



General Assembly

Seventy-fifth session

First Committee

13th meeting

Friday, 6 November 2020, 10 a.m.
New York

Official Records

Chair: Mr. Santos Maraver(Spain)

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

Agenda items 94 to 110 (continued)

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

The Chair (*spoke in Spanish*): This morning the Committee will continue to take action on all draft resolutions and draft decisions submitted under agenda items 94 to 110.

Before proceeding, I wish to inform delegations that the next meeting of the First Committee will be held on Monday, 9 November, at 10 a.m. in these combined Conference Rooms.

At its previous meeting, the Committee heard general statements under cluster 3, “Outer space (disarmament aspects)”, as contained in informal paper No.1/Rev.4. Before the Committee proceeds to take action on the draft resolutions and draft decisions submitted under cluster 3, we will hear from representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote or position.

I should like to remind delegations that statements are limited to three minutes.

Mr. Knight (United States of America): I would like to deliver an explanation of vote on behalf of the United States, the United Kingdom and France on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.62, entitled “No first placement of weapons in outer space”. We will vote against draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.62 and strongly encourage all delegations to do likewise.

The United States, the United Kingdom and France look forward to continuing to engage constructively and pragmatically with other States Members of the United Nations in order to strengthen the safety, stability, security and sustainability of outer-space activities. The safety and security of the outer-space environment is under threat, and all nations must make progress on the development of effective transparency and confidence-building measures.

However, we believe that Russia’s no-first-placement initiative contains a number of significant problems and that the continuing development of all anti-satellite weapons and capabilities, including those that are Earth-based, does not match the country’s diplomatic rhetoric. Some countries are currently developing new systems capable of carrying out aggressive action against those of their potential adversaries. Unfriendly activities or demonstrations of power, such as anti-satellite launches, proximity operations and the jamming of location systems, have been observed.

First, the no-first-placement initiative does not adequately define what constitutes a weapon in outer space. In the absence of a common understanding of what we mean by a space weapon, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.62 would only increase mistrust and misunderstanding with regard to the activities and intentions of States.

Secondly, there are limits to a State’s ability to understand the purpose of a satellite once it has been launched, and the no-first-placement initiative contains no features that would make it possible to effectively

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

20-30281 (E)



Accessible document

Please recycle



confirm a State's political commitment "not to be the first to place weapons in outer space".

Thirdly, we cannot support the reference to a common effort towards "a community of shared future for humankind", as stated in the fifth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.62. We urge countries to carefully consider that language. While it may sound innocuous, that phrase has been promoted by China in order to insert its own view of multilateralism and world geopolitics in the international system.

Finally, systems in space can also be damaged from Earth. The draft resolution fails to address the near-term threat from other types of anti-satellite weapons, such as lasers or ground-launched systems. Those weapons pose a serious threat to the space environment, including by creating large amounts of long-lasting debris that would remain in orbit for hundreds of years, as was the case following one single anti-satellite test in 2007.

All nations must take concrete steps to strengthen the safety, stability and sustainability of space. The draft resolution on no first placement of weapons in outer space is not the right mechanism for achieving those goals. Our nations support the development of non-legally-binding transparency and confidence-building measures that consider how we can better communicate, explain our intentions and demonstrate good behaviour. Those measures should be clear, practical and confirmable. Clarifying acceptable and unacceptable behaviour would therefore be important, as would considering space- and Earth-based threats to our space operations.

Ms. Jáquez Huacuja (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): Mexico wishes to explain its position on some of the draft resolutions before the First Committee today.

I will begin with draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.62. Mexico supports the draft resolution because we agree on the importance and urgency of preventing an arms race in outer space. That is in line with our commitment to ensuring that outer space is used exclusively for peaceful purposes. Nevertheless, we wish to reiterate that our support for draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.62 should in no way be understood as tacit endorsement or acceptance of an ostensible right to place weapons in outer space or to launch them from Earth if another State does so first or in response to an attack.

Mexico will continue to strive to prevent any actor from placing weapons in outer space under any circumstances. Mexico also reiterates in particular that all nuclear weapons should be banned and eliminated regardless of their type or location, in accordance with the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons. Mexico also promotes the strengthening of security and sustainability measures for space activities. We hope to make normative progress so as to achieve those objectives, including by negotiating legally binding treaties, in particular to prohibit the placement of weapons in outer space, as I just mentioned.

We hope that the discussion on reducing space threats — the basis of which is established by draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1, submitted by the United Kingdom, whom we thank for introducing the draft resolution and for its receptiveness to the concerns raised by delegations during consultations — and the report of the Secretary-General that will be prepared in due course will complement the discussions held in the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, especially the efforts of the Working Group on the Long-Term Sustainability of Outer Space Activities, as well as on the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

Mrs. Jakob (Germany): I take the floor on behalf of the member States of the European Union (EU). The candidate countries Turkey, the Republic of North Macedonia, Montenegro and Albania, as well as Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova and Georgia, align themselves with this explanation of vote.

With respect to draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.62, entitled "No first placement of weapons in outer space", we are not in a position to support it. The EU and its States members have long advocated the preservation of a safe and secure space environment and the peaceful uses of outer space on an equitable and mutually acceptable basis. Strengthening the safety, security and long-term sustainability of activities in outer space is a key priority for us and is in our common interest. We believe that it is important to develop initiatives that will increase confidence and mutual trust among current and future space actors.

In that regard, we would like to highlight the importance of transparency and confidence-building measures, which can make a contribution to the security, safety and sustainability of activities in outer space. That is why some years ago the EU proposed an international code of conduct for outer space activities.

We encourage further international cooperation in order to elaborate principles of responsible behaviour in outer space and underline the need to advocate responsible behaviour in outer space, notably within the framework of the United Nations.

The EU and its member States remain committed to the prevention of an arms race in outer space. All EU member States therefore support and will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.3, entitled “Prevention of an arms race in outer space”.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.62, we are concerned that the initiative does not adequately respond to the objective of strengthening trust and confidence among States. In particular, the no-first-placement initiative does not address the difficult issue of defining what a weapon in outer space is, which renders draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.62 ineffective. Furthermore, with space being increasingly contested, we remain concerned about the continuing development of anti-satellite weapons and capabilities, including ground-based systems. We underline the importance of addressing such developments promptly, comprehensively and as part of international efforts to prevent an arms race in outer space, which the draft resolution does not do sufficiently.

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

Mr. Dandy (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation would like to thank the Russian Federation and China for introducing draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.62, entitled “No first placement of weapons in outer space”. We would like to begin by explaining our position on that draft resolution. We agree that outer space is part of the common heritage of all humankind and that there are benefits to exploring it. However, the international community faces a number of challenges, including those related to outer space, and we must not stand idle because doing so could threaten international peace and security.

My country’s Government condemns the weaponization of outer space as well as an arms race in outer space. The Syrian Arab Republic underscores the

importance of ensuring that outer space can be used by all humankind and of establishing a treaty to prevent an arms race in outer space. We welcome the draft treaty on the prevention of the placement of weapons in outer space and of the threat or use of force against outer space objects, as proposed by Russia and China during the 2008 session of the Conference on Disarmament. We also welcome the 2014 version of that draft treaty, which includes the very popular notion of ensuring security for the future of humankind. For that reason, my delegation considers draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.62 to be very timely.

Three paragraphs in draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.62 will be put to the vote in the First Committee this year. However, those paragraphs use the same language as that contained in resolutions we adopted previously. We believe that represents a manoeuvre to jeopardize the adoption by consensus of the draft resolution, which is neither constructive nor in the spirit of cooperation. We call on all peace-loving countries to support draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.62 in the interests of all humankind.

Mr. Wu Jianjian (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): I should like to take this opportunity to explain China’s position on some of the draft resolutions before the First Committee today.

As our global commons, outer space inspires a clear sense of community of a shared future for humankind. Ensuring the peaceful use of outer space and preventing its weaponization and an arms race there is not only in the common interests of all countries but also a matter of shared responsibility. All States Members of the United Nations need to carefully assess the current security situation in outer space give due regard to preventing the weaponization of, and an arms race in, outer space and guard against outer space becoming a new battleground.

The weaponization of, and an arms race in, outer space is currently intensifying. The security situation in outer space is becoming increasingly grave. In particular, the United States has openly defined outer space as a new war-fighting domain and has established a space force and a space command. It has accelerated its weapons-testing and military exercises in outer space and even planned to deploy space-based anti-missile sensors and interceptors.

Those worrisome manoeuvres by the United States are aimed at exerting exclusive dominance over outer

space and establishing absolute military superiority, which not only seriously threatens outer-space security but also greatly undermines global strategic stability, thus becoming the most prominent factor affecting outer-space security. Against that backdrop, the necessity and urgency of preventing an arms race in outer space has further increased.

China stresses the importance of the peaceful use of outer space and actively advocates the prevention of an arms race in, and the weaponization of, outer space. For many years, together with Russia and other countries, China has actively promoted the negotiation of a legally binding instrument for the prevention of an arms race in outer space so as to fundamentally resolve the issues facing outer space. Thanks to the joint efforts of China and Russia, the United Nations established a Group of Governmental Experts on further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space, which conducted unprecedented, in-depth and substantive discussions on certain elements of relevant international legal instruments.

The draft treaty on the prevention of the placement of weapons in outer space and of the threat or use of force against outer space objects, which was proposed by China, remains an important basis for holding relevant discussions and is supported by an increasing number of countries. Regrettably, owing to their self-interest in pursuing their own outer-space military strategies, some countries are unwilling to accept any international constraints and have for a long time resisted international discussions on outer-space arms control. As a result, the Conference on Disarmament is unable to start negotiations on an international legal instrument on the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

China attaches great importance to the issue of outer-space security and is open to discussions on outer-space arms control. China engaged constructively in the consultations on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45, entitled “Reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours”. China also provided comments and suggested revisions to that draft resolution. Regrettably, its main sponsors did not adequately take on board China’s reasonable views and suggestions. The current text fails to address China’s main concerns. China will therefore vote against the draft resolution.

China is willing to continue to work with all parties, actively pursue the concept of building a community of a shared future for humankind in outer space and contribute to maintaining lasting peace and common security in outer space.

Mr. Shava (Zimbabwe): Zimbabwe wishes to make some brief remarks ahead of the voting on the draft resolutions under cluster 3.

Zimbabwe considers outer space to be the common heritage of humankind and of all nations, big and small. Outer space is sensitive, delicate and fragile and should as far as possible be maintained as a zone of stability and peace and should be used only for peaceful purposes. It is an essential asset that has the potential to determine the fate of the shared future of humankind.

