen existing national policies on conventional weapons, bearing in mind the legitimate

right of States to self-defence. Malaysia is committed to working towards the process of ratifying the Treaty.

The widespread misuse of small arms and light weapons has resulted in an extensive range of negative humanitarian consequences and serious threats to international peace and security. In that regard, Malaysia supports the United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects. Malaysia hopes that the Programme of Action will be fully implemented by States, as it serves as a road map for the international community to combat the proliferation and misuse of small arms.

Malaysia believes that collective action must be taken through a holistic arms-control and disarmament approach, post-conflict peacebuilding, conflict prevention and socioeconomic development. As such, Malaysia will continue to enhance cooperation and work closely with members of the international community towards a strong global solution to deal with the illicit arms trade. For the principles and reasons I have outlined, Malaysia supported and voted in favour of all draft resolutions on which the First Committee took action under cluster 4, "Conventional weapons".

Mr. Eberhardt (United States of America): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.47, "Problems arising from the accumulation of conventional ammunition stockpiles in surplus". The open-ended working group mandated in the draft resolution is the appropriate avenue to address international efforts regarding conventional ammunition, and we look forward to working with States in a constructive manner through that working group. While we were made aware early in the process that the draft resolution would trigger programme budget implications, we must express our sincere disappointment that the paper containing those implications was released only late last week and at a higher cost than projected.

We recall rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, which requires the consideration of expenditures. We expect information on expenditures to be provided accurately and in a timely fashion.

Mr. Sarwani (Pakistan): I take the floor to deliver Pakistan's explanation of vote on the draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/76/L.5 and A/C.1/76/L.41.

My delegation abstained in the voting on the draft resolution entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction", as contained in document A/C.1/76/L.5. Landmines continue to play a significant role in meeting the military needs of many States. Given our security compulsions and the need to guard long borders that are not protected by any natural obstacles, reliance on landmines is an integral part of Pakistan's defence.

Pakistan is a party to Amended Protocol II of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW), which regulates the use of landmines in order to protect civilians from their indiscriminate and lethal effects. There are no uncleared mines on Pakistan's territory. We remain committed to ensuring that mines in our military inventory will never become a source of civilian casualties. Pakistan is one of the largest troop contributors to United Nations peacekeeping operations. We have been successfully undertaking demining operations in various parts of the world and remain committed to providing further assistance in order to advance global humanitarian demining efforts.

Let me now share Pakistan's explanation of vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/76/L.41. As a matter of principle, Pakistan does not support the conclusion of important international treaties, especially those related to arms control and disarmament, such as the Convention on Cluster Munitions, outside the framework of the United Nations. Pakistan considers the multilateral framework of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons to be the most appropriate forum for addressing the issue of cluster munitions. The strength of the CCW lies in its legal framework, which strikes a delicate balance between the need to minimize human suffering without compromising the legitimate security interests of States. Pakistan supports international efforts to address the irresponsible and indiscriminate use of cluster munitions and condemns their use against civilian populations and peoples under illegal occupation. In view of those considerations, my delegation abstained in the voting on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/76/L.41.

Ms. Eng Man Yan (Singapore): I take the floor to explain my delegation's votes in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/76/L.5, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel

Mines and on Their Destruction”, and A/C.1/76/L.41, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions”, which the Committee just adopted.

Singapore’s position has been clear and consistent. We have traditionally voted in favour of the draft resolution entitled “Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction”. We support all initiatives against the indiscriminate use of anti-personnel landmines. In May 1996, Singapore declared a two-year moratorium on the exporting of anti-personnel landmines that do not have self-neutralizing mechanisms. The moratorium was expanded in February 1998 to include all manner of anti-personnel landmines, and it has since been extended indefinitely.

Singapore also voted in favour of the draft resolution entitled “Implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions”, as we support initiatives against the indiscriminate use of cluster munitions, especially when directed against innocent civilians. For that reason, Singapore declared an indefinite moratorium on the exporting of cluster munitions in November 2008.

Mr. Milanović (Bosnia and Herzegovina), Vice Chair, took the Chair.

Singapore supports the work of the Conventions I just mentioned by regularly attending the meetings of States parties to them. At the same time, as a small State, Singapore is firmly of the view that the legitimate security concerns and right to self-defence of any State cannot be disregarded. A blanket ban on all types of cluster munitions and anti-personnel landmines may therefore be counterproductive. Singapore supports international efforts to resolve humanitarian concerns about the use of anti-personnel landmines and cluster munitions. We will continue to work with the international community towards a durable and truly global solution.

Mr. Balouji (Islamic Republic of Iran): I take the floor to explain the vote of my delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.5.

Anti-personnel mines have been used irresponsibly during civil wars in certain regions of the world and have consequently claimed a great number of innocent lives, particularly among women and children. We welcome every effort to stop that trend. However, the Anti-personnel Mine Ban Convention is focused mainly on humanitarian concerns and does not adequately

take into account the legitimate military requirements of many countries, particularly those with long land borders, to use mines responsibly and in a limited manner to defend their territories.

Owing to the difficulties of monitoring extensive sensitive areas with established and permanent guard posts or effective warning systems, anti-personnel mines unfortunately continue to be an effective means for those countries to ensure minimum security requirements on their borders. While such defensive devices should be used under strict, established rules so as to protect civilians, more national and international efforts should also be made to explore new alternatives to anti-personnel mines. My delegation appreciates the objectives of draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.5. However, owing to our particular concerns and considerations, we abstained in the voting on it.

My delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.41, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions”, for the following reasons. First, my delegation did not participate in the negotiations on the Convention and is neither a signatory nor a party to it. Secondly, we cannot support an instrument negotiated outside the United Nations, given that such negotiations disregard the security concerns and interests of many States.

As a general principle, we believe that, owing to their nature in addressing vital issues such as the security concerns and interests of States, negotiations on disarmament matters require not only a balanced and comprehensive approach but also a progressive, transparent and all-inclusive process that incorporates consensual decision-making procedures. That is essential in order to guarantee each State’s right to security and to ensure that no individual State or group of States can 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 held by many delegations that the Convention on Cluster Munitions was negotiated and concluded in an exclusive process outside the United Nations disarmament machinery, thereby disregarding the interests of many States. Circumventing the United Nations disarmament machinery should not be allowed, and neither should such a process be encouraged or promoted by the General Assembly.

Finally, with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.45, Iran supports measures to counter the threat posed by the use of improvised explosive devices (IEDs) by illegal armed groups and terrorists. For that reason, my delegation joined the consensus on adopting the draft resolution. In our view, preventing and combating the use of IEDs by terrorists and illegal armed groups is the exclusive purpose of the draft resolution. Any interpretation of the provisions of the text should therefore be consistent with that purpose. Moreover, given that it is almost impossible to define the scope of the items used to manufacture IEDs, and that many of those items have civilian applications, any interpretation beyond the exclusive purpose of the draft resolution that could restrict free access to and trade in such equipment and goods for civilian uses is unacceptable.

Mrs. Narayanan Nair (India): India takes this opportunity to deliver its explanation of vote on the draft resolutions submitted under cluster 4, “Conventional weapons”.

India abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.5, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction”. India supports the vision of a world free of anti-personnel landmines and is committed to their eventual elimination. The availability of militarily effective alternative technologies that can perform the legitimate defensive role of anti-personnel landmines in a cost-effective manner will considerably facilitate the goal of the complete elimination of such mines.

India is a high contracting party to Amended Protocol II to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, which enshrines the approach of taking into account the legitimate defence requirements of States, especially those with long borders. India has fulfilled its obligations under Amended Protocol II, including, inter alia, by stopping the production of non-detectable mines, as well as rendering all of our anti-personal mines detectable. India observes a moratorium on the export and transfer of anti-personnel landmines. We have taken a number of measures to address the humanitarian concerns arising from the use of anti-personnel landmines, in accordance with international humanitarian law.

