



General Assembly

Seventy-first session

First Committee

24th meeting

Monday, 31 October 2016, 10 a.m.
New York

Official Records

Chair: Mr. Boukadoum (Algeria)

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

Agenda items 89 to 105 (continued)

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

The Chair: This morning, the Committee will begin by hearing the remaining delegations that requested the floor to make explanations of vote or position after the voting on documents under cluster 3, entitled “Outer space (disarmament aspects)”, and that did not have an opportunity to speak by the time we adjourned on Friday.

Mr. Hansen (Australia): I am delivering this explanation of vote on behalf of Canada and my own country, Australia. Australia and Canada abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.18, entitled “No first placement of weapons in outer space”. The draft resolution calls on States to uphold a political obligation not to be the first to place weapons in outer space. We have three concerns about it.

First, the draft resolution does not adequately deal with the question of what constitutes a weapon in outer space. The space environment is one where dual-use technologies abound. Any satellite capable of manoeuvre can be considered a space-based weapon. As such, it is particularly difficult to draw the line between a space object and a space weapon.

Secondly, we do not believe that a no-first-placement pledge would be effectively verifiable. A political obligation is of limited value without a means

to verify compliance. Without a means of confirming that it has been implemented, we do not believe that a no-first-placement pledge is consistent with the evaluation criteria for space-related transparency and confidence-building measures established by consensus in the 2013 report of the Group of Governmental Experts on Transparency and Confidence-Building Measures in Outer Space Activities (see A/68/189).

Thirdly, the draft resolution is solely focused on space-based weapons and does not address the threat of weapons that are terrestrial-based. The most serious threats to space-based systems currently in place or being developed are not those that might be placed in space, but those that are terrestrial-based, such as anti-satellite missiles and high-energy lasers. The draft resolution is silent on those threats.

Given those concerns, we are unable to support the draft resolution and have abstained.

Ms. Masmajan (Switzerland) (*spoke in French*): I am taking the floor to explain my delegation’s abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.18, entitled “No first placement of weapons in outer space”.

Switzerland supports the drafting of one or several legally binding instruments aimed at preventing an arms race in space. While we await negotiations on such an instrument, political and confidence-building measures have an important role to play.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.18, we welcome the fact that it incorporates recognition of the concern that space is becoming a space for military confrontation. Nevertheless, we remain concerned

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>).

16-35122 (E)



Accessible document

Please recycle



about some provisions, or rather the lack thereof, in the text. The development of terrestrial-based weapons for attacking satellites or disrupting space applications, including tests of such systems, are also a source of serious concern that is, in our opinion, even more immediate than that regarding the placement of weapons in outer space. Moreover, the draft resolution makes no reference to the possible placement of such weapons in outer space.

Switzerland will continue to carefully follow the draft resolution as it develops. We are prepared to delve deeper into these conceptual concerns with the sponsors and into finding the best way of improving the draft resolution so that it can enjoy more significant support.

Ms. Higgie (New Zealand): I am taking the floor to explain New Zealand's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.18, entitled "No first placement of weapons in outer space".

My delegation again abstained in the voting on the draft resolution. I would like to make it clear, however, that my delegation supports a number of the paragraphs in the text, as with the resolution put forward at the past two sessions of the Committee. That is particularly the case with regard to the preambular paragraphs, notably the first and fifth, which draw on the language of the Outer Space Treaty of 1967 and the 1962 Declaration of Legal Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space that preceded it, but it is also true with regard to operative paragraph 1.

New Zealand continues to be a strong supporter of measures, including transparency and confidence-building measures, aimed at preventing an arms race in outer space and ensuring its secure and sustainable preservation for peaceful uses. It seems to us that voluntary measures, as well as legally binding ones, can play a part in that, and we are therefore not opposed to an open and inclusive discussion to explore the benefits for the international community in advancing a broader formulation of the existing international legal regime governing outer space activities.

However, we are not able to support the approach outlined in paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.18, which encourages — albeit very weakly, in the phrase "the possibility of upholding as appropriate" — unilateral commitments not to be the first to place weapons in outer space. Such an approach would seem to sanction a subsequent — for instance, a second — placement of weapons. New Zealand has

taken note of the Russian Federation's assertion that the approach in paragraph 5 represents an interim measure, pending the development of a more comprehensive legal regime, and of Russia's suggestion that if there is no first placement there can be no second or third.

In my delegation's view, that argument overlooks two pivotal points. First, what the Russian Federation is proposing in paragraph 5 is very clearly signalled as a political commitment. With no legally binding effect — something that is reinforced by its lack of precision regarding scope and definitions — it seems unlikely to provide any real reassurance on the non-first placement of weapons in space, let alone any subsequent placement. Our concern on that score is compounded by our awareness that it can indeed take a long time to develop a universal regime. That is something that Russia has itself acknowledged in the context of discussions here on the proposal in draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.41 for a legal instrument to prohibit nuclear weapons, whether of a legally or politically binding character.

Accordingly, in the context of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.18, we could well be facing a very long period, if not forever, when there would be nothing like universal agreement with Russia's approach for no first placement of weapons in space. And yet in the meantime we would seem to have sanctioned the legality of a second or any other subsequent placement of such weapons.

Ms. Gambhir (India): India voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.18 on the issue of no first placement of weapons in outer space. As a major space-faring nation, India has vital development and security interests there.

The draft resolution states that the legal regime applicable to outer space should be consolidated and reinforced. India supports that objective, as well as that of strengthening the international legal regime, with the aim of protecting and preserving access to space for all and preventing the weaponization of outer space, with no exceptions. We support substantive consideration in the Conference on Disarmament of the prevention of an arms race in outer space. While transparency and confidence-building measures are not a substitute for legally binding instruments, they can play a useful role that complements them. We see the no first placement of weapons in outer space only as an interim step, not as a substitute for concluding substantive legal measures

designed to ensure the prevention of an arms race in outer space, which should continue to be a priority for the international community.