We therefore co-sponsored draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.62, entitled “No first placement of weapons in outer space”, in order to underscore our commitment to joining other members of the international community in endorsing the principle of not being the first to place weapons in outer space. That is the only way that we can prevent an arms race in outer space — a matter that is the subject of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.3, entitled “Prevention of an arms race in outer space”, which Zimbabwe also co-sponsored.

For that reason, Zimbabwe calls on other countries that share similar beliefs and objectives to vote in favour of the fifth, ninth and eleventh preambular paragraphs of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.62 and of the draft resolution as a whole. Those three paragraphs are an integral part of the draft resolution and consist largely of language that is inoffensive. Putting those paragraphs to a separate vote will undermine draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.62 as a whole.

Zimbabwe will also vote in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/75/L.63 and A/C.1/75/L.66.

We owe it to future generations to begin laying the foundation and basis for agreement in order to prevent the militarization of outer space. That foundation begins with putting aside our differences and forging consensus for the common good. The prevention of an arms race in outer space is in the interest of all countries and will help evade a situation of grave danger for international peace and security.

Mr. Balouji (Islamic Republic of Iran): I take the floor to explain the vote of my delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1, entitled “Reducing

space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours”. Some years back, the possibility of an arms race in outer space was just a potential risk; it is now a real and serious threat. In order to cope with the threat of the militarization of outer space, discussions on, and the development of, a legally binding instrument on the prevention of an arms race in outer space are especially necessary. The 1967 Outer Space Treaty is not enough to make outer space a safer place, simply because it does not mention or address other types of weapons and military activities.

It is our principled position that outer space is a common heritage of humankind that should be protected against any attempt to weaponize it and against an arms race in that area, and that setting certain tangible measures to promote and facilitate international cooperation through the transfer of technical knowledge, technology and required equipment is imperative. In addition to strengthening transparency and confidence-building measures, which are complementary to one another, the notion of some countries holding a monopoly of space-related science, experience, technology and services and imposing restrictions on the transfer thereof to developing countries should be rejected.

In the light of everything I have said, Iran will vote against draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1 and appeals to other delegations from developing countries to join us in voting against the draft resolution. From our point of view, not only does it fail to reflect the principles I have just mentioned but it also tries to establish preconditions for enjoying outer space and satellite technology for peaceful purposes. Any pretext to prevent developing countries from becoming emerging space-faring nations is rejected.

We are of the view that the adoption of such a draft resolution could lead us to a divisive situation in which Member States are split into so-called responsible and irresponsible States. That situation would be completely unacceptable. The draft resolution also overlaps with the agendas of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space and the Fourth Committee, which should be avoided. Last but not least, if we genuinely intend to contribute to a safe and secure outer space, we should start by negotiating a legally binding instrument.

I should also like to explain the vote of my delegation on draft resolutions A/C.1/75/L.62 and A/C.1/75/L.66. While my delegation will vote in favour of those draft

resolutions, I wish to put on record that our previously stated position on those drafts remains valid.

Mr. Tozik (Belarus) (*spoke in Russian*): I wish to speak in explanation of vote.

We express our unequivocal support for draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.62, on no first placement of weapons in outer space. We reaffirm the importance of common efforts to build a community of shared future on behalf of all humankind, as stated in the fifth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. We reiterate the importance of the draft treaty on the prevention of the placement of weapons in outer space and of the threat or use of force against outer space objects, which was proposed by Russia and China. We note the importance of establishing an international initiative and a political obligation with respect to no first placement of weapons in outer space and we call on all countries to join that initiative.

We will also vote in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/75/L.66, “Transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities”, and A/C.1/75/L.3, “Prevention of an arms race in outer space”. We advocate strengthening those processes on the basis of dialogue and taking all views into account with regard to practical measures for preventing an arms race in outer space. We will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.63, on further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

We note with regret that the outer-space cluster of the First Committee is increasingly losing its integrity and coherence. Instead of a unifying agenda, we are seeing an uptick in confrontational rhetoric, an increase in the number of paragraphs being put to the vote and the emergence of new initiatives that duplicate existing ones with a view to creating political opposition and competition. We call on all States to stop exacerbating disagreements and return to the path of consensus.

Mr. Penaranda (Philippines): Speaking in my national capacity, I wish to underscore that the Philippines recognizes that outer space is threatened with its potential weaponization and an arms race. As a non-space-faring nation, the Philippines is focused on supporting the exploration and preservation of outer space for peaceful uses. An important element of preventing an arms race in outer space is the commitment of space-faring nations not to place weapons there.

The Philippines also supports upholding transparency and confidence-building measures in order to guide our space initiatives. That is why the Philippines has traditionally supported draft resolutions on transparency and confidence-building measures in outer-space activities and on no first placement of weapons in outer space, such as draft resolutions A/C.1/75/L.66 and A/C.1/75/L.62, respectively. We note that the absence of agreed norms and defined parameters will increasingly pose a challenge as more players gain access to outer space. In that regard, the Philippines recognizes the need for an effective instrument for the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

The First Committee deals not only with disarmament but also with global challenges and threats to peace that affect the international community, and it seeks solutions to the challenges of the international security regime. Addressing space threats is important in that context. The Philippines therefore supports draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1, entitled “Reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours”, which demonstrates positive developments with regard to the function of responsible behaviours and perceptions of threat in the area of disarmament in outer space. Those developments could be seen as complementary to existing resolutions on outer space.

However, there are certain elements that we believe are not fully developed and require further discussion and debate, such as those concerning the common definition of responsible behaviours and perceptions of threat and a common understanding of potential threats in outer space or on Earth. Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1 must not be understood as putting forward the idea that the existence of weapons in outer space is acceptable as long as the behaviour of actors or objects is regulated.

The Philippines supports efforts aimed at allowing discussions to proceed expeditiously in order for the international community to gain a common understanding and pursue harmonized efforts towards preventing an arms race in outer space.

Mr. Murillo Quesada (Costa Rica) (*spoke in Spanish*): I take the floor to explain my country’s intention to vote in favour of the paragraphs of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.62, “No first placement of weapons in outer space”, that are put to the vote and in

favour of the draft resolution as a whole, since we agree on the need to prevent an arms race in outer space.

Our vote is based on our commitment to general and complete disarmament, in particular on the obligation to preserve outer space for exclusively peaceful purposes. We believe that we as humankind must go further and recognize outer space as a zone of peace. A State or group of States declaring that they will not be the first to place weapons in outer space does not amount to the complete, unequivocal and categorical prohibition of the placement of any kind of weapons in outer space that we would have preferred to see in the draft resolution.

Let me also refer to draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1, entitled “Reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours”. In line with the reasoning I just mentioned, Costa Rica insists that all activities in outer space should be carried out for exclusively peaceful purposes. Given the increase in the number of actors and the types of activities currently being carried out in outer space, it is important that this forum hold conversations that help us guarantee the exclusively peaceful use of outer space and that is why my country will vote in favour of the paragraphs of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1 that are put to the vote and in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

However, we wish to put on record that the exercise of the identification of threats considered by the draft resolution should not in any way constitute a basis or precedent to justify any type of aggression or an arms race on Earth or in outer space.

Mr. Kulmatov (Kyrgyzstan): The Kyrgyz Republic firmly supports the importance and urgency of the prevention of an arms race in outer space and the promotion of its use for peaceful purposes only. We should firmly oppose the weaponization of outer space and avoid being trapped in an arms race in outer space. From our standpoint, the elaboration of any agreement on the use and exploration of outer space should be held in the format of inclusive and consensus-based multilateral negotiations within the framework of the United Nations and its mandate.

For that reason, Kyrgyzstan will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.62, entitled “No first placement of weapons in outer space”; draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.66, entitled “Transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities”; draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.3, entitled “Prevention of an arms race in outer space”; and draft decision

A/C.1/75/L.63, entitled “Further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space”.

The Kyrgyz Republic is deeply convinced that it is only through joint efforts that progress can be made in resolving existing obstacles and problems in the area of the prevention of an arms race in outer space. In that regard, the Kyrgyz Republic appeals to all States to support our position and to endorse those important draft resolutions and their separate paragraphs.

Outer space is a common heritage of humankind, and the concept of a community of shared future for humankind has received wide support from the international community. Its inclusion in the draft resolutions on outer space is therefore appropriate and pertinent.

Mr. Rodrigo (Sri Lanka): I wish to speak in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1.

Sri Lanka’s position on the peaceful use of outer space and its commitment to the prevention of the militarization of outer space have been consistent. Together with Egypt, Sri Lanka submits to the First Committee each year a draft resolution on the prevention of an arms race in outer space and remains fully committed to the prevention of an arms race in outer space and to keeping it free of conflict for the safety of all humankind. The placement of weapons in outer space will only weaken the already fragile international peace and security environment and jeopardize the stability of States that possess space capabilities as well as those that do not possess such technology.

The common heritage of humankind to outer space, the Moon and other celestial bodies should be preserved at all times. To that end, it is essential to ensure that the exploration of outer space and its use for peaceful purposes be in the common interest of all humankind. It is our conviction that the important objective of preventing an arms race in outer space can be effectively achieved only through the early conclusion of an effective and verifiable multilateral agreement or agreements on the prevention of an arms race in outer space, which would contribute to strengthening the existing legal framework and provide binding limitations on the potential weaponization of outer space.

Sri Lanka will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1, entitled “Reducing space threats

through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours”, in line with its principled position of supporting all multilateral initiatives aimed at the promotion of the peaceful use of outer space and based on the importance of increased coordination and understanding among space-faring nations.

Sri Lanka’s intention to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1 is based on the understanding that the initiative proposed by the draft resolution is an interim step towards the negotiation and development of a comprehensive and legally binding treaty on the prevention of an arms race in outer space, as well as on the common understanding that the progress that the majority of States have achieved so far on this issue has not been disregarded in the course of that new initiative.

Mr. Munir Khan (Pakistan): I take the floor in explanation of my delegation’s vote on the draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/75/L.3 and A/C.1/75/L.62, under cluster 3.

Pakistan is a strong supporter of the goal of preventing an arms race in outer space with a view to ensuring the common interest of all humankind in the exploration and use of outer space for peaceful purposes. We have consistently highlighted the risks associated with the weaponization of outer space and underscored the urgent need to prevent outer space from emerging as a new realm of conflict and the arena for an arms race. Pakistan is committed to refraining from the threat or use of force in outer-space activities. As a strong proponent of the non-weaponization of outer space, Pakistan supports the immediate commencement of negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament in order to comprehensively address the gaps in the international legal regime governing the exploration and use of outer space.

Pakistan therefore supports draft resolutions A/C.1/75/L.3 and A/C.1/75/L.62. In addition to supporting draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.62 as a whole, my delegation will also vote in favour of its separate paragraphs, including its fifth preambular paragraph, which calls for a common effort towards a community of shared future for humankind. That noble goal is valid in all spheres of international relations, in particular in seeking a just and stable world order.