India remains committed to increasing international cooperation and assistance for mine clearance, as well as the rehabilitation of mine victims, and has been

contributing technical assistance and expertise to that end. India also regularly participates as an observer at the Meetings of the States Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personal Mines and Their Destruction..

Regarding draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.46, entitled “The Arms Trade Treaty” (ATT), India has established strong and effective national export controls with respect to exporting defence items. India subscribes to the objectives of the Treaty, and our export-control systems meet those objectives. As part of our commitment to international transparency measures, India submits an annual report under the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms for the same categories of conventional arms that are regulated under the ATT. Our commitment is also reflected in India’s participation in the Wassenaar Arrangement. India continues to keep the ATT under review from the perspective of its defence, security and foreign policy interests. We therefore abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.46.

Mr. Moreno (Israel): I would like to exercise our right to deliver an explanation of vote after the voting on draft resolutions A/C.1/76/L.43, entitled “The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects”, A/C.1/76/L.46, entitled “The Arms Trade Treaty”, and A/C.1/76/L.47, entitled “Problems arising from the accumulation of conventional ammunition stockpiles in surplus”.

Israel supported draft resolutions A/C.1/76/L.43, A/C.1/76/L.46 and A/C.1/76/L.47. Nevertheless, my country would like to reiterate its position on ammunition. We wish to recall our position that the United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects has no mandate with regard to ammunition. A separate venue was chosen for that purpose, namely, the meeting of the Group of Governmental Experts on Problems Arising from the Accumulation of Conventional Ammunition Stockpiles in Surplus, which took place in 2020 and 2021, and the subsequent draft resolution on ammunition (A/C.1/76/L.47), which the Committee just adopted.

Mrs. Romero López (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Cuban delegation would like to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.43, “The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects”.

Our delegation joined the consensus on the draft resolution as a whole based on Cuba's unwavering commitment to combating the scourge of the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons. However, we regret that the concerns of a group of delegations, including our own, were not taken into account. In that regard, Cuba dissociates itself from the consensus on operative paragraph 13, which reproduces elements of paragraph 92 of the outcome document of the seventh Biennial Meeting of States to Consider 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. We wish to recall that paragraph 92 did not enjoy consensus at that meeting.

Operative paragraph 13 of the draft resolution encourages States to take into account recent developments in small arms and light weapons manufacturing, technology and design, including polymer and modular weapons, in implementing the Programme of Action and the International Tracing Instrument (ITI), when it was precisely the lack of consensus on that issue and, consequently, on the proposed annex to the International Tracing Instrument that delayed an agreement being reached on the agenda of the seventh Biennial Meeting, which hindered progress in our work and the consideration of other issues that had been mandated for that process.

We reiterate that, in the context of any future consideration of new technological developments, it would be necessary to reflect on the implications of adopting new commitments or obligations within the framework of the Programme of Action or the ITI, which would entail greater financial and technological burdens for developing countries in terms of registration, marking and tracing, in particular if those that cannot meet such requirements are later categorized as non-compliant States.

We reaffirm the full validity and applicability of the United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects as an international benchmark adopted by consensus, as well as that of the International Tracing Instrument to enable States to identify and trace illicit small arms and light weapons in a timely and reliable manner.

We abstained in the voting on preambular paragraph 22 of draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.43, in line with our well-known position regarding the Arms Trade Treaty. Having endorsed the final outcome document of the

seventh Biennial Meeting of States, we nevertheless reiterate our rejection of the omission of an explicit reference to the inherent right of States to their legitimate defence, in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, and that of all States to manufacture, import and retain small arms and light weapons in order to meet their legitimate defence and security needs.

We reaffirm that nothing contained in paragraph 31 of the final outcome document can be interpreted as accepting manipulable or politically motivated criteria that attempt to limit or impede the right of States to acquire or possess weapons for their legitimate defence. We remain convinced that addressing the deep socioeconomic causes that give rise to the scourge of the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons requires genuine political will, including a real commitment to international cooperation and assistance.

Ms. Kritikou (Cyprus): I take the floor to explain our abstention on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.41, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions".

Cyprus attaches great importance to the application of restrictions and prohibitions of weapons deemed excessively injurious or having potentially indiscriminate effects. In that regard, Cyprus is a State party to all the Protocols to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons. Furthermore, our national policy and legislation are in full compliance with European Union standards and regulations. Cyprus signed the Convention on Cluster Munitions in 2009, and the relevant legislation for its ratification was forwarded to Parliament in 2011. However, the ratification process is still ongoing owing to considerations related to the abnormal security situation on the island. We remain hopeful that those issues will be resolved, which would then enable us to ratify the Convention and vote in favour of the draft resolution in future.

Mr. Belousov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): Our delegation takes the floor to explain its position on draft resolutions A/C.1/76/L.41 and A/C.1/76/L.46.

Russia voted against draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.41, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions". We continue to have serious concerns about that ambiguous instrument, which was formulated in haste outside the framework of the United Nations, and our position on it therefore remains unchanged. We did

not participate in its drafting because it was designed from the outset to introduce discriminatory restrictions that run counter to Russia's defence and security interests. While the Convention ostensibly declares a total ban on cluster munitions, in reality it seeks unjustifiably to differentiate between so-called bad cluster munitions, which are prohibited, and a specific high-tech type, whose use is permitted. We consider that to be a manifestation of double standards.

Another shortcoming of the instrument is that it allows States parties to the Convention to use cluster munitions in the course of military operations carried out jointly with countries that do not possess such munitions and that are not parties to the Convention. We wish to underscore that cluster munitions are a legal type of weapon. The humanitarian problems associated with them arise not from the weapons themselves, but from their inappropriate use.

The Russian Federation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.46, entitled, "The Arms Trade Treaty". We trust that the States parties to the Treaty will implement its provisions regarding the creation of appropriate national control systems for the transfer of conventional weapons. We will continue to monitor the implementation of the Treaty in that respect. Having carefully reviewed the outcomes of the seventh Conference of States Parties to the Arms Trade Treaty, which was held in Geneva from 30 August to 3 September, we note that the participants failed to achieve any concrete results.

At the same time, we note that the principle of diligent and responsible behaviour in the international trade in conventional arms, as set forth in the Treaty, is not being observed and is generally far from the standards adopted in the military and technical cooperation systems established by Russia and other leading weapons suppliers and importers. The Arms Trade Treaty lacks a direct ban on the unlicensed manufacturing of weapons and the transfer of weapons to non-State actors. It also lacks any provisions that would regulate the re-exporting of products for military use.

In addition, the Treaty contains significant shortcomings that make it difficult to effectively block the channels through which weapons enter into illicit circulation, which leaves the door open for the ambiguous and dubious interpretation of the Treaty's provisions. We also have serious questions about the Treaty's practical implementation. It is unacceptable

that some States parties to the Treaty continue to directly or indirectly supply products with military applications to zones suffering internal armed conflicts. In the light of everything I have said, Russia does not intend to join the Arms Trade Treaty in its current form or to participate in any events held under its auspices as an observer.

Mr. Leite Novaes (Brazil): I wish to explain Brazil's abstention on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.41, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions".

Brazil supports efforts to address cluster munitions within the United Nations, in particular the discussions related to the adoption of a protocol to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW). We actively participated in the negotiations within the framework of the Group of Governmental Experts on Emerging Technologies in the Area of Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems, the objective of which was the adoption of a legally binding instrument that would lead to the gradual banning of cluster munitions.