Mr. Sano (Japan): I would like to explain Japan's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.18, on the issue of no first placement of weapons in outer space.

Japan supports and has worked tirelessly to preserve the long-term safety, stability, security and sustainability of outer space. In that regard, we believe it is important to develop initiatives aimed at ensuring confidence and mutual trust among actors in the realm of space, particularly by enacting transparency and confidence-building measures. We therefore voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.3, entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space", and sponsored draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.19, entitled "Transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities". However, we are seriously concerned about the actual, rather than the abstract development and deployment of anti-satellite weapon capabilities, including those that are terrestrial-based. The international community should therefore make addressing that issue a priority. To that end, Japan supports developing the idea of an international code of conduct for outer space activities.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.18, which is associated with a 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, we believe that there are a number of issues that should be carefully examined, such as the definition of weapons in outer space and verifiability. Those are the reasons for Japan's abstention in the voting on the draft resolution.

Mr. Sandoval Mendiola (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): Mexico voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.18 because we recognize the importance and urgency of preventing an arms race in outer space, in keeping with our commitment to preserving outer space exclusively for peaceful purposes and to seeking general and complete disarmament under strict international controls. Mexico will continue to fight to ensure that no actor can place weapons in outer space in any circumstances or for any reason.

At the same time, we reiterate that all nuclear weapons must be prohibited and eliminated, regardless of their type or location. My country supports efforts to reach new international agreements on the subject, along with working to undertake new treaties designed

to complement those that already exist and aimed at encouraging confidence and a more secure world.

Lastly, Mexico would like to state that a declaration by one or several countries of a commitment to not being the first to place weapons in outer space should in no way be understood as a tacit endorsement or acceptance of a right to place such weapons or launch them from Earth because another State is doing so, including in response to an attack. That would create an arms race in space or could be used as an excuse for justifying the potential placement of weapons in outer space, which Mexico totally opposes.

Mr. Robotjazi (Islamic Republic of Iran): The Islamic Republic of Iran voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.18, entitled "No first placement of weapons in outer space", because we consider that its provisions are generally in line with the goal of preventing an arms race in outer space. In its second preambular paragraph, the draft resolution underlines the importance of the prohibition by the existing legal regime of the placement of nuclear weapons, or other types of weapon of mass destruction, in outer space. The paramount importance of strict compliance with that prohibition is reaffirmed in the fifth preambular paragraph.

Although the placement of weapons other than weapons of mass destruction is not expressly prohibited under international law, we believe it would nonetheless contravene the established global principle that outer space should be used exclusively for peaceful purposes. We think that paragraph 5 of the draft resolution is important because it calls on all States to uphold that principle and commit to refraining from placing weapons in outer space, pending the conclusion of an international agreement on preventing an arms race in outer space in all its aspects.

The Chair: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote after the vote on cluster 3, "Outer space (disarmament aspects)".

We turn now to informal paper 3, beginning with cluster 4, "Conventional weapons". I shall first give the floor to delegations wishing to make general statements or introduce draft resolutions. Delegations are reminded that general statements are limited to five minutes.

I call on the representative of Mali to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.32.

Mr. Koita (Mali) (*spoke in French*): I have the honour to speak 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, in order to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.32, entitled “Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons and collecting them”. The list of sponsors of the draft resolution is available on the Committee’s online portal.

Regrettably, the illicit trade and circulation of small arms and light weapons continues to create conflicts, exacerbate violence and fuel terrorism and organized crime in many parts of the world, including the West African subregion. Such weapons are responsible for nearly 90 per cent of the victims of armed conflict and recent terrorist attacks and are among the most dangerous and deadly in existence. In the face of those painful facts, it is the duty of the international community to strengthen its cooperation and solidarity in order to combat the proliferation of small arms and light weapons. That is the context for this draft resolution, which is aimed at building good governance, development and stability in West Africa by strengthening current regional initiatives and efforts to combat the proliferation of small arms and light weapons.

As the Committee is aware, beyond the necessary technical updates, the draft resolution reproduces exactly the terms of last year’s resolution, which was adopted by consensus. In substance, it emphasizes the pernicious effects that the proliferation and illicit use of small arms and light weapons continue to have on the efforts of the States of our subregion to eliminate poverty and promote sustainable development in a peaceful, secure and stable environment. The draft resolution both encourages the international community to provide technical and financial support for strengthening the capacity of States and civil society organizations to combat illicit trafficking of small arms and light weapons and supports the 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. In that regard, I welcome the substantive support that the European Union and the United Nations have given ECOWAS in its fight against the illicit

proliferation of small arms and light weapons. Beyond the West African region, this draft resolution reflects the resolve of many countries in Africa and around the world to put an end to the illegal trade and trafficking in small arms and light weapons.

In conclusion, I would like to thank the States that join the member States of ECOWAS every year in sponsoring the resolution, and at the same time to remind everyone that the list remains open for new sponsors.

Mr. Benítez Verson (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): I am taking the floor to make a general statement on this cluster.

As in previous years, the Cuban delegation will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.29, entitled “The Arms Trade Treaty”.

As we know, the Treaty was adopted by a premature vote when the negotiations on it had not yet been concluded, and it did not enjoy consensus. Regrettably, the Arms Trade Treaty contains significant ambiguities, inconsistencies and legal uncertainties and gaps that undermine its effectiveness and efficiency. An arms trade treaty cannot be effective when it does not prohibit and therefore legitimizes arms transfers to non-State actors who, obviously, are unauthorized and represent the main source of the global illicit trade in arms. The Treaty is an unbalanced instrument that favours arms-exporting States.