In the domain of outer space, it assumes added relevance given that the 1967 Outer Space Treaty already recognizes that the exploration and use of outer

space, including the Moon and other celestial bodies, shall be carried out for the benefit and in the interests of all countries, irrespective of their degree of economic or scientific development, and shall be the province of all humankind. Such references to a common or shared future underscore the aspirations and collective interests of humankind in shaping a future in which outer space is preserved as a peaceful realm for international cooperation and the common benefit of all, free from any arms race or destabilizing activities.

Mr. Hassan (Egypt): I take the floor to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1, entitled "Reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours".

First of all, Egypt appreciates the constructive and professional manner in which the United Kingdom conducted the consultations on the draft resolution. Egypt intends to vote in favour of the draft resolution on the understanding that it represents a step in the right direction towards the development of rules that could pave the way for necessary legally binding instruments that are needed to address the threats to space systems from a comprehensive point of view, including by addressing terrestrial and space-based threats to space systems.

However, Egypt intends to abstain in the voting on the fourteenth preambular paragraph as a result of an amendment that was introduced to the revised version of the text after the conclusion of the negotiations on it. The revised text in that paragraph could be interpreted as an attempt to turn the issue of verification into an obstacle that prevents negotiations and progress. We underscore that significant capabilities and expertise exist in the field of verifying and monitoring outer-space activities and we believe that the use of the term "arms control" rather than "disarmament" in the revised version of the paragraph was not a successful choice.

We intend to carefully assess the impact of the implementation of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1 and its complementarity with previous and ongoing international efforts aimed at preventing an arms race in outer space. We stress that we have no intention of accepting the weaponization of outer space or any notion that such weaponization can be conducted responsibly.

In conclusion, I should point out that we are sponsors of three of the five draft resolutions under cluster 3. The five draft resolutions under this cluster are not contradictory but actually complement one

another. We sincerely hope that the counterproductive polarization of this important issue will cease.

Mr. Khaldi (Algeria): My delegation is taking the floor to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1, entitled "Reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours".

Algeria will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1 and its separate paragraphs in order to reaffirm its attachment to all common efforts to preserve outer space as a peaceful, safe, stable, secure and sustainable environment and a common heritage of humankind. My country will continue to advocate for the equal exploration and use of outer space based on the principles of non-appropriation and peaceful use and in conformity with the United Nations treaties governing space activities.

In that spirit, the Algerian delegation wishes to underline the importance and urgency of preventing an arms race in outer space and its willingness to contribute to reaching that common goal. Any initiative should necessarily serve that objective. In that regard, Algeria urges that substantive negotiations begin as soon as possible within the Conference on Disarmament on a legally binding instrument on the prevention of the placement of weapons in outer space and of the threat or use of force against outer-space objects. The draft treaty on the prevention of the placement of weapons in outer space and of the threat or use of force against outer-space objects, presented jointly by China and Russia at the Conference on Disarmament in February 2008 and updated in 2014, as well as the report of the Group of Governmental Experts on further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space, established pursuant to resolution 72/250 (A/74/77), therefore constitutes a good basis for formulating an international legally binding instrument in that regard.

We also want to reiterate the importance of increasing transparency and confidence-building measures in order to reinforce the objective of preventing an arms race in outer space and promote mutual confidence among States. We strongly emphasize the importance of doing further work in the United Nations Disarmament Commission on preparing recommendations relating to the partial implementation of transparency and confidence-building measures in outer-space activities with the objective of preventing an arms race in outer space.

Finally, my delegation will maintain its traditional support for draft resolutions A/C.1/75/L.3, A/C.1/75/L.62 and A/C.1/75/L.63.

Mrs. Castro Loredo (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Cuban delegation would like to explain its vote regarding draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1, “Reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours”.

Regrettably, Cuba will not be able to support draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1, given that the concerns we raised during the initial consultations persist. Cuba believes that the Fourth Committee is the appropriate forum for addressing the issue of security in outer-space activities, as well as other issues addressed in the text, including the guidelines for the long-term sustainability of outer-space activities. With regard to substantive issues, Cuba believes that the draft resolution deliberately attempts to modify the approach that has generally been taken under this agenda item by establishing that the main threat in outer space comes from Earth-based actions, activities, systems, technologies and means, which has not previously been deliberated or considered by the First Committee and for which there is no precedent.

The placement of weapons in outer space and its militarization, including the continuing development and improvement of outer-space weapons, are the main threats that we face. The norms or rules of responsible behaviour on a voluntary basis that are proposed in the text are not sufficient to address the threats in outer space and weaken the path towards the adoption of a legally binding international instrument that complements the current legal regime supported by a majority of the international community. We believe that the difficulties of effectively verifying the capabilities of outer-space objects and developing a verification regime cannot be used as a pretext to impede the advancement of a legally binding instrument. The text intentionally omits the draft treaty proposed by Russia and China at the Conference on Disarmament on the prevention of the placement of weapons in outer space and of the threat or use of force against outer space objects, as well as the political declarations of several States on no first placement of weapons in outer space.

Operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution is ambiguous and does not close the door to the possibility of the use or threat of the use of force in outer space, which is contrary to our commitment to the use and

exploration of outer space for strictly peaceful purposes. While we share the concerns about the potential use of outer-space technologies to the detriment of the security of nations, the draft resolution, rather than rejecting this issue in the twelfth and fourteenth preambular paragraphs, legitimizes the notion that outer-space technologies, means and systems may be used for purposes that are incompatible with the objective of maintaining international peace and security. The text does not reflect the importance of the transfer of knowledge and technologies and of capacity-building for peaceful uses of outer space and ignores the aspirations of populations, especially in developing countries, to benefit from the potential of outer-space technologies and their applications for implementing the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

Finally, our delegation wishes to inform the Committee that it will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.62, “No first placement of weapons in outer space”, and its fifth, ninth and eleventh preambular paragraphs, and we call on all delegations to do the same.

Mr. Jiménez (Nicaragua) (*spoke in Spanish*): Nicaragua would like to explain its vote regarding draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1, “Reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours”.

We regret to inform the Committee that Nicaragua will not support draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1, given that the concerns of our delegation were not addressed in the respective informal consultations. For Nicaragua, addressing the issue of security in outer-space activities, as well as other issues addressed in the text, is an activity that falls exclusively within the remit of the Fourth Committee. The draft resolution also attempts to change the perspective that has predominated under this agenda item by establishing that the main threat in outer space comes from Earth-based actions, activities, systems, technologies and means, something that the Committee has not previously considered. We believe that the placement of weapons in outer space and its militarization, including the continuing modernization and improvement of weapons, are the main threats we face.

The submitted text also fails to take into account the draft treaty presented by China and Russia at the Conference on Disarmament on the prevention of the placement of weapons in outer space and of the threat or

use of force against outer-space objects, and the political declarations of several States on no first placement of weapons in outer space. Moreover, one of our biggest concerns is that it weakens the path towards the adoption of a legally binding international instrument that complements the current legal regime supported by the vast majority of the international community.

We ask delegations to support draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.62, on no first placement of weapons in outer space, submitted by Russia, which does take our proposal and concerns into account, and to vote in favour of its separate paragraphs.

Mr. Reyes Hernández (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): Venezuela is taking the floor to explain why it will vote against draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1 as a whole, as well as its twelfth and fourteenth preambular paragraphs and operative paragraph 5.

Venezuela has serious concerns about the draft resolution, given that the text proposes to rewrite the existing approach on this issue while failing to centrally address the issue of the prevention of an arms race in outer space. The proposal is more oriented towards the peaceful development of outer space and the promotion of voluntary measures, using language that seems to come under the remit of the Fourth Committee. The fourth preambular paragraph mentions the guidelines for the long-term sustainability of outer-space activities, which falls within the framework of the Fourth Committee. The text uses extremely weak and ambiguous language and makes no mention of the advances that have been made on this issue and that are reflected in other draft resolutions, such as that submitted by Egypt and Sri Lanka, and the proposed draft resolution submitted by China and Russia, representing important milestones and conceptual references in the discussions that have taken place on this issue.

We note that operative paragraph 3 expresses the desire of Member States to adopt a common understanding of how best to act to reduce the threats to space systems in order to maintain outer space as a peaceful environment. In that regard, we note that that may represent a setback in our discussions, since preventing an arms race in outer space is the best way to prevent it from becoming a zone of conflict.

Venezuela is concerned about the text's ambiguity in its use of subjective concepts such as the notion of responsible behaviour, the idea of the perception of

threat and the notion of security risks, which, rather than instilling confidence and providing security and transparency, increase the risk of conflict by creating multiple possible interpretations. We note that the ninth, eleventh and twelfth preambular paragraphs and operative paragraph 5 incorporate the phrase "in outer space or on Earth" as a scenario of action within the framework of preserving outer space as a safe and stable environment, which does not make clear how measures or actions could be carried out on Earth to combat a presumed threat in outer space. The operative paragraphs make no mention whatever of the importance of preventing an arms race in outer space, or of a ban on the placement of weapons in outer space. We note that draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1 could be an attempt to divide the United Nations membership with regard to the concepts, objectives and goals that have been established under this First Committee cluster.

The Venezuelan delegation would also like to inform the Committee that in the light of the issues raised, our delegation will support draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.62, entitled "No first placement of weapons in outer space", by voting in favour of the draft resolution as a whole and all of its separate paragraphs.

The Chair: As members will recall, in his general statement under cluster 3, the representative of the Russian Federation announced that he would submit a challenge to the competence of the First Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1.

I give the floor to the representative of the Russian Federation on a point of order.

Mr. Polyanskiy (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): Today we are considering draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1, submitted by the United Kingdom, on reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviour. It is of a generic nature and does not have a direct relationship to the prevention of an arms race in outer space. The draft resolution's mention of the prevention of an arms race in outer space has no bearing on the overall content or intent of the draft resolution and should not mislead us. The draft resolution completely ignores key concepts in resolution 74/32, on the prevention of an arms race in outer space, such as the importance of consolidating and strengthening existing international frameworks on outer space, reaching multilateral agreements on the prevention of an arms race in outer space through effective verification mechanisms and creating a

working group on the prevention of an arms race in outer space, and so forth.

In actual fact, draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1 is focused on other things that are more related to the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (COPUOS). It is hardly within the First Committee's remit to cover issues such as outer-space debris or the safety of outer-space activities. We therefore believe that this draft resolution falls within the existing mandate of the COPUOS Working Group on the Long-term Sustainability of Outer Space Activities. Within the General Assembly such issues should be addressed within the Fourth Committee and certainly not the First Committee, which is responsible for matters related to disarmament and international security.