Brazil did not participate in the Oslo process. In our view, the establishment of a parallel negotiating process outside the CCW was neither consistent with the objective of strengthening the Convention nor with the goal of promoting the adoption of balanced, effective and non-discriminatory arms-control instruments. Brazil considers that there are serious loopholes in the Oslo Convention. For instance, it allows the use of cluster munitions equipped with technologically sophisticated mechanisms for an indefinite period of time. Such mechanisms are present only in those munitions manufactured in a small number of countries with more advanced defence industries. The effectiveness of the Convention is also undermined by its article 21, known as the interoperability clause.

Brazil has never used cluster munitions and is a State party to all of the CCW's Protocols, including Protocol V, on explosive remnants of war. As such, we are committed to ensuring that any possible use of cluster munitions is in line with the obligations under applicable international humanitarian law.

Brazil voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.46, on the Arms Trade Treaty. Brazil is a party to the Treaty and a consistent supporter of the United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects. However, we

believe that the use of the term “synergies” in operative paragraph 9 of the draft resolution is inadequate in the light of the differences between the two instruments in relation to their legal nature and scope, among other factors.

Mr. Jiménez (Nicaragua) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation takes the floor to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.43, entitled “The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects”.

Our delegation joined the consensus on the draft resolution as a whole based on our commitment to combating the scourge of the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons. Nevertheless, we regret that the concerns raised and the comments made by many delegations, including our own, were not taken into account. Our delegation therefore disassociates itself from the consensus on operative paragraph 13, which includes elements taken from paragraph 92 of the final outcome document of the seventh Biennial Meeting of States to Consider 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. We recall that paragraph 92 did not enjoy consensus at that recently concluded meeting.

Consequently, paragraph 13 of the draft resolution encourages States to take into account the latest developments in small arms and light weapons manufacturing, technology and design, including polymer and modular weapons, in implementing the Programme of Action and the International Tracing Instrument (ITI), even in the absence of consensus on that issue. The subsequent lack of consensus on the proposed annex to the ITI delayed agreement on the agenda of the seventh Biennial Meeting, which hindered progress in our work and the consideration of other issues that had been mandated for that process.

We reiterate that, in the context of the future consideration of new technological developments, it would be necessary to assess the implications of adopting new commitments or obligations within the scope of the Programme of Action and the ITI, which would entail greater financial and technological burdens, especially for developing countries such as ours, in terms of registration, marking and tracing, in particular if those that cannot meet such requirements due to a lack of resources are later categorized as non-compliant States.

My delegation wishes to reaffirm the full validity and applicability of the United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects as an international benchmark adopted by consensus, as well as that of the International Tracing Instrument to enable States to identify and trace illicit small arms and light weapons in a timely and reliable manner.

Our position on the Arms Trade Treaty is well known and is the reason for our abstention on the twenty-second preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.43. We wish to reiterate that addressing the deep socioeconomic causes that give rise to the scourge of the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons requires genuine international cooperation and solidarity, including a real commitment to international assistance on that issue.

Ms. Song Da Hee (Republic of Korea): My delegation would like to deliver an explanation of vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/76/L.5 and A/C.1/76/L.41.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.5, the Republic of Korea sincerely supports the objectives and purposes of the Ottawa Mine Ban Convention. However, owing to the unique security situation on the Korean peninsula, we are currently not a party to the Convention and therefore abstained in the voting on the draft resolution. That does not mean that we are less concerned about the severe challenges associated with anti-personnel mines, and we remain committed to mitigating the suffering caused by their use. In that respect, the Korean Government exercises tight control over anti-personnel landmines and has maintained an indefinite moratorium on their export since 1997.

In addition, the Republic of Korea is a party to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons and its Amended Protocol II, under which we participate in a range of discussions and activities to ensure only limited and responsible use. We also joined Protocol V, on explosive remnants of war, and are implementing all relevant obligations. On the domestic front, my Government continues its efforts on mine clearance and victim rehabilitation. We have cleared 1,326 mines over the past two years alone, including 1,297 anti-personnel mines, over an area of approximately 376,026 square metres. We also enacted a special law in 2014 to support and provide assistance to mine victims and their bereaved family members. Moreover, my Government has contributed more than \$40 million since 1993 to relevant United Nations programmes for

demining and victim assistance, including the United Nations Voluntary Trust Fund for Assistance in Mine Action and the International Trust Fund for Demining and Mine Victim Assistance. The Republic of Korea will continue to contribute to international efforts for mine clearance and victim assistance.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.41, the Government of the Republic of Korea fully shares the concerns of the international community about the humanitarian impact of cluster munitions and supports efforts to address the humanitarian problems arising from their use. However, owing to the unique security situation on the Korean peninsula, my Government is currently not a party to the Convention on Cluster Munitions and therefore abstained in the voting on the draft resolution. Nevertheless, my delegation would like to inform Member States that the Ministry of National Defence of the Republic of Korea adopted a directive on cluster munitions in 2008, according to which only cluster munitions that are equipped with self-deactivation devices and that have a failure rate of less than 1 per cent can be included in acquisition plans. The directive also recommends developing alternative weapon systems to replace cluster munitions in the long term. While it is regrettable that we are not able to support the draft resolution at this moment, the Republic of Korea will continue its constructive efforts to mitigate the humanitarian problems associated with the use of cluster munitions.

The Acting Chair: We have heard from the last speaker in explanation of vote or position after action on cluster 4, “Conventional weapons”.

The Committee will now turn to cluster 5, “Other disarmament measures and international security”.

I shall first give the floor to those delegations wishing to make either a general statement or to introduce new or revised drafts under cluster 5. Statements are limited to five minutes.

I give the floor to the representative of the United States to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.16.

Mr. Eberhardt (United States of America): I take the floor to deliver a general statement and to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.16, entitled “Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments”. We are pleased with the draft resolution’s wide co-sponsorship, which is a testament to the importance of the issue it addresses.

The issue of compliance continues to gain increasing prominence, as reinforced by recent incidents of non-compliance and their unfortunate repercussions. Today there is broad consensus on the necessity that States Members of the United Nations comply with their respective international obligations and commitments to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and to constrain and reduce armaments. Confidence in compliance with such obligations and commitments is a central element of the international security architecture and the maintenance of international peace and stability. A treaty that does not enjoy full compliance cannot provide the full measure of confidence that its negotiators had intended in maintaining and improving international peace and security. Moreover, there is broad recognition of the value of building national, regional and international capacities in order to strengthen measures and of having effective verification, compliance and enforcement mechanisms that are consistent with the Charter of the United Nations.

Given the compliance challenges posed by several countries with respect to their arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation obligations, now is the time to signal strong support for compliance as an essential contribution to international peace and security, including by supporting draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.16. We therefore call on all delegations to vote in favour of and co-sponsor the draft resolution, entitled “Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments”.

The Acting Chair: I now give the floor to the representative of the Republic of Korea to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.36.

Ms. Song Da Hee (Republic of Korea): I have the honour to briefly take the floor to introduce the biennial draft resolution entitled “Youth, disarmament and non-proliferation”, as contained in document A/C.1/76/L.36, which aims to empower, engage and educate youth in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation. It is essential to provide opportunities to youth so that they can participate in the key disarmament discussions, not only as beneficiaries but also as important stakeholders. Moreover, their participation is sure to help spur diversity in ongoing disarmament and non-proliferation discussions and help ensure the sustainability of those discussions.

It is based on that firm belief that, for the second time since 2019, the Republic of Korea is submitting

the draft resolution on youth, in the hope of bringing young people to the attention of the First Committee and to encourage Member States to seek concrete measures to empower, engage and educate youth. It is my sincere hope that the draft resolution could also generate further momentum to advance disarmament discussions, which have been polarized and remained at a standstill for quite some time.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all Member States that have co-sponsored and shown support for the draft resolution and encourage those that have not yet done so to do the same. The draft resolution has more than 80 co-sponsors at this stage, and we hope that it will be adopted by consensus.