The parameters that the Treaty establishes for exporting States to evaluate approvals and denials of transfers are by their very nature subjective and can therefore be easily manipulated or abused for political reasons. That infringes on the right of States to acquire and possess arms for their legitimate self-defence, as recognized in Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations.

Our delegation wishes to stress that going forward it dissociates itself from the paragraphs relating to the Arms Trade Treaty that are included in the various draft resolutions on which the First Committee will take action.

With regard to the Convention on Cluster Munitions, on 1 October Cuba officially became a State party to the Convention, whose provisions we will strictly implement. Cuba condemns the use of cluster munitions because such weapons are incompatible with the principles and norms of international humanitarian law.

The Chair: The Committee will now hear delegations wishing to explain their position before we take action on the draft resolutions listed under cluster 4, “Conventional weapons”. I insist that statements be limited to 10 minutes.

Mr. Ben Sliman (Tunisia) (*spoke in Arabic*): I would like to deliver the following statement on behalf of the States members of the Group of Arab States on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.21, entitled “Transparency in armaments”.

Once again, the Arab delegations would like to stress their position with regard to transparency in armaments in the light of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms. We have expressed our position and are committed to the Register. Our general position falls within a framework applicable to the situation in the Middle East.

The Group of Arab States supports transparency in armaments as a tool for fostering international peace and security. We believe that if we are able to identify a successful transparency mechanism, it should follow guidelines that are balanced and transparent without differentiation or bias. Moreover, it should enhance the security of all States at the regional, international and national levels, and in accordance with international law.

When the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms was first established, it was the international community’s very first attempt to address transparency on an international scale. While we cannot question its credibility, since it is a tool and a mechanism for building trust, it has a number of negative aspects, of which the main one is that half of the States Members of the United Nations do not provide it with the necessary information.

The Arab Group calls for the Register to be broadened in scope. Recent experience has highlighted the fact that it is limited to traditional conventional weapons and does not take into consideration modern armaments and other high-technology systems. The Arab Group therefore believes that the Register is inadequate to the needs it must meet. In such circumstances, we leave it up to the members of the United Nations to build trust in the Register itself in order to ensure further transparency. In that regard, as provided for in the draft resolution, we believe that the Register should be broader in scope and include advanced traditional weapons and high technology with military applications, which will ensure that it is more comprehensive and balanced and

less biased. That ambitious expansion would make for greater transparency for all States Members of the United Nations.

The Middle East faces a weapons imbalance. That is why we cannot bring transparency and confidence-building to the region unless we adopt a balanced and comprehensive approach. Limiting the Register to seven categories of conventional weapons, while disregarding more modern, upgraded weapons, will be perceived as unbalanced and unfair, lacking in transparency and unfit for its purpose. First and foremost, we have to take into consideration the situation in the Middle East, in particular in the light of Israel’s occupation of Arab territories and possession of highly lethal weapons. Israel is the only country in the region that is not party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). It also turns a blind eye to the repeated calls of the international community urging it to accede to the NPT and provide all the guarantees required by the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Israel continues to build a very modern arsenal of weapons of mass destruction and delivery systems, including nuclear weapons, thereby maintaining a qualitative military build-up by comparison to its neighbours and undermining the international community’s control and transparency mechanisms. We emphasize the need for effective and comprehensive transparency measures that apply to all weapons, including nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction.

We stress the objection of the Group of Arab States to the fact that not one Arab country was selected for inclusion in the Group of Governmental Experts working on the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms. In that regard, we ask that, in future, one Arab country be given the opportunity to participate in the Group of Experts. The Arab Group reaffirms its position on the importance of expanding the Register in a balanced manner that takes the interests of all countries into consideration.

For all of those reasons, the States members of the Group of Arab States will abstain in the voting on this draft resolution.

Mr. Isnomo (Indonesia): I wish to explain Indonesia’s position on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.29, entitled “The Arms Trade Treaty”, on which Indonesia will abstain. However, it should be noted that despite that decision, Indonesia nonetheless fully subscribes

to the spirit of the Arms Trade Treaty. Our abstention in the voting on the draft resolution should not be misconstrued as dissociation from the Treaty's goals and objectives.

For the record, Indonesia is currently undertaking a careful and thorough study of the Arms Trade Treaty that is intended to enable us to avoid any possible legal discrepancies with our national laws and regulations, should Indonesia decide to join the Treaty in the future.

Mr. Benítez Verson (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Cuban delegation will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.21, entitled "Transparency in armaments".

We regret the negative direction taken by this text, which has previously enjoyed Cuba's support and vote. Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.21 is unbalanced, owing to its unjustified emphasis on small arms and light weapons, which are explicitly referred to in a number of paragraphs despite the fact that they are not included on the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms. The draft resolution does not recognize any other category of weapons is acknowledged in this way. We do not support biased analyses that minimize the serious problems associated with the transfer of modern, highly sophisticated conventional weapons with considerably devastating effects.

The draft resolution endorses the 2016 report of the Group of Governmental Experts on the continuing operation and further development of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms (see A/71/259), which we object to for the following reasons.

First, we are not in favour of expanding the Register to cover small arms and light weapons, nor of the request for additional information on other issues, such as the acquisition of domestically produced material and assistance. Any expansion of the Register must begin by including weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear weapons.

Secondly, the draft resolution encourages the submission to the Register of a rolling nil return, valid for up to three years. This would not only create a false impression in the statistics of an increase in the number of reports, but could also affect the quality and authenticity of the reports themselves.

Thirdly, it should not be in the power of the Register and the Group of Governmental Experts to define the functions, tasks and responsibilities of the national

focal points, as suggested in the report of the Group. The functions and responsibilities of the focal point are and should continue to be a national prerogative, as each country has its own particularities, priorities, needs and capabilities.