In the light of this, and based on rule 121 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, we call into question whether draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1, submitted by the United Kingdom, falls within the remit of the First Committee. We oppose the inclusion of a draft resolution on reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviour on the agenda of the First Committee under the item on the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

The Chair: The representative of the Russian Federation has called for a vote on a motion on the competence of the First Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1. It should be noted that rule 121 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly is applicable in this case. It reads,

“any motion calling for a decision on the competence of the Committee to adopt a proposal submitted to it shall be put to the vote before a vote is taken on the proposal in question.”

The Committee will now proceed to vote on the motion on the competence of the First Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1. I want to point out that those who vote yes will be voting in favour of the motion submitted by the representative of the Russian Federation, that is, that the Committee has no competence to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1. Delegations against the motion should signify by voting no.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee is now voting on the motion on the

competence of the First Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Belarus, Burundi, China, Comoros, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Dominica, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Latvia, Lebanon, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Yemen

Abstaining:

Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Chad, Ecuador, Eritrea, Eswatini, India, Iraq, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Madagascar, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Togo, United Arab Emirates

The motion that the Committee has no competence to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1 was rejected by 102 votes to 15, with 33 abstentions.

The Chair: In the light of the Committee's rejection of the motion that the Committee has no competence to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1, the Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1 during its action phase under cluster 3.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.3, entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.3 was submitted by the representatives of Egypt and Sri Lanka on 5 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/75/L.3. The additional sponsors are listed on the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, 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, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, 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, Nicaragua, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Israel, United States of America

Abstaining:

None

Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.3 was adopted by 174 votes to 2.

[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.1/75/L.45/Rev.1, entitled "Reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45 was submitted by the representative of the United Kingdom on 12 October. Subsequently, a revision of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1 was submitted on 23 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1. The additional sponsors are listed on the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Finland and Zambia have also become sponsors.

The Chair: Separate votes have been requested on the twelfth and fourteenth preambular paragraphs and

operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1. We shall now begin the voting process. I shall put those paragraphs to the vote, one by one.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Burundi, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Dominica, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

Abstaining:

Angola, Armenia, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Israel, South Africa, Togo

The twelfth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1 was retained by 138 votes to 11, with 7 abstentions.

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

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, 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, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sudan, 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 States of America, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Yemen

Against:

Burundi, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Dominica, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe

Abstaining:

Angola, Armenia, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Egypt, India, Israel, Pakistan, South Africa, Sri Lanka

The fourteenth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1 was retained by 135 votes to 12, with 10 abstentions.

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

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone,

Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Yemen

Against:

Burundi, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Dominica, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe

Abstaining:

Angola, Armenia, Belarus, Israel, Pakistan

Operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1 was retained by 140 votes to 13, with 5 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.1/75/L.45/Rev.1, as a whole.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives,

Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, 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, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen

Against:

Burundi, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Dominica, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe

Abstaining:

Angola, Armenia, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), India, Israel, Nigeria, Palau

Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1, as a whole, was adopted by 150 votes to 12, with 8 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.1/75/L.62, entitled "No first placement of weapons in outer space".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.62 was submitted by the representative of the Russian Federation on 15 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/75/L.62. The additional sponsors are listed on the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee.

The Chair: Separate votes have been requested on the fifth, ninth and eleventh preambular paragraphs of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.62. We shall now begin the voting process. I shall put those paragraphs to the vote, one by one.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Guinea, Papua New Guinea, Republic of Korea, Switzerland, Turkey

The fifth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.62 was retained by 114 votes to 47, with 7 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegations of the Central African Republic, Madagascar, Sao Tome and Principe and Solomon Islands informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Liechtenstein, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Switzerland, Turkey

The ninth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.62 was retained by 116 votes to 44, with 7 abstentions.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

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

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Cyprus, Djibouti, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Liechtenstein, Malta, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, San Marino, Spain, Switzerland, Turkey

The eleventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.62 was retained by 115 votes to 31, with 21 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.62, as a whole.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Australia, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Iceland, Israel, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cyprus, Djibouti, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Liechtenstein, Malta, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, San Marino, Spain, Switzerland, Turkey

Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.62, as a whole, was adopted by 122 votes to 32, with 21 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegations of Solomon Islands and the United Republic of Tanzania informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour; the delegation of Haiti that it had intended to vote against.]

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/75/L.63, entitled "Further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/75/L.63 was submitted by the

representative of the Russian Federation on 15 October. The sponsors of the draft decision are listed in document A/C.1/75/L.63. The additional sponsors are listed on the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. The Comoros has also become a sponsor.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Israel, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Kiribati, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Republic of Korea, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Ukraine

Draft decision A/C.1/75/L.63 was adopted by 139 votes to 2, with 33 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of China 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.1/75/L.66, entitled "Transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.66 was submitted by the representative of the Russian Federation on 15 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/75/L.66. The additional sponsors are listed on the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee.

The Chair: A separate vote has been requested on the ninth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.66.

I shall now put that paragraph to the vote.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Chile, China, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya,

Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

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

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Canada, Colombia, Djibouti, Egypt, Estonia, Georgia, Germany, Iceland, Indonesia, Japan, Latvia, Libya, Lithuania, Morocco, North Macedonia, Norway, Poland, Republic of Korea, Romania, San Marino, Solomon Islands, Spain, Turkey, Ukraine

The ninth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.66 was retained by 131 votes to 5, with 26 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.66, as a whole.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada,

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

Against:

Israel, United States of America

Abstaining:

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.66, as a whole, was adopted by 169 votes to 2, with 6 abstentions.

The Chair (*spoke in Spanish*): We will now hear from delegations wishing to speak in explanation of vote after the voting. I would like to remind delegations that statements are limited to three minutes.

Mr. Kakanur (India): I am taking the floor to explain India's vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1 and A/C.1/75/L.62.

As a major space-faring nation, India has vital development and security interests in space and remains opposed to the weaponization of outer space. India will not resort to any arms race in outer space. We have been a consistent advocate of preserving outer space as a common heritage of humankind and remain committed to maintaining it as an ever-expanding frontier for the cooperative endeavours of all space-faring nations.

India continues to support the substantive consideration of the prevention of an arms race in outer space within the multilateral framework of the United Nations. We remain committed to the negotiation in the Conference on Disarmament of a legally binding instrument on the prevention of an arms race in outer space. While not a substitute for legally binding instruments, transparency and confidence-building measures can play a useful and complementary role. India was an active participant in the Group of Governmental Experts on further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space, which concluded last year.

India has always voted in favour of all draft resolutions submitted under the outer-space cluster. However, we felt constrained to abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1. While we share with the United Kingdom and the draft resolution's other sponsors the goal of reducing space threats, we believe that the draft resolution does not address the key issue of preventing an arms race in outer space through a universally acceptable and multilaterally negotiated legally binding instrument. It also introduces a number of subjective elements, including concepts of responsible and irresponsible behaviour and the characterization and interpretation of behaviour, as well as the perception of threats, that further complicate the task at hand. We believe that the draft resolution deflects and takes us further away from the objective of preventing an arms race in outer space, which continues to be a priority for the international community. We abstained in the voting on some of the draft resolution's preambular and operative paragraphs for the same reason.

India voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.62, entitled "No first placement of weapons in outer space". The draft resolution states that the legal

regime applicable to outer space needs to be consolidated and reinforced. India supports that objective, as well as that of strengthening the international legal regime to protect and preserve access to space for all and to prevent the weaponization of outer space, without exceptions.

We support the substantive consideration of the topic of the prevention of an arms race in outer space in the Conference on Disarmament. We see the effort to ensure no first placement of weapons in outer space as a useful initiative and not a substitute for substantive legal measures to ensure the prevention of an arms race in outer space. We voted against the fifth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.62, owing to the inclusion of the phrase "a community of shared future for humankind". That phrase is part of a political ideology, and General Assembly resolutions are not appropriate places for reflecting countries' individual ideologies.

Mr. Hassan (Egypt) (*spoke in Arabic*): I am honoured to be delivering this statement on behalf of the Group of Arab States to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1, entitled "Reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours".

We voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1 because we believe it is designed to develop rules and facilitate legally binding instruments related to the issue of access to outer space. It also seeks to prevent the placement of weapons in outer space and the launching of weapons from Earth. The Arab Group reaffirms that the international community has the necessary experience and expertise to be able to identify and agree on definitions and put in place verification mechanisms. We look forward to seeing draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1 implemented so that we can achieve our goals and re-evaluate the implementation in the future. We also stress that the Arab Group entirely rejects any attempts to legitimize an arms race in outer space or turn outer space into a zone of conflict.

Mr. Situmorang (Indonesia): I am taking the floor to explain Indonesia's position on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1, entitled "Reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours".

Indonesia's support for draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1 is in line with its principled position on maintaining outer space as a peaceful, safe, stable,

secure and sustainable development environment. We underscore that the exploration and use of outer space and celestial bodies should be for peaceful purposes only and should be carried out for the benefit and in the interests of all countries, irrespective of their degree of economic or scientific development. All space assets should therefore have exclusively peaceful purposes and be free from all forms of threats, whether from space or Earth-based systems.

At the same time, we remain concerned about any policy of placing weapons in outer space or making space a new arena for conflict, which runs counter to our objective of preventing an arms race in outer space. Indonesia therefore maintains that threats to space systems should be addressed in a comprehensive manner. Our efforts should aim to prevent both the militarization and weaponization of outer space as well as any use of space- or Earth-based capabilities that goes against the peaceful use of outer space.

We consider the formulation of rules, norms and principles of responsible behaviour to be a step in the right direction towards the potential drafting of a legally binding instrument on the prevention of an arms race in outer space. Our delegation stands ready to engage constructively with all Member States in the implementation and development of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1 with a view to ensuring its alignment with our principles and its complementarity with existing initiatives on the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

Mr. Fiallo Karolys (Ecuador) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation is taking the floor to explain its vote with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1, entitled “Reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours”.

First, we note that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1, usually very reluctant to accede to requests for the inclusion of new items when they are put forward by other countries, are going against the efforts to streamline the work of the General Assembly by submitting an item that replicates those that already exist with regard to outer space. Ecuador will take that into account in the process of revitalizing the work of the General Assembly. Secondly, Ecuador believes that the potential for use and abuse of the concept of the perception of threats included in draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1 would render it unnecessary and counterproductive for international security.

Finally, Ecuador believes that the way to maintain and achieve a safer outer space is by reaching a legally binding instrument that bans the placement and use of weapons and prevents an arms race in outer space. Regrettably, draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1 favours a line of urging only voluntary actions and behaviours on the part of States, which has not garnered great support for a number of years. However, Ecuador voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1, given the good-faith effort of the United Kingdom and the fact that the draft resolution acknowledges the need for all States to work together in order to reduce threats to space systems and to continue to consider legally binding instruments in that area.