Mr. Sarwani (Pakistan): I take the floor to deliver Pakistan's general statement on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/76/L.55, entitled "Promoting international cooperation on peaceful uses in the context of international security".

Science and technology have been recognized as critical enablers for the achievement of the socioeconomic development of countries. The technology revolution embraces every aspect of life and has emerged as a guarantor of national development and progress. Pakistan is a strong advocate of utilizing technology for peace, progress and prosperity for all. We believe in an equitable, non-discriminatory and criteria-based approach to advancing the universally shared goals of non-proliferation and the promotion of the peaceful uses of technology, materials and scientific information.

We believe that the consideration of safety and security aspects would facilitate rather than hinder the pursuit of the peaceful uses of technology in promoting the development agenda. If we are to build back better from the wreckage of the coronavirus disease crisis and accelerate the realization of the Sustainable Development Goals and climate goals, the application and adoption of new technologies in the development paradigm will be indispensable, if not imperative. That will be possible only if access to advanced technologies in all relevant spheres is available to developing countries on preferential terms, without any discrimination.

It is unfortunate that developing countries continue to face considerable challenges in the legitimate exchange of science and technology for peaceful purposes. The derogation from non-proliferation

norms, discriminatory exceptions based on political or strategic interests and disregard for any equitably applicable criteria have undermined the credibility and legitimacy of existing export-control regimes. We believe that the international community should seek to work together to change the status quo and reduce the wide technological gaps among States.

Against that backdrop, the draft resolution entitled "Promoting international cooperation on peaceful uses in the context of international security" highlights the significance of safeguarding the legitimate right of all States to peaceful uses and urges all Member States, without prejudice to their non-proliferation obligations, to take concrete measures to promote international cooperation on materials, equipment and technology for peaceful purposes. The draft resolution also highlights the urgent need for a comprehensive and holistic approach in order to strike a proper balance between non-proliferation and the peaceful uses of science and technology for the benefit of humankind. We believe that the United Nations is the most representative multilateral institution and should play a central role in that regard. The draft resolution requests that the Secretary-General seek the views of Member States on the issue of peaceful uses and explore solutions in the interests of all parties. In the light of those key considerations and our principled position on peaceful uses, my delegation co-sponsors the draft resolution and calls on all Member States to support and vote in favour of it.

The Acting Chair: I now give the floor to the representative of the Russian Federation to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.13.

Mr. Belousov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The First Committee will today consider draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.13, submitted by the Russian Federation and the United States, on the issue of ensuring security in the use of information and communications technologies (ICT). We are one step away from taking a truly historic decision in adopting a draft resolution that consolidates the restored atmosphere of consensus in the global discussion on international information security, under the auspices of the United Nations.

This year has been marked by major diplomatic achievements in this area, including the adoption of the consensus final reports of both the Open-ended Working Group (OEWG) (see A/75/816) and of the Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in

the Context of International Security (see A/76/135). The international community has proven in practical terms that it is capable of negotiating and elaborating mutually acceptable solutions when it comes to resolving fundamental issues of national and international security.

Russia's initiative this year to adopt a single draft resolution on international information security represents a logical outcome of the constructive and pragmatic approach shown by all Member States in having participated in the negotiations. We are grateful to the delegation of the United States for its joint efforts to agree on a common text and its readiness to promote it on behalf of our two countries, as the main sponsors of the draft resolution. We are also pleased to note that 104 States have already joined our initial agreement as co-sponsors.

The Russian-American text was drafted in a unifying and objective spirit. It encapsulates the positive outcomes of the OEWG and the GGE and recommends their final reports as guidance for States in their use of ICT. The draft resolution therefore draws a line under the so-called dual-track period of negotiations at the United Nations on international information security and fulfils the international community's aspiration to pursue discussions on that topic in a single-track format.

The draft resolution provides a strategic basis for continuing the negotiations process. It expresses support for the launching of the OEWG for the period 2021 to 2025 and reaffirms its mandate in dealing with matters of ICT use and security, as enshrined in resolution 75/240. The text also reflects indisputable principles of ensuring international information security, including by promoting the peaceful uses of ICT, preventing their use for criminal and terrorist purposes and averting conflicts in the information space. It also reaffirms the possibility of developing additional rules, norms and principles for the responsible behaviour of States, including through establishing additional binding agreements.

We believe that the adoption of Russian-United States draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.13 will contribute meaningfully to strengthening international peace and security in the use of ICT. We therefore call on all Member States to support the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.13.

The Acting Chair: I now give the floor to the representative of China to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55.

Mr. Geng Shuang (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): Today's world is experiencing a new round of scientific and technological revolution in which emerging technologies are developing rapidly. In order to strike a better balance between development and security, non-proliferation and peaceful uses, and to ensure that all States fully enjoy their legitimate right to peaceful uses, the Chinese delegation has this year submitted to the First Committee draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55, entitled "Promoting international cooperation on peaceful uses in the context of international security".

The draft resolution aims to promote international cooperation on peaceful uses. Given the wave of scientific and technological advancement, the right of all countries to peaceful uses should be respected and safeguarded. The draft resolution urges all parties to implement multilateral arms-control obligations and treaties in a more comprehensive and balanced manner, without prejudice to their non-proliferation obligations, and to take practical measures to promote international cooperation on peaceful uses.

The draft resolution also seeks to promote fair export-control regimes. While the existing regimes were established with good intentions, their frequent abuse has caused disruption to and restrictions on regular economic, trade and scientific and technological cooperation, which affect several developing countries. The draft resolution calls on the international community to work together to change that status quo. It also aims to promote the central role of the United Nations as the most authoritative and representative multilateral institution. Moreover, it requests that the Secretary-General seek the views of Member States on the issue of peaceful uses, launch an inclusive and transparent United Nations process and coordinate the international community in exploring solutions that serve the interests of all parties.

Some delegations claim that adopting draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55 will weaken the international community's consensus on non-proliferation, which is not the case. Non-proliferation and peaceful uses can be compared to two sides of the same coin, in that neither one can exist without the other. The draft resolution begins with a clear statement reaffirming that the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery constitute a threat to international

peace and security and that parties must not abuse their right to peaceful uses with a view to engaging in proliferation activities.

Some delegations claim that draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55 is an attempt to repudiate existing export-control regimes, which again is not the case. The purpose of the existing export-control regimes is to promote peaceful uses, which is consistent with the spirit of the draft resolution. China hopes to promote and enhance existing export-control regimes and strengthen exchanges with those within and outside them, especially developing countries.

Some delegations claim that the draft resolution failed to take on board the views of all parties, which could not be further from the truth. China adhered to an open, transparent and inclusive process in preparing the draft resolution. We convened a three-hour consultation with Member States, engaged on multiple occasions with members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and like-minded States and listened to the views of relevant countries through in-depth one-on-one exchanges. All proposed amendments that were in line with the spirit of the draft resolution were taken into consideration and incorporated into the text.

I would like to point out that it is not constructive for individual countries to request a separate vote on the draft resolution. Operative paragraphs 2 and 3 of the text request the Secretary-General to consult Member States and submit a report to the General Assembly, which is common practice in advancing the process of any multilateral discussion and an important way for Member States to reflect their own positions, which should be upheld.

Scientific and technological progress is the key driving force for economic and social development. While all countries are confronted with the risks of proliferation, they should also enjoy the right to peaceful uses. China has resolved to defend that right and calls for the removal of undue restrictions. We hope that all delegations will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55 and its operative paragraphs 2 and 3. We believe that adopting the draft resolution will help improve existing export-control regimes, consolidate the process of multilateral disarmament, safeguard the right to peaceful uses and better realize the universal security and common development of all countries.