Fourthly, we are not in favour of convening a new Group of Governmental Experts in 2019, as the draft resolution proposes. A topic of such importance to all States such as the question of transparency in armaments, cannot continue to be discussed and decided in a Group in which only 26 countries participate. It is ironic that greater transparency in armament matters is sought through exclusive and barely transparent formats that hinder the participation of the majority of States in those discussions.

Mr. Ismail (Egypt): As a matter of principle, Egypt is well aware of the effects of the illicit trafficking in weapons and is fully committed to making every effort to combat and eradicate the illicit trade in arms. Nevertheless, Egypt will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.29, entitled "The Arms Trade Treaty". The Treaty cannot be considered either universal or inclusive and we therefore do not accept the provisions of paragraph 4, about which we voiced our reservations during the consultations.

Similarly, Egypt wants to place on record its reservations about the relevant paragraphs of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.21, entitled "Transparency in armaments", for which Egypt will join the Group of Arab States in abstaining in the voting. It is regrettable that the United Nations Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) was not able to reach an agreement on a balanced and robust text that is acceptable to all States. Egypt does not support the adoption of an important international disarmament instrument by a vote. It sets a dangerous precedent that undermines the principle of consensus on which most international agreements on disarmament have been developed. In that context, Egypt would like to point out the following concerns.

The first centres on the lack of definitions of important terms and concepts that are essential to the implementation of the Treaty, including "end use" and "end user". We stress that the provision of information regarding end uses or end users should be consistent with the laws and national security requirements of the receiving party.

Secondly, another important missing element is the criteria that an exporter would use to determine the

application of the Treaty. In that connection, we believe that the international community is meant to rely chiefly on the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms, which includes only seven categories of weapons, not including small arms and light weapons. We have similar reservations about the following paragraphs of other draft resolutions — the nineteenth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.25, entitled “The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects”, and the fifteenth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.32, entitled “Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons and collecting them”. However, Egypt values the traditional consensus on those two resolutions and has therefore decided not to break it.

Thirdly, the inclusion of a clear reference to the crimes of aggression and foreign occupation as part of the assessment would have clarified the implementation process of the ATT. Fourthly, we emphasize that the essence of the Treaty should be regulating the arms trade, not restricting or limiting it. Fifthly, we believe that all countries should be equally accountable to the same benchmarks. Without agreed definitions or clear criteria, the implementation of the Treaty risks being subjective and dependent on the national political considerations of exporting States.

The international community should continue to work to fill the remaining gaps that the Treaty has left untouched. We continue to call on States to address the issues of overproduction and the ever-increasing stockpiles of conventional weapons held by major arms exporters and producers. We still believe that every effort must be made to bring production and stockpiling in major arms-producing States under international scrutiny. International accountability is the only guarantee against the possible abuse of the existing imbalance between major arms producers and the rest of the world.

In conclusion, we will be closely following further developments regarding the implementation of the Treaty in order to determine our future position.

Mr. Eloumni (Morocco): I am speaking in explanation of vote before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.7/Rev.1, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction”.

Morocco, which actively contributed to the preparatory process for the Ottawa Convention, has decided to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.7/Rev.1, as it has done since 2004, in order to emphasize our support for the Convention’s eminently humanitarian objectives, in particular that of protecting civilians from the unacceptable damage caused by anti-personnel mines.

Similarly, Morocco’s March 2002 ratification of the Protocol on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby-Traps and Other Devices, as amended on 3 May 1996 and annexed to the 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, and regular submission, since 2003, of a national report on the implementation of the Protocol’s provisions, reflect Morocco’s support for the universal drive to eliminate anti-personnel mines.

To that end, Morocco applies the provisions of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction in the areas of demining, destruction of stockpiles, outreach, training and assistance to the victims of antipersonnel mines. We would like to highlight three elements in that — first, the remarkable demining work of our armed forces, resulting in the recovery and destruction of thousands of anti-personnel mines, anti-tank mines and unexploded devices; secondly, the Moroccan authorities’ efforts to care for victims and address their medical, social and economic rehabilitation needs; and thirdly, our support to regional countries in demining and our continuing dialogue with non-governmental organizations in working to meet the Convention’s goals.

The Kingdom of Morocco has voluntarily submitted reports pursuant to article 7 of the Convention since 2006. In the same spirit, Morocco also regularly attends the meetings of States parties and the review conferences of the Convention. Morocco’s accession to the Convention is a strategic goal linked to security imperatives and respect for its territorial integrity.

Mr. Wood (United States of America): My delegation will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.7/Rev.1, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction”. I would ask members to note

the following aspects of United States anti-personnel landmine policy related to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction.

On 27 June 2014, at the third Review Conference of the States Parties to the Convention in Maputo, the United States announced that it would not produce or otherwise acquire any anti-personnel munitions that are not compliant with the Convention, including replacing such munitions as they expire in the coming years. On 23 September 2014, the United States further announced that it was aligning its anti-personnel landmine policy outside the Korean peninsula with the key requirements of the Convention. That means that the United States will not use anti-personnel landmines outside the Korean peninsula, will not assist, encourage or induce anyone outside the Korean peninsula to engage in activity prohibited by the Convention and will undertake to destroy anti-personnel landmine stockpiles not required for the defence of the Republic of Korea.

Those measures represent important steps in further advancing the humanitarian aims of the Convention to bring United States practice in closer alignment with the international humanitarian movement embodied in the Convention. The unique circumstances on the Korean peninsula continue to preclude us from changing our landmine policy there at this time. As such, we are not presently in a position to fully comply with nor seek accession to the Convention and must continue to abstain in the voting on this draft resolution. However, we will continue our diligent efforts to pursue material and operational solutions that would be compliant with and ultimately allow us to accede to the Convention while ensuring our ability to respond to contingencies on the Korean peninsula and meet our alliance commitments to the Republic of Korea.