Mr. Masmеjean (Switzerland): Switzerland once again abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.62, entitled “No first placement of weapons in outer space”. Our delegation wishes to put on the record that the explanation of vote that we delivered regarding the corresponding draft resolution last year remains fully valid (see A/C.1/74/PV.24). We wish to add that it has not escaped our delegation’s attention that a number of worrying developments directly connected to draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.62 have recently taken place, notably with regard to counter-space capabilities. Those developments accentuate the reservations that we have already expressed regarding the draft resolution. Switzerland will closely follow further developments in that area, which will inform our future voting on this draft resolution.

Mrs. Jakob (Germany): I am taking the floor on behalf of a group of States consisting of Croatia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Iceland, Montenegro, the Netherlands, North Macedonia, Norway, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden and my own country, Germany, in order to explain the reasons pertaining to our shift from abstaining in the voting to voting against draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.62, on “No first placement of weapons in outer space”.

Our group of countries continues to promote a safe, secure and sustainable space environment and the peaceful use of outer space. But we do not believe that the Russian approach to the issue of no first placement of weapons in outer space responds adequately to the objective of strengthening trust and confidence among States.

First, our group of countries is concerned about the development and ongoing testing of various counter-

space capabilities, in particular by the main sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.62. Russia has failed to meaningfully address the concerns of others regarding the rationale of the draft resolution. It has also failed to reconcile its approach with the fact that it already possesses and has continued to develop capabilities that could be regarded as weapons. That includes ground-based counter-space capabilities. We are particularly concerned about the Kosmos-2543 satellite, which, by releasing a new object at high velocity in low-Earth orbit, has the characteristics of an on-orbit counter-space capability. We wonder how Russia can reconcile the development, placement in space and testing of such capabilities with its no-first-placement initiative.

Secondly, the discussions of the Group of Governmental Experts on further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space in 2018 and 2019 showed that the international community is facing a broad spectrum of space-related threats. We have not seen Russia and China engage seriously in amending their approach and responding constructively to the concerns regarding all the threats and risks perceived by the international community. The no-first-placement initiative also continues to ignore the challenge of a sufficient definition of weapons or illegitimate objects in outer space, in particular with regard to certain dual-use technologies, which our group of countries has repeatedly asked for. Ambiguities regarding the capabilities of certain objects and their intended use could lead to misinterpretations, misunderstandings and miscalculations and consequently increase the risk of conflict in outer space. We believe it would be more useful to follow an approach that addresses existing security threats and risks in and around outer space, increases transparency and confidence-building measures and promotes consensus-building on responsible behaviour with regard to space activities.

Thirdly, we abstained in the voting on the draft resolution on the no first placement of weapons in outer space last year with the aim of facilitating the relaunch of arms-control efforts with regard to all relevant threats to space systems arising from irresponsible behaviour in outer space. We deeply regret that Russia has taken no steps in that direction and is actively opposing initiatives that aim to do so. A full version of our explanation of vote will be uploaded to the compendium.

Mrs. Nadeau (Canada) (*spoke in French*): I take the floor to explain Canada's vote on draft resolution

A/C.1/75/L.62, entitled "No first placement of weapons in outer space".

Space security and the peaceful use of space are of vital importance to Canada, and we support efforts to ensure the sustainable use of outer space for all nations. We are determined to prevent an arms race in outer space. However, Canada believes that the approach to space-related issues as outlined in draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.62 is ineffective and does not contribute to enhanced stability or security. Our concerns are as follows. An adequate description of what constitutes a weapon in outer space is lacking. The draft resolution focuses exclusively on space-based weapons and does not cover ground-based anti-satellite capabilities, despite the fact that space infrastructure is vulnerable to a wide range of threats, including space-to-space, space-to-Earth and Earth-to-space exchanges. It does not include a commitment on the part of States to refraining from developing or testing weapons intended for deployment in space. That omission translates to a commitment that in effect does nothing to preclude an arms race in outer space.

(*spoke in English*)

While there could be value in a political declaration on outer-space security, the no-first-placement pledge amounts to a promise without any means of verifying whether it is being upheld and without any consequences in the event that it is not respected. The main sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.62 is developing and testing counter-space capabilities to be deployed both from the ground and from space, of which the latter is clearly inconsistent with the draft resolution's stated purpose. Those actions undermine the pledge and therefore increase the type of mistrust that fuels arms races, both terrestrial and celestial.

Space knows no boundaries and calls for an inclusive and holistic approach. Canada believes that cooperation among all Member States is key to ensuring the safe, secure and sustainable use of outer space. It is our belief that the proposal in draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.62 does not advance that. For all those reasons, Canada voted against it.

Mr. Polyanskiy (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): We regret that, despite the fact that taking action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1, submitted by the United Kingdom and entitled "Reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours", clearly does not

fall under the competence of the First Committee, its sponsors succeeded in mobilizing their allies and a number of other Member States in order to ensure that it was introduced into the agenda and to vote in favour of it.

We wish to once again explain our negative view of the proposal submitted by the United Kingdom, which we believe could do serious damage to the vital task of preventing an arms race in outer space. In 1978, the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament established that one of the key objectives in the field of disarmament are the prevention of an arms race in outer space and the holding of appropriate negotiations, in line with the 1967 Outer Space Treaty. Those objectives are reaffirmed in the annual draft resolution on the prevention of an arms race in outer space, sponsored by Egypt and Sri Lanka, which the First Committee adopted today as draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.3. Russia has consistently supported and co-sponsored that draft resolution.

On the other hand, draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1 takes a completely different stance, which we believe is aimed at eroding the fundamental provisions of the prevention of an arms race in outer space, thereby threatening to exacerbate disagreements in the field of outer-space activities and international security in general. Besides that, the draft resolution is at best redundant with regard to improving the predictability and safety of outer-space activities. As we have already noted, the United Kingdom's draft resolution is focused on issues that fall within the remit of the Fourth Committee and the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. That is where issues such as space debris mitigation and the physical security of outer-space activities should be addressed.

We would like to draw the Committee's attention to the fact that draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1 makes no reference to the key provisions of the Egypt/Sri Lanka draft resolution on the prevention of an arms race in outer space (A/C.1/75/L.3), including negotiations on a legally binding instrument with reliable guarantees for ensuring no first placement of weapons in orbit and not using or threatening to use force against outer-space objects. Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1 detracts from the First Committee's discussions on the task of preventing an arms race in outer space, and its adoption will have extremely serious negative consequences for our future efforts to demilitarize outer space.

In our view, the draft resolution also seeks to legitimize the realization of projects put forward by the United States and a number of its allies to deploy armed-strike systems in outer space and to use outer space for war operations. An example of that can be seen in the updated space defence strategy of the United States, which typically sets as one of its objectives that of achieving military superiority and even total domination in outer space through both defensive and offensive operations. In other words, outer space is viewed as an arena for military operations.

We believe that the United Kingdom's draft resolution is an attempt to revise the decisions of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, in 1978, and to deflect the efforts of Member States away from the goal of preventing an arms race in outer space and towards the formulation of various amorphous rules for responsible behaviours in outer space. For those reasons, we voted against draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1 today.

Mr. Mohd Nasir (Malaysia): Malaysia voted in favour of all the draft resolutions submitted under cluster 3, "Outer space (disarmament aspects)". We recognize the significance of protecting outer space for our common interests and in order to prevent an arms race in outer space, an arena that should be used exclusively for peaceful purposes. In our efforts to strengthen the peaceful use of outer space, Malaysia continues to seek opportunities to collaborate with other Member States and the international community within the international legal framework in that area. Our shared goal and interests are ultimately about preserving the peaceful nature of outer space. While we take note of the comments and statements delivered today in the context of cluster 3, it is our hope that we can continue to maintain a constructive approach and engagement under this cluster and that the proposals submitted under it can be seen as complementary, not contrary, to one another.

Mr. Khan (Pakistan): I am taking the floor to explain my delegation's position on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1, entitled "Reducing space threats through norms, rules and principles of responsible behaviours".

Pakistan is of the view that preventing an arms race in outer space and the placement of weapons in outer space is the single most important issue for outer-space security. Measures aimed at ensuring the safety

and sustainability of the outer-space environment are important, especially where safety is deliberately jeopardized and could lead to mistrust among States and affect outer-space security. We therefore decided to support draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1. In doing so, we also note that it affirms the importance of the prevention of an arms race in outer space and acknowledges the primary role of the Conference on Disarmament in that regard.

While we voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1 as a whole, we would have preferred a more comprehensive approach that extended the scope of its operative paragraph 5 to also recognize the need for the development of norms and principles for the prevention of an arms race in outer space. We do not agree that space technologies for military and peaceful uses cannot be verified effectively. Systems like anti-satellite weapons leave no ambiguity as to their potential use, and there is an urgent need to bring them under internationally legally binding restrictions or prohibitions.

We also share concerns about the implications that draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.45/Rev.1 could have for the peaceful uses of outer space. Although we voted to adopt it, our position on it remains under review. We hope that it will promote the objectives of the prevention of an arms race in outer space and complement existing initiatives. This initiative cannot be a substitute for progress on the prevention of an arms race in outer space, which the international community should accord high priority.

The Chair (*spoke in Spanish*): We have heard from the last speaker in explanation of vote after the voting on cluster 3.

The Committee will now turn to cluster 4, “Conventional weapons”, as contained in document A/C.1/75/INF/2/Rev.2. I shall first give the floor to delegations wishing to make either a general statement or to introduce new or revised draft resolutions under cluster 4, “Conventional weapons”. Statements are limited to three minutes, and I once again appeal to delegations to consider submitting written statements.

Mr. Diarra (Mali) (*spoke in French*): The delegation of Mali has the honour to introduce the annual draft resolution entitled “Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons and collecting them”, contained in document A/C.1/75/L.32, on behalf of the 15 States members

of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) — Benin, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Côte d’Ivoire, the Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, the Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo and my own country, Mali.

Other than the necessary technical updates, draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.32 uses the same terms as the draft resolution that was adopted by consensus last year (resolution 74/51). In that regard, ECOWAS member States very much hope that the tradition of consensus will prevail once again this year in the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.32. Essentially, the draft resolution seeks to strengthen stability in West Africa by improving regional security through strengthened regional initiatives and efforts to reduce the proliferation and illicit trafficking of small arms and light weapons.

Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.32 calls on the international community to support the effective implementation of the ECOWAS Convention on Small Arms and Light Weapons, Their Ammunition and Other Related Materials, which entered into force on 29 September 2009. Among other things, it encourages the international community to provide technical and financial support for building civil-society organizations’ capacity to curb the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons and to collect them.