Mr. Tozik (Belarus) (*spoke in Russian*): Our delegation takes the floor to deliver a general statement on the drafts submitted under cluster 5.

We wish to underscore the importance of consolidating multilateral efforts to strengthen international information security, which should be centred around developing and adopting universal comprehensive rules, under the auspices of the United Nations, for the responsible behaviour of States in the information space. Such rules should consolidate activities in the digital sphere and the principles of the non-use of force, respect for the sovereignty of States, digital good-neighbourliness and non-interference in the internal affairs of States.

We note the successful outcomes of this year's session of the Open-ended Working Group on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security, established pursuant to resolution 73/27, and welcome the adoption of resolution 75/240, which establishes a renewed mandate for the Open-ended Working Group for the coming five-year period. We welcome the joint efforts and the agreement reached by the main sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.13, entitled "Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security, and advancing responsible State behaviour in the use of information and communications technologies", which we will support and co-sponsor.

The Republic of Belarus will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55, entitled "Promoting international cooperation on peaceful uses in the context of international security". We support its provisions on ensuring equal access for countries, especially developing countries, to advancements in science and technology and to new and emerging technologies, which should promote the peaceful uses of materials, equipment and technology in ensuring international security, including with respect to existing commitments in the area of non-proliferation and arms control. We also support the separate paragraphs of draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55 on which a recorded vote has been requested.

Mr. Balouji (Islamic Republic of Iran): I take the floor to make a general statement regarding the draft resolution entitled "Promoting international cooperation on peaceful uses in the context of international security, as contained in document A/C.1/76/L.55.

My delegation appreciates the initiative of the Chinese delegation and strongly supports the draft resolution being submitted for the consideration of the First Committee with a view to promoting international collaboration on peaceful uses. It is a globally accepted norm to ensure that all countries have the right to participate in the greatest possible exchange of equipment, materials, science and technology for peaceful purposes. Unfortunately, as proven by the implementation of numerous export-control regimes established by small groups of countries over past decades, the track record for putting that theory into practice has been far from perfect.

Undue restrictions imposed on the grounds of non-proliferation or national security that run counter to international obligations and treaties and are based on selective and discriminatory approaches, some of which are exaggerated or completely false, have greatly impeded genuine exchanges in science and technology for peaceful purposes. That situation has heightened the tensions between countries and exacerbated the scientific and technological divide between developed and developing nations. The unilateral coercive measures imposed by the United States, which hamper the development of targeted countries, are just one example in that regard.

As mentioned by the representative of China, the purpose of draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55 is to emphasize the importance and urgency of all Member States fully exercising their legitimate right to the peaceful uses of science and technology, as well as to initiate discussions at the United Nations in order to facilitate international cooperation on the peaceful uses of science and technology.

Iran strongly supports the premise underlying draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55 and believes that future iterations will take into account and reflect the views of the vast majority of the world. Along with its non-proliferation concerns, my delegation emphasizes that the mere existence and advancement of weapons of mass destruction pose a threat to international peace and security.

Mr. Dandy (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): I take the floor to deliver a general statement on draft resolutions A/C.1/76/L.13 and A/C.1/76/L.55.

My country co-sponsored draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.13, entitled “Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of

international security, and advancing responsible State behaviour in the use of information and communications technologies”, because we believe that it is in the interest of every country to encourage the peaceful uses of information and communications technologies (ICT) and to prevent conflicts arising from their use, especially given that a number of countries are developing their ICT capabilities for military purposes.

Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.13 reaffirms that the potential use of such technologies for purposes that are inconsistent with the objectives of maintaining international peace and security may negatively affect the integrity of States’ infrastructure. The use of information or technology resources for criminal or terrorist purposes must therefore be prevented. We urge Member States to support the draft resolution, especially as it stresses the importance of respecting human rights and fundamental freedoms in the use of information and communications technologies and reaffirms that capacity-building is essential for cooperation and confidence-building among countries in that regard.

My country also co-sponsored draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55, entitled “Promoting international cooperation on peaceful uses in the context of international security”, based on our belief that there is an urgent need for the international community to take a comprehensive and holistic approach in advancing the goals of non-proliferation and the peaceful uses of science and technology by striking an appropriate balance between security and sustainable development, which would allow all States to have non-discriminatory access to science and technology for peaceful purposes, irrespective of their level of scientific and technological development.

Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55 is of vital importance, as it will serve as a catalyst for intensifying efforts to promote the peaceful uses of science, technology and international cooperation in relevant fields. It will also strengthen dialogue among members of existing multilateral export-control regimes and the international community as a whole, so that those regimes may better serve the goals of global security and development. Given that the United Nations is the most universal international organization, it is well placed to play a central role in initiating comprehensive and transparent discussions to identify the concerns of all Member States, especially developing countries, and to seek possible solutions that serve the common

interests of the entire international community. We therefore urge all States to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55 and its paragraphs.

Finally, my delegation would like to reaffirm its support for draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.24, entitled “Relationship between disarmament and development”; draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.26, entitled “Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control”; and draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.27, entitled “Promotion of multilateralism in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation”.

Mr. Reyes Hernández (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): The delegation of Venezuela takes the floor to make a general statement under cluster 5, “Other disarmament measures and international security”, in particular with respect to draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55, entitled “Promoting international cooperation on peaceful uses in the context of international security”.

Venezuela appreciates the initiative of the People’s Republic of China in having submitted draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55, which we have jointly co-sponsored together with a group of countries. Venezuela supports the draft resolution based on the inalienable right of all States to participate in the greatest possible exchange of equipment, materials and scientific and technological information for peaceful purposes, in accordance with existing international obligations and without prejudice to the non-proliferation obligations of all States. The draft resolution suggests that universal, comprehensive and non-discriminatory multilateral agreements can be useful tools in addressing proliferation-related concerns and, as such, that they provide an opportunity to remove undue restrictions on exports to developing countries of materials, equipment and technologies for peaceful purposes, which undermine economic, trade and scientific cooperation in the international arena.

The drafting of a report under the auspices of the Secretary-General that brings together the views and recommendations of all States on every aspect of promoting international cooperation on peaceful uses in the context of international security, as proposed in draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55, could serve the dual purpose of promoting international cooperation while also pursuing the goal of non-proliferation. In the light of those objectives, my delegation invites all States to support draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55, “Promoting

international cooperation on peaceful uses in the context of international security”, and all its paragraphs.

The Acting Chair: We have exhausted the list of requests from delegations to take the floor for general statements. Before the Committee proceeds to take action on the draft resolutions and draft decisions under cluster 5, we will hear from delegations wishing to explain their position on those drafts.

Mrs. Thomas-Greenfield (United States of America): The United States is compelled to vote against draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55, entitled “Promoting international cooperation on peaceful uses in the context of international security”, for three reasons. It fails to protect against the dire risks posed by advanced technologies; a collaborative and inclusive First Committee process to consider the text was not followed; and it misses an opportunity to ensure equitable access to new technologies.

First, the United States believes that the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55 would undermine international cooperation in the field of science and technology. All countries should benefit from cutting-edge technologies, which hold the promise to enrich lives, create prosperity and solve global challenges. Yet those new technologies also create new risks. They can be abused, used to threaten others and can contribute to the proliferation of nuclear, biological and chemical weapons. Countries therefore need to cooperate both within multilateral structures and based on the solid foundation of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the Biological Weapons Convention and the Chemical Weapons Convention in order to ensure the safe transfer of those technologies for peaceful uses. Non-proliferation and export-control regimes are critical for implementing their associated treaties. The adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55 would lead to an erosion of those vitally important regimes. There simply is no evidence that the existing non-proliferation agreements and regimes have hampered the international exchange of technology or hindered any country’s economic development. In fact, those regimes play an essential role in the international system, which has allowed global trade to flourish.