More broadly, the United States is the world's largest single financial supporter of humanitarian mine action, providing more than \$2.6 billion in aid to more than 95 countries for conventional weapons destruction programmes since 1993. The United States will continue to support that important work and remains committed to a continuing partnership with Ottawa States parties and non-governmental organizations in addressing the humanitarian impact of anti-personnel landmines.

My delegation will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.22, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions". The United States is not a party to the Convention and, as such, is not bound by its provisions. We consider the draft resolution — in particular those paragraphs calling for the Convention's full and effective implementation — to be applicable only to States parties to the Convention. We note the references to "the principles of humanity and the dictates of the public conscience" that flow from the Martens clause. While the United States believes that the principles of humanity and the dictates of the public conscience can provide relevant and important paradigms for discussing the moral or ethical issues related to warfare, the Martens clause is not a rule of international law that prohibits any particular weapon, including cluster munitions. In general, the lawfulness of the use of a type of weapon under international law does not depend on an absence of authorization but on whether the weapon is prohibited. The United States does not accept that the Convention on Cluster Munitions represents an emerging norm or prohibition in customary international law on the issue of cluster munitions in armed conflict.

The United States continues to be firmly of the view that, when used in accordance with international humanitarian law, cluster munitions with a low unexploded-ordnance rate provide key advantages against certain types of legitimate military targets and can produce less collateral damage than high-explosive unitary weapons. Although cluster munitions remain an integral part of United States force capabilities, the United States is committed to reducing the potential for unintended harm to civilians and civilian objects caused by either the misuse of cluster munitions or the use of cluster munitions that generate a large amount of unexploded ordnance. Under the United States Department of Defense's 2008 cluster munitions policy, by the end of 2018 the Department will no longer employ cluster munitions with an unexploded-ordnance rate greater than 1 per cent. In addition, by United States law the United States has not transferred cluster munitions to other countries except those that meet the 1 per cent unexploded-ordnance rate.

Mr. Samvelian (Armenia): I wish to provide Armenia's explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.29, entitled "The Arms Trade Treaty", and the other draft resolutions that reference the Treaty.

Armenia has consistently supported efforts towards a negotiated, comprehensive international instrument designed to regulate the trade in conventional arms and to prevent and end their diversion into illicit markets and use for illegitimate purposes. We strongly believe that if the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) is to become an effective, inclusive and viable international instrument, it must be adopted by consensus and have all major players on board.

Armenia has always had significant concerns about the preambular and principal sections of the Treaty. Throughout the negotiations, the Armenian side advocated for the need to have balanced and non-restrictive references to the principles of international law, and in particular those relating to the equal rights and self-determination of peoples, in accordance with paragraph 2 of Article 1 of the Charter of the United Nations.

The key objective of the Treaty—the encouragement and enforcement of the regulation of the conventional arms trade through a strong national control system—should have been appealed more strongly. We have serious concerns about the fact that the Treaty, in its current shape, contains loopholes for political interpretations that would hinder countries’ exercise of their sovereign right to self-defence and prevent them from having legitimate access to relevant technologies.

Having said that, while continuing to be a staunch advocate for a robust and legally binding conventional arms-control regime, whether at a regional or international level, Armenia upholds its initial reservations about the Treaty and will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.29. Similarly, Armenia’s position concerning the ATT is applicable to all other draft resolutions of the Committee that contain a reference to the Treaty. Not willing to break consensus, Armenia therefore dissociates itself from such paragraphs in other draft resolutions that contain references to the ATT.

Mr. Robotjazi (Islamic Republic of Iran): The Islamic Republic of Iran supports the objective of the prevention of the illicit trade in arms. However, my delegation will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.29, entitled “The Arms Trade Treaty” for the following reasons.

First, the draft resolution continues to welcome the 2013 adoption of the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT), an instrument in which the political and commercial

interests of certain arms-exporting countries take higher priority than the observance of the fundamentals of international law. While the international prohibition of the use of force by one State against the territorial integrity or political independence of another is the most fundamental principle of modern international law, the ATT has failed to uphold that principle in not refraining from prohibiting arms transfers to countries that are engaged in committing acts of aggression, including foreign occupation. That is a significant loophole and major legal deficiency of the instrument, and we therefore cannot welcome its adoption.

Secondly, paragraph 4 of the draft resolution calls on non-parties to accede to the Treaty, based on the fact that the Treaty was not adopted by consensus due to its substantial flaws and ignoring the concerns and interests of some Member States. As long as some of its States parties are committing major violations of the ATT’s provisions, calling for its universalization is unacceptable and lacks credibility. There is well-documented evidence of serious violations of international humanitarian law by Saudi Arabia in its 20-month-long aggression against Yemen. In such circumstances, certain States parties to the ATT, particularly its creation’s major champion, continue to export to Saudi Arabia arms and munitions that could be used to commit such violations. States parties to the ATT have an obligation not to authorize any transfer of arms when they have knowledge that those weapons might be used to commit grave breaches of the Geneva Conventions of 1949 or in attacks on civilians and civilian objects.

The Chair: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of the vote before the vote on cluster 4, “Conventional weapons”.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolutions under cluster 4, entitled “Conventional weapons”.

We shall first take action on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.4, 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.1/71/L.4 was introduced by the representative of Sri Lanka at the Committee’s 18th

meeting, on 24 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/71/L.4.