Beyond the subregion of West Africa and the Sahel, the draft resolution reflects the willingness of many countries around the world to collect and curb the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons, which currently have the sad reputation of being some of the world’s most feared. On behalf of the States members of ECOWAS, I would like to take this opportunity to thank all countries that have sponsored draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.32, which my country has the honour to introduce, and at the same time to encourage those that have not yet done so to express their support for it.

In conclusion, the delegation of Mali reiterates the gratitude of all ECOWAS member States to our technical and financial partners for their support in implementing draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.32.

Ms. Quintero Correa (Colombia) (*spoke in Spanish*): As one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.44, entitled “The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects”, Colombia would like to thank Japan for introducing the draft resolution, which we fully support.

The illicit manufacture and trafficking of small arms and light weapons, along with that of ammunition and explosives, continues to be a concern and a threat to peace, security, sustainable development and global stability insofar as terrorist groups and transnational organized criminal groups can access them relatively cheaply and transport them easily. The scope of the problem demonstrates that this is the result of the convergence of national realities with flows and variables at the regional or global level, which is why it is essential to continue to strengthen the execution of action at those levels.

International cooperation and assistance are essential and complementary to national and regional measures for the full and effective implementation of the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects and the International Tracing Instrument. Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.44 therefore seeks to continue to strengthen our collective efforts and enhance international cooperation in order to combat this issue. Colombia encourages all delegations to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.44 without a vote.

The Chair (*spoke in Spanish*): Before the Committee proceeds to take action on the draft resolutions and draft decisions in cluster 4, we will hear from delegations wishing to speak in explanation of vote or position on any of them.

Mrs. Castro Loredo (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): As in previous years, the Cuban delegation will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.53, “The Arms Trade Treaty” (ATT). The Treaty, which was adopted prematurely, when the negotiations on it had not yet concluded, does not enjoy consensus. It contains significant ambiguities, inconsistencies, vague definitions and legal loopholes that undermine its effectiveness and efficiency. The Arms Trade Treaty cannot be considered effective given that it does not prohibit, and therefore legitimizes, the transfer of weapons to unauthorized non-State actors, the main source of illicit arms trafficking.

The Treaty is an unbalanced instrument that favours arms-exporting States. The parameters established for those States to evaluate the approval and denial of transfers are subjective in nature and can therefore be easily manipulated for political purposes, which hinders the right of States to acquire and possess weapons for their legitimate defence, as recognized in the Charter of

the United Nations. With regard to operative paragraph 9 of the draft resolution, we reiterate our concern about any claims to establish synergies between the ATT and other instruments that are universally accepted. Our delegation will dissociate itself from all paragraphs related to the ATT in any of the draft resolutions that the First Committee takes action on.

The Cuban delegation will also abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.26, “Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction”. We share fully the legitimate humanitarian concerns associated with the indiscriminate and irresponsible use of anti-personnel mines. Our country is a State party to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, including its original Protocol II, and fully complies with the prohibitions and restrictions on the use of mines outlined in the Convention. For more than six decades, Cuba has been subjected to an ongoing policy of hostility and aggression on the part of the Government of the United States. We 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 established in the Charter of the United Nations.

We will continue to support all efforts that maintain the necessary balance between humanitarian and national security issues while seeking to eliminate the devastating effects resulting from the indiscriminate and irresponsible use of anti-personnel mines on the civilian populations and economies of many countries.

Mr. Hassan (Egypt): I am taking the floor to explain my delegation’s vote on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.53, entitled “The Arms Trade Treaty” (ATT), and on references to the Treaty contained in other draft resolutions submitted to the First Committee. Egypt continues to be at the forefront of all genuine efforts to combat illicit trafficking in arms and eradicate arms transfers to terrorists and illegal armed groups. We also actively and constructively participated in the negotiations leading to the adoption of the ATT.

Nevertheless, motives related to some States’ desire to manipulate and politicize the legitimate arms trade resulted in several shortcomings and loopholes in the Treaty, especially its deliberate lack of necessary definitions and criteria, which make its implementation selective and subjective and allow arms-exporting

States to abuse its provisions. It also completely failed to prohibit intentional State-sponsored supplies of weapons to unauthorized recipients, including terrorists and illegal armed groups, which represent the main threat in this area. My delegation will therefore continue to abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.53, as well as on paragraphs that refer to the Treaty in other draft resolutions, such as draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.32 and draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.21.

Mr. Balouji (Islamic Republic of Iran): I would like to explain my delegation's position regarding draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.53, on the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT). My delegation will abstain in the voting on the draft resolution for the following reasons.

First, with respect to the ATT, greater priority is given to the political and commercial interests of certain arms-exporting countries than to the observance of 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 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, the draft resolution calls on non-parties to accede to the Treaty. Calling for the ATT's universalization 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. Furthermore, some States parties to the ATT are committing major violations of its provisions, exporting billions of dollars in arms to Israel and certain countries in the Persian Gulf region, where they are being used to cause death and destruction in occupied Palestine and by aggressors in Yemen, in only two examples 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.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.38, entitled "Countering the threat posed by improvised explosive devices", my delegation will join the consensus on its adoption. In our view, preventing and combating

the use of improvised explosive devices by terrorists and illegal armed groups is the draft resolution's exclusive purpose. Any interpretation of the provisions of the draft resolution should therefore be consistent with that purpose, while any interpretation beyond it that could restrict free access to and trade in such equipment and goods for civilian uses is unacceptable.

Mr. Knyazyan (Armenia): I am taking the floor to explain the position of the delegation of Armenia on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.61, 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"; draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.43, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions"; and A/C.1/75/L.53, entitled "The Arms Trade Treaty".

The delegation of Armenia will join the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.61, given the importance of demonstrating the unity and solidarity of the international community in addressing the impact of excessively injurious and indiscriminate weaponry on civilian populations and the environment during armed conflicts. We are concerned about the use of such weaponry, in particular incendiary weapons, including in our region. As the Committee is aware, it has now been more than a month since Azerbaijan, with the direct involvement of Turkey and foreign terrorist fighters and mercenaries, unleashed a large-scale military aggression against the people of Nagorno Karabakh. Since 30 October the armed forces of Azerbaijan have been using munitions containing white phosphorus, causing severe injuries to the civilian population and creating forest fires in the vicinity of civilian settlements, which could potentially lead to environmental disaster. The use of such weapons, which do not distinguish between military and civilian targets and can also cause environmental disaster and human losses, constitutes a war crime. That is yet another manifestation of Azerbaijan's policy, which seeks to make life in Artsakh untenable by inflicting the maximum possible damage to the environment as well as to critical civilian infrastructure.

We condemn in the strongest terms the massive use of banned weapons, including cluster munitions, by the Azerbaijani armed forces against civilian populations and infrastructure in Artsakh. Aerial bombardments and missile strikes targeting more than 120 settlements have resulted in the deaths of 50 civilians, including

women and children and other vulnerable persons, and injuries to a further 140 people. Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.43 sends an important message in decrying the recent uses of cluster munitions and their related casualties. Given the critical importance of putting an end to the suffering and casualties caused by cluster munitions, Armenia will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.43.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.53, Armenia reiterates its concerns about the preambular and principles sections of the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT). We have always stressed the need for balanced and non-restrictive references to the principles of international law. We reaffirm our position that the Treaty, in its current form, may be interpreted in a way that limits countries' exercise of their sovereign right to self-defence and may hinder legitimate access to relevant technologies, and Armenia will therefore abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.53. Armenia's position on the ATT is applicable to all other draft resolutions of the First Committee containing references to the Treaty. We therefore dissociate ourselves from related paragraphs in other draft resolutions.

Mr. Penaranda (Philippines): The Philippines supports the implementation of strong regulations covering conventional weapons. We are a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.53, on the Arms Trade Treaty, and of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.44, on the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects. We have also sponsored draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.28, entitled "Information on confidence-building measures in the field of conventional arms", and draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.43, "Implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions".

The Philippines is deeply concerned about reports of the continuing use of cluster munitions and calls on the relevant countries to become States parties to the Convention on Cluster Munitions. As coordinator for the universalization of the Convention, the Philippines stands ready to assist any country that wishes to complete the necessary steps in acceding to it.

The Philippines is also President-designate of the Conference of the High Contracting Parties to Amended Protocol II to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW). We need to address the threat posed by improvised explosive devices, particularly with respect to armed non-State actors and terrorists. We therefore

strongly support draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.61, 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". The Philippines notes that the CCW is the appropriate framework for addressing potential threats arising from lethal autonomous weapons systems, including their possible acquisition by armed non-State actors and terrorists. There is a need for a robust and future-proof legally binding instrument to address those threats.

Lastly, we support draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.26, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction". Explosive remnants of war and unexploded ordnance such as mines and cluster munitions continue to threaten lives. The Philippines urges the international community to pursue mine action in a manner that affirms the centrality in our work of supporting mine victims and establishing solid national capacities for affected countries.

Mr. Khan (Pakistan): I am taking the floor to explain Pakistan's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.26, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction", which the Committee will take action on under this cluster. As in previous years, my delegation will abstain in the voting on it. Landmines continue to play a significant role in meeting the military needs of many States. Given our security considerations 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 to 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, and we have successfully undertaken demining operations in various parts of the world. We remain committed to providing further assistance in order to advance global humanitarian demining efforts.

Pakistan will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.43, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions”. 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 importance of minimizing human suffering without sacrificing States’ legitimate security interests. Pakistan supports international efforts to address the irresponsible and indiscriminate use of cluster munitions and condemns the use of cluster munitions against civilian populations and peoples under illegal occupation.

The Chair (*spoke in Spanish*): We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote before the voting.

(*spoke in English*)

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.26, 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.1/75/L.26 was submitted by the representatives of the Sudan, the Netherlands and Norway on 6 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/75/L.26.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, 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, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zambia

Against:

None

Abstaining:

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.26 was adopted by 163 votes to none, with 17 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.28, entitled “Information on confidence-building measures in the field of conventional arms”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.28 was submitted by the representative of Argentina on 7 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/75/L.28. The additional sponsors are listed on the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Equatorial Guinea and Mali have also become sponsors.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.28 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.32, 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.1/75/L.32 was submitted on 8 October by the representative of Mali, on behalf of the Member States of the United Nations that are members of the Economic Community of West African States. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/75/L.32. The additional sponsors are listed on the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Equatorial Guinea and Lesotho have also become sponsors.

The Chair: A separate, recorded vote has been requested on the sixteenth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.32.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Eswatini, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras,

Hungary, Iceland, India, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, 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, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

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

The sixteenth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.32 was retained by 148 votes to none, with 18 abstentions.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.32, as a whole, was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.38, 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 resolution A/C.1/75/L.38 was submitted by the representatives of Afghanistan, Australia and France on 9 October. The main sponsors have informed the Secretariat of the following oral revision. Operative paragraph 26 should read as follows:

“Notes that the United Nations Policy on Victim Assistance in Mine Action highlights the significance of integrating survivor assistance efforts into broader international and national frameworks, as well as the importance of sustained services and support to survivors, including the survivors of attacks involving improvised explosive devices”.