Secondly, we have serious concerns about the process that was followed in preparing draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55. The draft resolution warranted good-faith negotiations and a transparent and inclusive process. Given that it is a new draft resolution that addresses an important topic, Member States did

not have sufficient opportunities to discuss it. The amendments proposed by the United States and our belated engagement, including in the only round of informal consultations that were held, did not result in one single change being made to the draft resolution. Overall, the final text has been minimally altered from that which was initially circulated, thereby reflecting a unilateral rather than a consensus-based, broad international position.

Thirdly and finally, draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55 misses an opportunity to ensure that every society may benefit from scientific and technological breakthroughs. Every country wishes to take advantage of such technologies and minimize the ways in which they may harm health, safety, human rights and international security by falling into the hands of terrorists and malign actors. We need to work together to wrestle with those challenges, and we must not merely paper over them.

For decades we have used bodies like the First Committee to resolve our differences, work through difficult topics on which we rarely enjoy consensus from the outset and agree on a way forward. It is a shame that was not the case this year. We hope we can revive the good-faith spirit in future deliberations of the First Committee. Looking ahead, it is up to all of us to maintain the dialogue. We expect more conversations to be held on the rules and systems. We need to share the benefits and manage the risks of technological breakthroughs. Given our serious concerns about the initiative and the lack of meaningful deliberation and debate, we have no choice but to vote against draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55. We urge others to do so as well.

Mrs. Ponikvar Velázquez (Slovenia): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union (EU) and its member States. The candidate countries the Republic of North Macedonia, Montenegro and Albania; the European Free Trade Association countries Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway, members of the European Economic Area; as well as the Republic of Moldova, align themselves with this explanation of vote.

I take the floor to explain our vote on the proposal contained in document A/C.1/76/L.55, entitled “Promoting international cooperation on peaceful uses in the context of international security”. We are not in a position to support draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55, submitted by the People’s Republic of China, and we call on States to vote against it.

Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55 creates a false dichotomy between the peaceful uses of nuclear, chemical and biological material, on the one hand, and export-control measures and regimes, on the other. Export control is necessary to maintain international peace and security and to prevent the proliferation of sensitive items and materials. Existing export-control regimes stem from international legal obligations and are a condition for enabling peaceful uses by all States. The draft resolution also risks calling into question, and even undermining, existing export-control regimes. Its motives appear to be national, given that China expressed its frustration at certain denied exports during the only round of informal consultations that were held on the text.

The EU fully supports the view that international cooperation on peaceful uses should be promoted. The EU provides significant financial and political support to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) for their work in third countries to promote and build capacities for peaceful uses. For example, the EU and its member States are the largest donors to the OPCW’s Centre for Chemistry and Technology, which will provide better training facilities for developing countries, and are also among the largest contributors to the IAEA’s Technical Cooperation Programme.

Peaceful uses are also facilitated through the provisions of relevant treaties and Security Council resolutions, which promote robust export-control mechanisms and legislation worldwide. Security Council resolution 1540 (2004) is a vital legally binding component of the international non-proliferation architecture. All States Members of the United Nations are required to implement effective export controls in order to prevent the illicit export of sensitive goods to non-State actors, which is a universally accepted obligation. The United Nations supports its Member States in fulfilling their obligations, as does the EU, which is providing widespread support to partner countries in setting up or enhancing their own export-control systems through the Centres of Excellence on Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear Risk Mitigation in 64 countries and the P2P Export Control Programme.

The EU is concerned that the text of the draft resolution mentions “undue restrictions” on the export of sensitive items, which is not based on facts.

Such an assertion could give rise to the unnecessary politicization of export controls and ultimately undermine international trade, science and technology cooperation, which requires robust and trustworthy export-control systems. There are no findings in the comprehensive reviews of Security Council resolution 1540 (2004) that undue restrictions exist as a result of export controls that are inhibiting sustainable development. From a non-proliferation perspective, there is no benefit in creating a new non-proliferation system within the framework of the General Assembly in addition to the existing non-proliferation treaties and conventions and relevant Security Council resolutions, forums and processes, and neither is there any added value in asking the Secretary-General to seek the views of Member States on that issue.

Finally, with regard to process, the EU was disappointed by the lack of transparency surrounding the negotiations process, the lack of opportunities to enter into open and informal consultations on the topic, the selective engagement of China with only certain Member States and that country's lack of openness to consider the draft proposals put forward by the EU and its member States. Multilateralism is about listening to each other. For those reasons, together with the substantive arguments that have been raised, the EU and its member States —

The Acting Chair: I am sorry, but the representative of Slovenia is out of time.

Mr. Balouji (Islamic Republic of Iran): I take the floor to explain the position of my delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.13, entitled “Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security, and advancing responsible State behaviour in the use of information and communications technologies”.

Iran has been the victim of a number of malicious acts in cyberspace, including the 2010 Stuxnet malware attacks against its critical infrastructure by the United States and Israel, which have since become more frequent. We believe the First Committee is best placed to address such irresponsible behaviour. Since 1998, the Islamic Republic of Iran has continuously joined the consensus in the First Committee regarding the process of addressing advancements in the field of information and communications technologies in the context of international security. That was despite our serious reservations about how the Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) on Developments in the

Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security was established and how its work was conducted.

In 2018, following five rounds of discussions held under the GGE format, the General Assembly adopted resolution 73/27, which established the Open-ended Working Group (OEWG) on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security — the first-ever inclusive multilateral intergovernmental process to address that issue with the participation of the entire United Nations membership. Iran fully participated in all of the initial debates of the OEWG and fully supported the creation of a new OEWG, through resolution 75/240, with the purpose of addressing the concerns of the wider membership. As a matter of principle, Iran has consistently demanded that the ongoing parallelism in terms of the two processes — the GGE and the OEWG — and two resolutions be brought to an end. In our view, as the most inclusive existing mechanism, the OEWG has a clear mandate that requires independence and need not rely on the disputed conclusions of the GGE.

Having said all of that, we will join the consensus on the draft resolution in the spirit of flexibility and collaboration. We will support the draft resolution for as long as it considers and expands on the positions of all Member States, none of which should be left behind. We would like to put it on record that my delegation does not agree with the references in the draft resolution to the GGE and its reports, given that those reports and the recommendations contained therein are voluntary. Iran expects that the issue will be reviewed and rectified accordingly, both in the OEWG and in the next iteration of the draft resolution, whenever it is next submitted.

We will vote against draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.16, as it constitutes further proof of the hypocritical policies of the United States. We believe the document should be fully rejected. It is redundant and unnecessary given the sophisticated compliance mechanisms in place under the various international instruments on arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation. Ironically, the United States itself fails to comply with those mechanisms owing to the ill-intentions of its Administration, which has been proven to have abused them time and again. It is a source of regret that United States agencies publish annual reports on the so-called non-compliance of rival countries and use them as an excuse to exert political pressure on those

countries. Such approaches and actions are completely unacceptable, especially in the light of everything we have witnessed pertaining to that country's adherence to its obligations. The nuclear-weapons strategy of the United States and its rigid intention to produce and deploy more sophisticated nuclear weapons run counter to its explicit nuclear-disarmament obligations.

The United States has not affirmed the goal of a world without nuclear weapons. Instead, it has increased its military budget in order to carry out a programme to modernize its nuclear arsenal. Pursuing a more aggressive nuclear strategy by using other countries as an excuse to break from the constraints of international treaties proves that the United States wishes to develop and deploy nuclear armaments, lower the threshold for the use of nuclear weapons, vigorously enhance its global missile defence system and pursue its strategy for outer-space supremacy.