In addition, the following oral statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraphs 14 and 15 of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.4, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to render the necessary assistance and to provide such services as may be required for the fifth Review Conference of the High Contracting Parties to the Convention, to be held from 12 to 16 December 2016, and other annual conferences and expert meetings of the High Contracting Parties to the Convention and of the High Contracting Parties to Amended Protocol II and Protocol V, as well as for any continuation of the work after the meetings. The General Assembly would also request the Secretary-General, in his capacity as depositary of the Convention and the Protocols thereto, to continue to inform the General Assembly periodically, by electronic means, of ratifications and acceptances of and accessions to the Convention, its amended article 1 and the Protocols.

The Secretary-General wishes to draw the attention of Member States to the fact that the respective cost estimates for servicing the Conferences of the High Contracting Parties, which were held from 29 August to 2 September, as well as the fifth Review Conference to be held from 12 to 16 December, have been prepared by the Secretariat and approved by the seventeenth Annual Conference of the High Contracting Parties to amended Protocol II, which was held in Geneva on 11 November 2015; by the ninth Conference of the High Contracting Parties to Protocol V, which was held in Geneva on 9 and 10 October 2015; and by the Meeting of the High Contracting Parties to the Convention, which was held in Geneva on 12 and 13 November 2015.

The Secretary-General also wishes to draw the attention of Member States to the fact that the costs of the eighteenth Annual Conference of the High Contracting Parties to Amended Protocol II, the tenth Conference of the High Contracting Parties to Protocol V, the 2016 Preparatory Committee meeting and the fifth Review Conference of the High Contracting Parties to the Convention would be borne by the High Contracting Parties and States non-parties to the Convention participating in the meetings, in accordance with the United Nations scale of assessment and adjusted appropriately.

Consequently, the request that the Secretary-General render the necessary assistance and provide services to the eighteenth Annual Conference of the High Contracting Parties to Amended Protocol II, the tenth Conference of the High Contracting Parties to Protocol V, the 2016 Preparatory Committee meeting and the fifth Review Conference of the High Contracting Parties to the Convention would not entail any budgetary implications for the programme budget of the United Nations. Following the established practice, the Secretariat will prepare cost estimates for any continuation of the work after the conferences for the approval of the High Contracting Parties.

It is recalled that all activities related to international conventions or treaties that, under their respective legal arrangements, ought to be financed by States may be undertaken by the Secretariat only when sufficient funding is received in advance. Accordingly, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.4 would not give rise to any financial implications under the programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017.

The Chair: The sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.4 has expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.4 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.7/Rev.1, 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.1/71/L.7/Rev.1 was introduced by the representative of Chile at the Committee's 16th meeting, on 20 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/71/L.7/Rev.1.

In addition, the following 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.1/71/L.7/Rev.1, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General, in accordance with article 11, paragraph 1, of the Convention, to undertake the preparations necessary to convene the Sixteenth Meeting of the States Parties to the Convention

and, on behalf of the States parties and in accordance with article 11, paragraph 4, of the Convention, to invite States not parties to the Convention, as well as the United Nations, other relevant international organizations or institutions, regional organizations, the International Committee of the Red Cross and relevant non-governmental organizations, to attend the Sixteenth Meeting of the States Parties as observers.

In accordance with article 14 of the Convention, the cost of the Sixteenth Meeting of the States Parties would be borne by the States parties and States not parties to the Convention participating therein, in accordance with the United Nations scale of assessment, adjusted appropriately. Preliminary cost estimates for servicing the 2017 Sixteenth Meeting of the States Parties will be prepared by the Secretariat and submitted for the approval of the States parties at their Fifteenth Meeting, to be held in Santiago during the week of 28 November to 2 December.

It is recalled that all activities related to international conventions or treaties that, under their respective legal arrangements, ought to be financed outside a programme budget of the United Nations, may be undertaken by the Secretariat only when sufficient funding is received in advance from States parties and States not parties participating at the meetings. Accordingly, the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.7/Rev.1 would not give rise to any financial implications under the programme budget for the biennium 2016-2017.

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, 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, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau,

Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.7/Rev.1 was adopted by 161 votes to none, with 16 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.8, 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.1/71/L.8, entitled "Information on confidence-building measures in the field of conventional arms", was introduced by the representative of Argentina at the 17th meeting of the Committee, on 21 October. The sponsors of the

draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/71/L.8. Additional sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.8 are Turkey and Cambodia.

The Chair: The sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.8 has expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.8 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.9, entitled “Preventing and combating illicit brokering activities”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.9, entitled “Preventing and combating illicit brokering activities”, was introduced by the representative of Australia on 12 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/71/L.9. The additional sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.9 is the Niger.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested. A separate vote has been requested on the eighth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.9.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

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

Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Democratic People’s Republic of Korea

Abstaining:

Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Nicaragua, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe

The eighth preambular paragraph was retained by 159 votes to 1, with 13 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.9 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, 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, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt,

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

Against:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea

Abstaining:

Iran (Islamic Republic of)

Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.9, as a whole, was adopted by 179 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.21, entitled "Transparency in armaments".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.21, entitled "Transparency in armaments", was introduced by the representative of

the Netherlands on 21 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/71/L.21.

I have the honour to read out the present oral statement, in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraph 6 (b) of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.21, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General, with the assistance of a group of governmental experts to be convened in 2019, within existing resources, with the broadest possible participation, in line with the recommendation contained in paragraph 93 of the 2016 report of the Secretary-General, and on the basis of equitable geographical representation, to prepare a report on the continuing operational relevance of the Register and its further development, taking into account the work of the Conference on Disarmament, relevant deliberations within the United Nations, the views expressed by Member States and the reports of the Secretary-General on the continuing operation of the Register and its further development, with a view to taking a decisions at its seventy-fourth session.

Pursuant to the request contained in paragraph 6 (b), it is envisaged that a group of governmental experts to review the operation and further development of the Register of Conventional Arms will hold three sessions of five days each in 2019. Two sessions will be composed of 20 meetings over 10 days in Geneva and one session will be composed of 10 meetings over 5 days in New York.