The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/75/L.38. The additional sponsors are listed on the e-deLEGATE portal of the First Committee.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.38 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.43, 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.1/75/L.43 was submitted by the representative of Switzerland, on behalf of a group of States, on 12 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/75/L.43.

The present oral statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. Under the terms of operative paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.43, the General Assembly would

“request the Secretary-General to continue to convene the Meetings of States Parties to the Convention on Cluster Munitions and to continue to render the necessary assistance and to provide such services as may be necessary to fulfil the tasks entrusted to him under the Convention and in the relevant decisions of the Meetings of States Parties and the second Review Conference.”

In accordance with article 14 of the Convention, the costs of the Meetings of States Parties, the Review Conferences and the Amendment Conferences shall be borne by the States parties and States not party to the Convention participating therein, in accordance with the United Nations scale of assessments, adjusted appropriately. Preliminary cost estimates for servicing the tenth Meeting of States Parties will be prepared by the Secretariat and approved by the States parties at the second Review Conference, which will take place from 23 November to 27 November 2020.

It is recalled that all activities related to international conventions or treaties that, under their respective legal arrangements, need to be financed outside the regular budget of the United Nations, may be undertaken by the Secretariat only when sufficient funding is received, in advance, from States parties and States not parties participating in the meetings. Accordingly, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.43 would not give rise to any financial implications under the proposed programme budget.

The Chair: A separate, recorded vote has been requested on the fourteenth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.43. I shall first put that paragraph to the vote.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Canada, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall

Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, 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, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Kuwait, Myanmar, Nepal, Oman, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates, United States of America, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe

The fourteenth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.43 was retained by 144 votes to none, with 19 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Myanmar 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.1/75/L.43, as a whole.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire,

Croatia, Cuba, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, 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, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Tuvalu, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Argentina, Bahrain, Belarus, Brazil, China, Cyprus, Egypt, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Greece, Haiti, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Kuwait, Latvia, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, 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.1/75/L.43, as a whole, was adopted by 137 votes to none, with 39 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Sweden 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.1/75/L.44, 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.1/75/L.44 was submitted on 12 October by the representatives of Japan, Colombia and South Africa. A statement on the programme budget implications of the draft resolution has been issued as document A/C.1/75/L.75 and placed on the e-deleGATE portal. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/75/L.44. The additional sponsors are listed on the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Equatorial Guinea and the Gambia have also become sponsors.

The Chair: A separate, recorded vote has been requested on the seventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.44. I shall first put that paragraph to the vote.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova,

Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Israel, United States of America

Abstaining:

Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

The seventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.44 was retained by 167 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

[Subsequently, the delegations of Barbados and Venezuela informed the Secretariat that they 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.1/75/L.44, as a whole, was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.53, 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.1/75/L.53 was submitted by the representative of Sierra Leone on 13 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are contained in document A/C.1/75/L.53. The additional sponsors are listed on the e-deleGATE portal of the First Committee. Andorra, Botswana, Equatorial Guinea and Guinea have also become sponsors.

The Chair: Separate, recorded votes have been requested on the ninth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 10 of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.53. I shall now put those paragraphs to the vote, one by one.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Zambia

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Armenia, Azerbaijan, Egypt, Eritrea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Sudan,

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

The ninth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.53 was retained by 153 votes to none, with 17 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 10.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, 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, Dominica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay

Against:

Israel, United States of America

Abstaining:

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

Operative paragraph 10 of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.53 was retained by 130 votes to 2, with 31 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.53, as a whole.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, 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, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Zambia

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.53, as a whole, was adopted by 150 votes to 1, with 28 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.61, 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.1/75/L.61 was submitted by the representative of Pakistan on 14 October. The sponsor of the draft resolution is listed in document A/C.1/75/L.61.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.61 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/75/L.67, 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 decision A/C.1/75/L.67 was submitted by the representatives of Germany and France on 15 October. The sponsors of the draft decision are listed in document A/C.1/75/L.67. A statement on the programme budget implications of the draft resolution has been issued as document A/C.1/75/L.78 and placed on the e-deleGATE portal.

The Chair: The sponsors of the draft decision 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 decision A/C.1/75/L.67 was adopted.

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

Mr. Kakanur (India): I am taking the floor to explain India's vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/75/L.53 and A/C.1/75/L.26.

Regarding draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.53, India has established strong and effective national export controls concerning the export of defence items. India subscribes to the objectives of the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT), and our export-control system meets 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.1/75/L.53.

India also abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.26. 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 way will considerably facilitate the goal of the complete elimination of anti-personnel mines.

India is a high contracting party to Amended Protocol II to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, which enshrines the approach of taking account of the legitimate defence requirements of States,

especially those with long borders. India has fulfilled its obligations under Amended Protocol II, including stopping the production of non-detectable mines, as well as rendering all of our anti-personnel 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.

Mr. Hassan (Egypt): I am taking the floor to explain my delegation's decision to abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.26, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction". On several occasions Egypt has expressed its reservations about the unbalanced nature of the Convention, which was developed and concluded outside the framework of the United Nations. Mindful of the humanitarian considerations associated with landmines, Egypt imposed a moratorium on its capacity to produce and export landmines beginning in the 1980s, long before the conclusion of the Convention. We believe that the Convention lacks a balance between the humanitarian concerns related to anti-personnel landmines and their possible legitimate military uses, especially in countries with long borders that face extraordinary security challenges. Furthermore, the Convention does not establish any legal obligation on States to remove the anti-personnel mines that they have placed in the territory of other States, making it almost impossible for many States to meet the demining requirements on their own. That is particularly true for Egypt, which is one of the worst-affected countries, given that it still has more than 22 million of the landmines that were placed on its territory during the Second World War.

Egypt will continue to abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.43, on the implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions, owing to the selective and unbalanced nature of the Convention, which was also developed and concluded outside the

framework of the United Nations, and which 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.

Ms. Jáquez Huacuja (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to explain the Mexican delegation's position on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.44, entitled "The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects". Mexico thanks Japan, Colombia and South Africa for making minimal changes to the draft resolution, thereby acknowledging that there are no substantive changes in the United Nations process on combating the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons that warrant a separate ruling by the General Assembly.

In Mexico's view, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.44 does not denote a change in the General Assembly's endorsement of the final outcome document of the third Review Conference 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. At the same time, the language in the draft resolution cannot be considered a substitute for that agreed to at the Review Conference on the obligations and multilateral commitments related to combating the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons. Mexico hopes that the draft resolution will act as a vehicle for further progress on the achievements reached to date, especially in the lead-up to the seventh Biennial Meeting of States on the Programme of Action, to be held in 2021.

Mr. Baek Yong-Jin (Republic of Korea): My delegation would like to explain its position on draft resolutions A/C.1/75/L.26 and A/C.1/75/L.43.

With respect to draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.26, the Republic of Korea sincerely supports the objectives of the Ottawa Mine Ban Convention. However, due to the unique security situation on the Korean peninsula, we are 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. My Government exercises tight control over anti-personnel mines and has maintained an indefinite moratorium on their export since 1997.

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 activities to ensure only limited and responsible use. On

the domestic front, my Government continues to work on mine clearance and victim rehabilitation. In 2019 alone we cleared 893 mines, including 891 anti-personnel mines, over an area of 179,000 square metres. In 2014 we also enacted a special law on support for civilian landmine victims, and we have contributed more than \$40 million to relevant United Nations programmes for demining and victim assistance since 1993.

With respect to draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.43, we fully share the international community's concerns about the humanitarian impact of cluster munitions and support efforts to address the issue. However, owing to the unique security situation on the Korean peninsula, we are currently not a party to the Convention on Cluster Munitions and therefore abstained in the voting on the draft resolution. Nevertheless, we would like to inform the Committee that our Ministry of Defence adopted a directive on cluster munitions in 2008 according to which only cluster munitions with self-deactivation devices and 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.

Lastly, my delegation would like to draw the Committee's attention to the ongoing demining efforts along the demilitarized zone of the Korean peninsula, in line with the Pyongyang Joint Declaration, signed in 2018. Since the signing of that agreement, we have sought ways to make operational progress by enhancing our own demining capabilities and exploring opportunities for further cooperation. The support of the international community will be all the more valuable in making progress towards that objective.

Mr. Balouji (Islamic Republic of Iran): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.26, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction", we feel that the Convention focuses mainly on humanitarian concerns and does not take adequate account of the legitimate military reasons of many countries, particularly those with long land borders, for needing the responsible and limited use of mines to defend their territories. Owing to difficulties related to monitoring extensive sensitive areas through established and permanent guard posts and effective warning systems, anti-personnel mines unfortunately continue to be an effective way for such countries to ensure their borders' minimum security requirements. While these defensive

devices should be used only under strict, established rules in order to protect civilians, there should be more national and international efforts to explore new alternatives to mines. My delegation appreciates the draft resolution's objectives, but owing to our particular concerns and considerations, we abstained in the voting on the draft resolution.

We abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.43 because our delegation did not participate in the negotiations and is neither a signatory nor a party to the Convention. We cannot support an instrument negotiated outside the United Nations, as such negotiations disregard the security concerns and interests of many States. It is essential to guarantee every State's right to security and to ensure that no individual State or group of States can obtain advantages over others at any stage. Lastly, circumventing the United Nations disarmament machinery should not be allowed, and neither should such a process be encouraged or promoted by the General Assembly.

Ms. Mac Loughlin (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): The delegation of Argentina abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.43, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions". The Republic of Argentina does not possess banned munitions and continues to advocate for the full prohibition, without exception, of such weapons, or for a meaningful reduction in their numbers, without discrimination.

As the Committee is aware, to date the Republic of Argentina has not joined the Convention on Cluster Munitions. Argentina actively participated in the entire negotiating process with the goal of adopting an international instrument that would fully prohibit such weapons and meet high humanitarian standards. However, in our view, the text adopted was not sufficiently ambitious and we believe its articles 2 and 21 in particular are at variance with the goal of full prohibition and the principle of non-discrimination. That situation has not changed. Nevertheless, given that Argentina seeks to promote full prohibition, in line with its national policy, my country participates as an observer in the meetings of States parties to the Convention and will take part in the upcoming Review Conference.

Mr. Fiallo Karolys (Ecuador) (*spoke in Spanish*): I am taking the floor to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.53.