During the deliberations of the First Committee, most countries candidly expressed their —

The Acting Chair: I am sorry, but the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran is out of time.

Mr. Magosaki (Japan): The delegation of Japan would like to share its views on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55, entitled “Promoting international cooperation on peaceful uses in the context of international security”.

The draft resolution pits peaceful uses against non-proliferation and creates unnecessary conflict between them. Japan believes that preventing the proliferation of weapons and sensitive technologies actually paves the way for promoting international cooperation on peaceful uses. Scientific and technological cooperation can be promoted while ensuring non-proliferation through international efforts, including existing export controls. At this juncture, we would like to emphasize that non-proliferation regimes could contribute to preventing the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMDs), their means of delivery and conventional weapons, particularly in the current severe international security environment, which includes grave concerns about the proliferation of technologies for the development of WMDs, including nuclear weapons.

From that perspective, Japan has been hosting the Asian Senior-level Talks on Non-Proliferation and the Asian Export Control Seminar in order to strengthen international cooperation on non-proliferation in the

Asian region and raise awareness about export-control efforts. From our point of view, the draft resolution could end up hampering existing international cooperation in science and technology for peaceful uses by undermining international non-proliferation frameworks, including export-control regimes.

For those reasons, Japan intends to vote against draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55.

Mr. Rice-Howell (United Kingdom): I take the floor to provide an explanation of position on the draft proposal contained in document A/C.1/76/L.55, entitled “Promoting international cooperation on peaceful uses in the context of international security”.

The United Kingdom strongly supports the exchange of technology, information and expertise for peaceful uses in support of global development. We also underline the crucial importance to international peace and security of countering the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery. The draft resolution fails to strike the appropriate balance between those two objectives, in contrast, for example, to draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.6, which the First Committee has adopted by consensus for many years.

We are particularly concerned about the assertion in the draft resolution that multilateral export-control regimes place undue restrictions on transfers. The sponsor of the draft resolution has been unable to provide convincing evidence that that is the case. Multilateral export-control regimes play an important role in the global counter-proliferation architecture by setting standards of practice and promoting robust but proportionate controls on militarily relevant dual-use technology. Such controls are crucial to preventing the proliferation of weapons and sensitive technology to terrorists and malign actors and therefore reinforce global and regional security and stability. The draft resolution also appears to be at odds with the fact that decisions on exports of sensitive technology are the sovereign prerogative of Member States.

We regret that the sponsor of this new draft resolution was unable to carry out the wide-ranging consultations that the topic deserves or to respond to the suggestions made by my delegation and many others in order to improve the balance of the text and thereby achieve consensus support. We therefore have no choice but to vote against draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55.

Mr. Mohd Nasir (Malaysia): Malaysia will join the consensus on and has co-sponsored draft

resolution A/C.1/76/L.13, entitled, “Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security, and advancing responsible State behaviour in the use of information and communications technologies”.

Malaysia has been supportive of both the Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) and the Open-ended Working Group (OEWG) on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security. The GGE has contributed to our substantive discourse owing to its unique nature, which allows for targeted discussions and in-depth deliberations on specific topics. Moreover, the OEWG is an inclusive platform that allows all States Members of the United Nations to openly engage on various pertinent issues, including norm-setting, principles, rules and legally binding commitments in cyberspace.

Malaysia welcomes the consensus final reports of the OEWG (see A/75/816) and the sixth session of the GGE. We are pleased that the First Committee is this year able to agree on a single, unifying draft resolution that duly recognizes the work and outcomes of both the GGE and the OEWG. Malaysia remains committed to working with other countries and all stakeholders towards a peaceful, secure and resilient cyberspace that will serve as an enabler of economic progress, enhance regional connectivity and improve living standards for all.

For the principles and reasons I have mentioned, Malaysia will join the consensus on and has co-sponsored draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.13, entitled, “Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security, and advancing responsible State behaviour in the use of information and communications technologies”.

Mr. Murillo Quesada (Costa Rica) (*spoke in Spanish*): Like the majority of States that receive cooperation in the world of science and technology, Costa Rica has legitimate concerns regarding security in cyberspace, not only because there are State and non-State actors that carry out illicit activities that serve to undermine international peace and security, but also due to the polarization of ideological positions. In order to jointly combat such threats, our country believes in processes that are developed in multilateral, peaceful and, above all, depoliticized spaces so as to enable countries to participate on an equal footing at the negotiating table. In that context, Costa Rica believes that cyberspace should not be a zero-sum competition

among a select few, but rather a peaceful space for cooperation with a strong multilateral component.

Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.13 is a vitally important and constructive example that allows us to forge consensus. In particular, it prevents us from becoming polarized on a major issue, which is a significant achievement in itself. That is why my country, like many others, has co-sponsored draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.13. Finally, we believe that the achievements made by the entire membership in the previous Open-ended Working Group (OEWG) should be our starting point for the important work that will begin next month in the new OEWG.

Mr. Lynch (New Zealand): I take the floor to explain New Zealand’s position on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55, entitled “Promoting international cooperation on peaceful uses in the context of international security”.

New Zealand strongly supports efforts to strengthen international cooperation with a view to advancing the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals. However, we cannot support an initiative that would undermine efforts to prevent the proliferation of weapons and sensitive technologies. We regret that draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55, in its current form, appears to be one such initiative. The draft resolution suggests an abandonment of the export-control regimes that were established to underpin our shared non-proliferation objectives — regimes of which New Zealand is a member and strong supporter. The restrictions that those regimes impose on the exporters of weapons, sensitive technologies and dual-use items make an important contribution to national, regional and global non-proliferation efforts. Undermining such efforts would have negative implications for international peace and security and the global rules-based order. We have seen no evidence to suggest that the draft resolution would have any positive impact on sustainable development. New Zealand’s application of the standards and guidelines agreed under the existing multilateral export-control regimes is the primary mechanism through which we fulfil our international obligations and commitments relating to non-proliferation and counter-proliferation. That is our responsibility and national prerogative, which draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55 appears to challenge, without offering a viable alternative. For those reasons, New Zealand opposes draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55 and will accordingly vote against it.

Mrs. Nadeau (Canada): I take the floor to explain Canada's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55, entitled "Promoting international cooperation on peaceful uses in the context of international security". We are not able to support the draft resolution or the intent behind it, and we call on all States to vote against the text, which was submitted by China.

Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55 contends that the existing system of multilateral export-control regimes is inherently flawed and creates undue restrictions on the peaceful uses of nuclear, chemical and biological items and technologies among participating and non-participating countries. The text's language creates an illusory distinction between the promotion of the peaceful uses of nuclear, chemical and biological equipment and technology, on the one hand, and export control measures and regimes, on the other. A key objective of effective export control is to allow for the peaceful uses of sensitive items. To assert otherwise is to call into question the foundational framework upon which peaceful uses rely.

Our collective right to access peaceful uses exists under relevant treaties, including the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). Those rights are balanced by obligations to ensure non-proliferation, as well as by various Security Council resolutions, which together promote robust export-control mechanisms and legislation worldwide to ensure access to the peaceful uses of sensitive technologies. Canada sees no benefit in creating a new non-proliferation system within the framework of the General Assembly in addition to the non-proliferation treaties and conventions that already exist, as well as the numerous relevant Security Council resolutions, forums and processes. The so-called undue restrictions on the export of sensitive items, as mentioned in the draft resolution, is an assertion that does not have a factual underpinning, implying that States Members of the United Nations that participate in one or more of the multilateral export-control regimes do not fulfil their responsibilities.

(spoke in French)

Canada provides significant financial and political support to several initiatives that promote the goals of non-proliferation through organizations such as the International Atomic Energy Agency and the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW), by supporting and enhancing their work in order to promote and build capacities for peaceful

purposes. Canada is pleased to be the largest national contributor to the construction of the OPCW Centre for Chemistry and Technology, which, once built, will be a leader in research, analysis, training and capacity-building.