The aforementioned one-time 30 meetings over 15 days would require interpretation in all six languages and would constitute an addition to the meetings workload for the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management in 2019. This would entail additional resource requirements in the amount of \$194,000 for meeting services in 2019. In addition, some sound-technician recording services would be required in support of the meetings, which would entail additional resource requirements in the amount of \$6,800 in 2019.

Furthermore, the request for documentation contained in paragraph 6 (b) would constitute an addition to the documentation workload for the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management of five pre-session documents with a total of 14,000 words, six in-session documents with a total of 12,000 words, and seven post-session documents with a total of 21,000

words, to be issued in all six languages in 2019. This would entail additional resource requirements in the amount of \$217,900 for documentation services in 2019.

Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.21, the additional resource requirements that would arise in the amount of \$418,700 for 2019 — including \$411,900 under section 2, “General Assembly and Economic and Social Council Affairs and Conference Management”, and \$6,800 under Section 29 (f), “Administration Geneva” — will be included in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2018-19.

With regard to paragraph 6 (b), wherein it is stated “within existing resources”, the attention of the Committee is drawn to provisions of section VI of resolution 45/248 B of 21 December 1990 and subsequent resolutions, the most recent of which is resolution 70/247 of 23 September 2015, wherein the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee is the appropriate Main Committee of the General Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters, and reaffirmed the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

That brings me to the end of the oral statement.

I take this opportunity to draw the attention of delegations to the additional sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.21, listed in the e-Delegate portal of the First Committee.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested. Separate, recorded votes have been requested on the fourth, seventh and eighth preambular paragraphs and on paragraphs 3, 4, 6, 6 (c) and 7.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti,

Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Algeria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Libya, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates

The fourth preambular paragraph was retained by 145 votes to none, with 22 abstentions.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan,

Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, 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, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Zambia

Against:

None

Abstaining:

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

The seventh preambular paragraph was retained by 132 votes to none, with 34 abstentions.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, 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, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Zambia

Against:

None

Abstaining:

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

The eighth preambular paragraph was retained by 133 votes to none, with 34 abstentions.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kiribati, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, 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, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Egypt, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Libya, Malawi,

Myanmar, Nicaragua, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Paragraph 3 was retained by 139 votes to none, with 27 abstentions.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kiribati, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Egypt, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Libya, Malawi, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Oman, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Operative paragraph 4 was retained by 141 votes to none, with 26 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote paragraph 6 (c).

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Turkmenistan,

Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

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

Operative paragraph 6 (c) was retained by 147 votes to none, with 21 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote paragraph 7.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kiribati, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, 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,

Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Libya, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Tuvalu, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Operative paragraph 7 was retained by 141 votes to none, with 24 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.21 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, 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, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique,

Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Algeria, Bahrain, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Djibouti, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Yemen, Zimbabwe

Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.21, as a whole, was adopted by 151 votes to none, with 28 abstentions.

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

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.22, 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.1/71/L.22 was introduced by the representative of the Netherlands on 11 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/71/L.22.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, 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, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Tuvalu, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zambia

Against:

Russian Federation, Zimbabwe

Abstaining:

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.22 was adopted by 134 votes to 2, with 40 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.25, 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.1/71/L.25 was introduced by the representatives of Colombia, South Africa and Japan at the 18th meeting of the Committee, on 24 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/71/L.25.

I have the honour to read out the present oral statement in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.25 the General Assembly would recall its decision, in accordance with the decision of the Second Review Conference, to hold the Third United Nations Conference to Review Progress Made in the Implementation of the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects in 2018 for a period of two weeks, preceded by a one-week preparatory committee meeting early in 2018.

Pursuant to the request contained in paragraph 7, it is envisaged that the Third United Nations Conference to Review Progress Made in the Implementation of the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects would be held in New York in 2018 over a period of two weeks, composed of 20 meetings in 10 days, and would be preceded by a one-week preparatory committee meeting in early 2018, composed of 10 meetings in 5 days.

The aforementioned 30 meetings over 15 days would require interpretation in all six languages and would constitute an addition to the meeting's workload for the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management in 2018. That would entail additional resource requirements in the amount of \$180,000 for meeting services in 2018. Furthermore, the request for documentation contained in paragraph 7 would constitute an addition to the documentation workload for the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management of 40 pre-session documents, for a total of 130,000 words; 20 in-session documents,

for a total of 40,000 words; and 6 post-session documents, for a total of 35,000 words, to be issued in all six languages in 2018. That would entail additional resource requirements in the amount of \$890,000 for documentation services in 2018.

Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.25, the additional resource requirements of \$1,070,000, which would arise for 2018, under section 2, "General Assembly and Economic and Social Council Affairs and Conference Management", would be included in the programme budget for the biennium 2018-2019.

That brings me to the end of the oral statement.

I would like to draw the attention of delegations to the additional sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.25, listed in the e-Delegate portal of the First Committee. The additional sponsor is the Niger.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.25 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.25 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.29, 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.1/71/L.29 was introduced by the representative of Finland at the 17th meeting of the Committee, on 21 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/71/L.29. The additional sponsors are listed in the e-Delegate portal of the First Committee. The additional sponsors are the Niger and the Central African Republic.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, 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, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, 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, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Zambia

Against:

None

Abstaining:

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.29 was adopted by 152 votes to none, with 28 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/71/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.1/71/L.32 was introduced by the representative of Mali at the 17th meeting of the Committee, on 21 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/71/L.32. Additional sponsors are listed in the e-Delegate portal of the First Committee.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.32 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.58, entitled “National legislation on transfer of arms, military equipment and dual-use goods and technology”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.58 was submitted by the representative of the Netherlands. The sponsor of the draft resolution is listed in document A/C.1/71/L.58.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested. Separate, recorded votes have been requested on the seventh and eighth preambular paragraphs and operative paragraph 1. I shall therefore put these paragraphs to the vote, one by one.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic,

El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, 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, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, 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, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Zambia

Against:

None

Abstaining:

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

The seventh preambular paragraph was retained by 143 votes to none, with 27 abstentions.