Ecuador voted in favour of all draft resolutions that convened the process leading to the adoption of the Arms Trade Treaty and participated actively in its negotiations. We felt that the text that was ultimately submitted for consideration by the General Assembly in April 2013 and subsequently entered into force had some regrettable shortcomings, in particular the conspicuous imbalance between the rights and responsibilities of exporting and importing countries; the importance of the fundamental principles of international law and its standing in the Treaty; the lack of an explicit ban on transfers to unauthorized non-State actors; the lack of explicit references to the crime of aggression and the fact that certain articles related to the criteria could be used subjectively and based on double standards. That is why Ecuador abstained in the vote to adopt the Arms Trade Treaty and why today we abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.53. In spite of that, Ecuador will continue to consider whether the shortcomings in the Treaty's text are counteracted when it is implemented by its States parties. Because of that, while Ecuador does not support the paragraphs calling for the Treaty's ratification, today we were able to support the sixteenth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.32.

Mr. Polyanskiy (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The Russian Federation abstained in the voting on draft resolutions A/C.1/75/L.26, A/C.1/75/L.53 and A/C.1/75/L.43.

We do not consider it advisable to join the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction, because we believe that anti-personnel mines remain an effective and relatively inexpensive means of ensuring the security of Russia's borders. We still have serious doubts about the Convention's reliability, because it does not have the necessary leverage to influence countries that do not comply with it. The Russian Federation shares the goals and objectives of the Convention, but we have succeeded in implementing our approach to combating the threat posed by mines within the framework of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons and its Protocol II. We are working actively to achieve a mine-free world. We should also note that in recent years Russia has destroyed more than 10 million mines, including anti-personnel mines, and we have accumulated solid scientific and technical expertise in demining.

Russia's position on the Convention on Cluster Munitions, which was formulated in haste and outside the framework of the United Nations, remains unchanged. We did not participate in its drafting, because from the start it was designed to introduce discriminatory restrictions that run counter to our country's defensive security interests. While the Convention merely declares a complete ban on cluster munitions, in reality it is aimed at reorganizing the market for such weapons based on banning so-called bad cluster munitions but permitting a specific high-tech type, to the benefit of a specific group of munitions-producing States, which we view as a manifestation of a double standard. We believe that cluster munitions are a legal type of weapon. The humanitarian problems associated with them arise not from the weapons themselves, but from inappropriate use. The optimal forum for discussing all issues related to cluster munitions is the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons.

Russia took an active part in the negotiations on the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT). Based on the outcomes of the sixth Conference of States Parties to the Arms Trade Treaty held in Geneva in August, it became even clearer to us that the Treaty remains far from ideal in terms of its universality and its criteria for assessing Member States' activity in the regulation of the arms trade in general and in establishing transparent national control systems for arms trafficking in particular. It is clear that Washington's official announcement in 2019 that the United States does not intend to accede to the ATT and does not consider itself bound by any legal obligations in connection with its signing will not improve the Treaty's viability.

We should point out that the Treaty's standards are significantly lower than Russia's own. There are therefore serious risks under the ATT framework that weapons could fall into the hands of criminals and terrorists, as well as threats of further destabilization in various hotspots. We also have serious doubts about the Treaty's implementation. It is unacceptable when some individual States parties continue to directly or indirectly supply products with military applications to areas with internal armed conflicts. We continue to consider it inadvisable to join the ATT in its current form.

Mr. Knight (United States of America): I am taking the floor to explain our position on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.44.

For the past 19 years the United States has continued to state 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 that the issue of ammunition is outside the Programme of Action's scope. In fact, the inclusion of ammunition did not achieve consensus in 2001, and the United States voted against the inclusion of ammunition in the outcome document of the third Review Conference in June 2018 (A/CONF.192/2018/RC/3, annex). We strongly and unequivocally opposed the inclusion of ammunition language in the final outcome document of the Review Conference. As such, we cannot accept the language in the seventh preambular paragraph of the draft resolution characterizing the outcome of the Review Conference as an unqualified success, when consensus on two paragraphs in the outcome document concerning a highly controversial issue was clearly not achieved. We proposed compromise language that would have enabled us to join the consensus on this important draft resolution, but that language was ultimately not accepted.

Mr. Leite Novaes (Brazil): I would like to explain Brazil's abstention on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.43, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions".

Brazil has supported efforts to address cluster munitions within the United Nations, particularly 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, whose objective 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.1/75/L.53, on the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT). However, we abstained in the voting on operative paragraph 10 owing to its reference to synergies between the ATT and the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects. Brazil is a party to the ATT and a consistent supporter of the Programme of Action. However, we believe that the use of the term "synergies" is inadequate in the light of the differences between the two instruments in relation to their legal nature and scope, among other factors.

Mr. Khan (Pakistan): I am taking the floor to explain my delegation's position on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.38, entitled "Countering the threat posed by improvised explosive devices", on which we joined the consensus. We share the concerns about the indiscriminate effects arising from the use of improvised explosive devices (IEDs) by illegal armed groups and terrorists. Numerous Pakistani civilians and security personnel have suffered gravely on that account. Several issues that the draft resolution seeks to address can be best tackled through existing frameworks. The Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW), in particular its Amended Protocol II, provides the most appropriate forum for considering the issue of IEDs. The CCW platform has the right expertise and technical focus to deal with it in the most effective manner. It also provides pathways for international assistance and cooperation, which are critical for addressing the challenges associated with IEDs. While it is important to take measures to prevent the access of illegal armed groups and terrorists to explosives and other materials and components that can be used to manufacture IEDs, it is crucial to ensure that access to those materials for trade, development, research or other peaceful and legitimate purposes is not restricted.

My delegation also joined the consensus on draft decision A/C.1/75/L.67, entitled "Problems arising

from the accumulation of conventional ammunition stockpiles in surplus". We would like to highlight a few points with respect to the issue. First, the largest stockpiles of conventional armaments and ammunition are maintained by the major military Powers. They should therefore take the lead in assessing surplus stockpiles and their safe disposal. Secondly, such efforts could be supplemented by action at the regional and subregional levels to prevent excessive accumulation, as well as imbalances, in conventional armaments and military forces. Thirdly, while it may not be possible to have a universal definition of surplus stockpiles of armaments or their ammunition, some general guidelines could be developed on the basis of previous work done under the auspices of the United Nations. Pakistan has been working diligently towards the associated goal of promoting conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels. We believe that international efforts on disarmament and arms control are reinforced and complemented by regional approaches.

Ms. Kritikou (Cyprus): I am taking the floor to explain our abstention on draft resolution A/C.1/75/L.43, 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 due to considerations related to the abnormal security situation on the island. We remain hopeful that those issues will be resolved, which will then enable us to ratify the Convention and vote in favour of the draft resolution in future.

The Chair (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to delegations wishing to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

Mrs. Baghirova (Azerbaijan): We would like to exercise our right of reply in connection with the statement delivered by Armenia, which was the height of hypocrisy.

Since the start of our counteroffensive, the political and military leadership of Azerbaijan has repeatedly stated that our country is acting to exercise its right to self-defence and in full compliance with international law, including international humanitarian law. Azerbaijani armed forces neutralize only legitimate military objects in the occupied territories of Azerbaijan and do not target civilian populations or civilian infrastructure, adhering to the principle of distinction. Azerbaijan therefore fully rejects Armenia's groundless accusations, which fail to provide any credible evidence for any wrongdoing on the part of Azerbaijan, aside from utterly unprofessional fake videos and photos. The sole purpose of the statement by the representative of Armenia was to misuse this platform in order to present a distorted reality that no one else believes in and to divert attention from and cover up Armenia's own attacks and crimes targeting the civilian population of Azerbaijan.

While there is not enough time to list them all, I would like to specify a few examples. The city of Ganja has been targeted three times, two of them with Scud ballistic missiles. On 28 October, the city centre of Barda was attacked with a Smerch multiple rocket launch system carrying prohibited cluster munitions. The United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights emphasized, with regard to the rocket attack on the Azerbaijani city of Barda, that the rockets allegedly fired by Armenian forces from Nagorno Karabakh reportedly contained cluster munitions.

As of 2 November, Azerbaijan's national mine action agency had exposed 1,173 bomblets containing cluster munitions. Armenia's use of those prohibited weapons has also been recognized and confirmed by reputable international non-governmental organizations. Amnesty International has stated that it verified that banned cluster munitions were used by Armenia for the first time in the Nagorno Karabakh conflict. Human Rights Watch has stated that Armenian forces either fired or supplied internationally banned cluster munitions. Our national mine action agency determined that Armenia used prohibited white phosphorus projectiles in the Fuzuli and Tartar districts and in Shusha in order to create an environmental disaster, because very soon those territories will be fully liberated and the forcibly displaced Azerbaijani population will return to live there. The political and military leadership of Armenia and the agents of its racist puppet regime installed in the occupied territory

of Azerbaijan bear the responsibility for those heinous acts and must be brought to account. The Republic of Azerbaijan calls on the international community to strongly condemn the atrocities amounting to warfare carried out by Armenia, which constitute war crimes under international law.

Mr. Polyanskiy (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): We believe that today's insinuations by a number of Western delegations are part of a campaign to discredit Russia's initiatives on the prevention of an arms race in outer space. All of Russia's outer-space activities are carried out in full compliance with our obligations under the 1967 Outer Space Treaty. I would like to draw the Committee's attention to the fact that unlike the space doctrines of the United States and France, our doctrine provides for the development of a legally binding agreement aimed at maintaining outer space as a weapon-free zone, while the official military doctrines of the United States provide for the deployment of combat systems in outer space within the current decade.

Our satellite has not interfered with other States, and we have repeatedly provided clarification on the matter. At the same time, we have yet to receive an explanation as to why there are more than 1,000 American satellites in space, most of them launched by the United States Department of Defense, and all of them registered as communications or meteorological satellites. The accusations by the United States and its allies that Russia is developing anti-satellite weapons look like yet another attempt to shift the blame from the guilty to the innocent. The United States is constantly improving and building up its anti-satellite capacity, which, by the way, it subjected to a practical test in 2008. It is also evident that if there really are grounds for serious concern, they will not be resolved through this kind of public discourse but should be discussed via existing expert and political channels. In the case of Russia and the United States, those channels do not even need to be created from scratch. They already exist and simply need to be put to use. We keep the door open and are always ready to engage in dialogue. Unfortunately, the same cannot be said for our American colleagues.

The Chair (*spoke in Spanish*): We have exhausted the time available to us this morning.

I would like to remind delegations that the deadline for submitting explanations of vote in written form for inclusion in the compendium is 10 November.

The next plenary meeting of the Committee will be held on Monday, 9 November, at 10 a.m. sharp, in these

combined conference rooms 1, 2 and 3, when we will take up the remaining thematic clusters. I would like to thank the interpreters for their flexibility and everyone for their cooperation.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.