Canada remains steadfast in its commitment to advancing key disarmament and non-proliferation priorities, as highlighted by our funding of initiatives such as the NPT regional outreach seminars in Africa, South-East Asia and the Americas through Canada's Weapons Threat Reduction Programme, which has provided more than \$1.5 billion to date in support of global initiatives to address the threat of weapons and materials of mass destruction.

For the reasons I have outlined, Canada sees no other choice but to vote against draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55 and calls on other States to do the same.

Mrs. Romero López (Cuba) *(spoke in Spanish)*: We take the floor to explain our position on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55, "Promoting international cooperation on peaceful uses in the context of international security". We will vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole and the separate paragraphs that are put to the vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55 is relevant in a context in which restrictions persist on international cooperation for peaceful purposes, which runs counter to the obligations assumed under multilateral disarmament and non-proliferation agreements. In that regard, the draft resolution requests the Secretary-General to seek the views and recommendations of Member States on all aspects of promoting international cooperation for peaceful uses in the context of international security, including with respect to undue restrictions on exports to developing countries of materials, equipment and technology for peaceful purposes.

The Secretary-General is subsequently requested to publish a report to be discussed by Member States. That initiative could contribute to countering the remaining obstacles to international cooperation for peaceful purposes, which affect developing countries in particular. We wish to underscore that the draft resolution acknowledges the inalienable right of all States to participate in the greatest possible exchange of equipment, materials and scientific and technological information for peaceful purposes, which would facilitate the economic and social development of States, particularly that of developing countries.

We co-sponsored draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55 and call on States to vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole and its operative paragraphs 2 and 3, which will be voted on separately.

Mr. Knyazyan (Armenia): I take the floor to explain the position of the delegation of Armenia on draft resolutions A/C.1/76/L.24, A/C.1/76/L.26, A/C.1/76/L.27, A/C.1/76/L.8 and A/C.1/76/L.28 with respect to the references made to the eighteenth Summit of Heads of State and Government of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, which was held in Baku on 25 and 26 October 2019.

Paragraphs 662 and 663 of the final document of the Summit of Heads of State and Government of the Non-Aligned Countries, adopted in Baku, contain biased and one-sided formulations that distort the root causes, essence and principles of the peaceful settlement of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict. The provisions of that final document run counter to the long-established position of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe Minsk Group co-Chairs, which is the internationally agreed mediation format dealing with the settlement of the conflict.

The paragraphs of the final document that relate to the conflict also fall short of upholding the principles at the heart of the Non-Aligned Movement, particularly people's right to self-determination. We highly regret the fact that the Movement appears to have condoned the manipulative and abusive tactics of the current holder of its chairmanship. Ever since it assumed the chairmanship of the Movement, Azerbaijan has been attempting to turn it into a platform for advancing its distorted conflict narratives, often in violation of the working methods of the Movement.

Instead of committing to the peace process in good faith, under the auspices of the Minsk Group co-Chairs, the authorities of Azerbaijan opted for uncontrolled and unabated military build-up. The country's long-standing objective to resolve the conflict by force resulted in a premeditated large-scale military offensive against the people of Nagorno-Karabakh between September and November last year. In what would become the biggest military escalation in times of global pandemic, Azerbaijan carried out massive attacks against Nagorno-Karabakh, deliberately targeting the civilian population, including women, children, journalists and humanitarian and medical workers, destroying critical civilian infrastructure, including schools and

hospitals, and causing mass displacement and a major humanitarian crisis.

Azerbaijan's membership in the Movement is driven not by the goal of contributing to its principles and values, but by the sole purpose of propagating its distorted conflict narratives, concealing its responsibility for decades of hijacking the peace process and creating a false perception of international support for its destructive position to resolve the conflict by force.

In the light of everything I have said, the delegation of Armenia would like to express its reservation about, and disassociate itself from, the paragraphs of the draft resolutions before the Committee that contain a reference to the eighteenth Summit of Heads of State and Government of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, held in Baku.

Ms. McIntyre (Australia): I take the floor to explain Australia's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55, entitled "Promoting international cooperation on peaceful uses in the context of international security". Australia will vote against the draft resolution. We consider the proposal, submitted by the People's Republic of China, to be inconsistent with international norms. It risks politicizing what is, and should remain, a technical issue.

Australia strongly disagrees with the draft resolution's false premise that export-control regimes unduly restrict development on grounds of non-proliferation or national security or that they discriminate against developing countries. Non-proliferation regimes do not inhibit international development or cooperation on the peaceful uses of technology. Neither do they disrupt legitimate trade or restrict access to equipment and technology for peaceful purposes or sustainable development. Moreover, membership in an export-control group does not facilitate the transfer of sensitive technology or weapons between countries.

Australia has a long and abiding interest in working towards the ultimate goal of a world without weapons of mass destruction (WMD). We are vigilant, and we encourage others to be so in order to counter proliferation and ensure the effectiveness of export controls on goods and technologies used in the manufacture of weapons of mass destruction. To that end, Australia fully supports the existing export-control regimes, including the Australia Group, the

Missile Technology Control Regime, the Wassenaar Arrangement and the Nuclear Suppliers Group. Those regimes harmonize export controls so as to provide the reassurance that technology and materials will not fall into the wrong hands. Importantly, such regimes are key to international efforts to curb the proliferation of conventional weapons and weapons of mass destruction worldwide, including by implementing States' obligations under non-proliferation treaties and Security Council resolution 1540 (2004) regarding the proliferation of WMD to terrorists.

There is no evidence that the current model of export-control measures has stood in the way of any country's development or legitimate cooperation. The Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1540 (2004) regularly reviews its implementation and has found no such evidence.

Given the serious concerns I have outlined, Australia will vote against draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.55.

Mr. Lagardien (South Africa): South Africa supports the various strands of work and consensus outcomes that have been achieved in the General Assembly regarding information and communications technologies (ICT) in the context of peace and security. My delegation will join the consensus on and has co-sponsored draft resolution A/C.1/76/L.13, entitled "Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security, and advancing responsible State behaviour in the use of information and communications technologies".

It is important to unite behind that single process, and we look forward to the work of the second Open-ended Working Group on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security, which serves as an all-inclusive, single-track process to consider how the international community may best seize the opportunities provided by ICT, while addressing the threats to international peace and security in cyberspace. With the ICT field

continually and rapidly evolving, it is unlikely that we will ever reach the point of having a complete and sustainable response to the opportunities and threats it presents. Implementation must therefore be priority, which also requires capacity-building and assistance.

The Acting Chair: Given the time remaining for the meeting and given the provisions of rule 128 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, which stipulates that no representative shall interrupt the voting except on a point of order in connection with the actual conduct of the voting, the Committee will proceed with the voting on the draft proposals submitted under cluster 5 at 10 a.m. tomorrow morning.

I shall now call on those representatives who have requested the floor in exercise of the right of reply. In that connection, 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 Azerbaijan.

Mr. Gusman (Azerbaijan): My delegation is exercising its right of reply to remind the delegation of Armenia that the final outcome document of the Baku summit was unanimously adopted by the Heads of State and Government of the 120 States members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. It is entirely inappropriate for the delegation of Armenia to use the First Committee to advance its agenda, which has been addressed by my delegation on previous occasions.

The Acting Chair: There are no more requests from delegations to take the floor in exercise of the right of reply.

The time available for the meeting does not allow for us to proceed to the voting phase. The next meeting of the First Committee will therefore take place tomorrow, Wednesday, 3 November at 10 a.m. in the General Assembly Hall, when we will proceed with the voting phase on cluster 5.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.