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

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium,

Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Zambia

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Lao People's Democratic Republic, Nicaragua, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe

The eighth preambular paragraph was retained by 143 votes to none, with 24 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 1.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, 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, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Zambia

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Azerbaijan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Malawi, Nicaragua, Rwanda, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe

Operative paragraph 1 was retained by 144 votes to none, with 20 abstentions.

The Chair: I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken. *In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, 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, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, 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, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Syrian Arab Republic

Draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.58, as a whole, was adopted by 175 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The Chair: I now call on delegations wishing to make statements in explanation of vote on the draft resolutions just adopted.

Mr. Broilo (Poland): I am speaking on behalf of Greece, Estonia, Finland, Romania and my own country, Poland, to explain our abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.22, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions".

We support and will continue to support international efforts aimed at addressing the humanitarian, socioeconomic and security impact of conventional weapons, including cluster munitions, and halting their indiscriminate use, especially when they are directed at innocent and defenceless civilians. We are convinced that respect for the relevant international law is crucial to ensuring the protection of civilians in armed conflict. In that context, we support the humanitarian goal of the Convention on Cluster Munitions. At the same time, we believe that humanitarian concerns must be balanced against States' legitimate security concerns and military and defence needs.

We believe that the most competent and effective framework for addressing the issue of cluster munitions is the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW), since it includes main producers, possessors and users, as well as non-users. We supported the CCW negotiation process aimed at adopting a new CCW protocol on cluster munitions, and we remain disappointed by the failure of the Geneva discussions. However, as a high contracting party to the CCW and all its five Additional Protocols, we remain firmly committed to fulfilling all our obligations under the CCW umbrella. With the above reasons in mind, we abstained in the voting on the draft resolution.

Ms. Grinberga (Latvia): I am taking the floor to explain Latvia's abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.22, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions".

Latvia supports the goals of the Convention on Cluster Munitions. We fully share the concerns about the disastrous consequences of the indiscriminate use of certain cluster munitions. At the same time, we believe that the humanitarian point of view must be balanced against security concerns and strategic defence considerations. We maintain the commitment to acting in line with the provisions of the Convention. Latvia neither produces nor possesses cluster munitions, nor do we store or use them, yet we are not a State party to the Convention on Cluster Munitions. This position regarding the Convention could be revisited in a mid-term perspective.

Mr. Benitez Verson (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Cuban delegation would like to explain its votes on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.9, entitled “Preventing and combating illicit brokering activities”, and A/C.1/71/L.7 /Rev.1, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction”.

Cuba supports efforts to prevent and combat illicit brokering activities, in full compliance with the Charter of the United Nations and the relevant international instruments. We believe that draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.9 could contribute positively to such efforts, and for that reason we voted in favour of it. However, in the future the draft resolution should not continue to stress a single category of weapon, in this case small arms and light weapons, at the expense of weapons of mass destruction and sophisticated modern arms.

The eighth preambular paragraph should not refer to the Arms Trade Treaty, as that instrument does not enjoy the consensus of all States. The Treaty does not prohibit and therefore ends up legitimizing the transfer of arms to unauthorized non-State actors, which are precisely the main source of illicit brokering activities. For those reasons, the Cuban delegation abstained in the separate vote on the eighth preambular paragraph of A/C.1/71/L.9.

We regret the fact that the ninth preambular paragraph takes note of certain Security Council resolutions that do not enjoy consensus even within that body and were adopted by a divided vote because they do not take account of the urgent need to prohibit the transfer of small and light weapons to non-State actors.

With respect to the sixteenth preambular paragraph, Cuba stresses that the so-called Nuclear Security Summits organized outside of the International Atomic Energy Agency have proven to be selective and exclusionary. The key entity in the field of nuclear security is the International Atomic Energy Agency.

As in previous years, Cuba abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.7/Rev.1, on the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention. We share the legitimate humanitarian concerns linked to the indiscriminate and irresponsible use of mines. Cuba is a State party to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, including its Amended Protocol II, and fully abides by all of its provisions and restrictions with regard to the use of anti-personnel mines.

It is not possible for Cuba to renounce the use of mines to maintain our sovereignty and territorial integrity, pursuant to the right to legitimate defence, recognized in Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations. Cuba shall continue to support all efforts that, while striking the appropriate balance between humanitarian and national security issues, seek to eliminate the awful impact on civilians and the economies of many countries of the indiscriminate and irresponsible use of anti-personnel mines.

Mr. Ismail (Egypt): I am taking the floor to explain Egypt’s position on draft resolution A/C.1/71.L.7.

Egypt abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.7/Rev.1, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction”, due to the unbalanced nature of that instrument, which was developed and concluded outside the framework of the United Nations. Egypt imposed a moratorium on its capacity to produce and export landmines in the 1990s, long before the conclusion of the Convention.

Egypt views the Convention as lacking balance between the humanitarian concerns relating to the production and use of anti-personnel landmines and their legitimate military use in border protection, particularly in countries that have long borders or face extraordinary security challenges. Furthermore, the Convention does not impose any legal responsibility on States to remove anti-personnel mines that they have placed on others’ territory, making it almost impossible for many States to meet the demining requirement on their own. That is particularly true in the case of Egypt,

which still has millions of landmines on its territories placed by the warring States during the Second World War. That serious concern is further exacerbated by the insufficient system of international cooperation set up by the Convention, which is still limited in effect and highly dependent on the good will of donor States.

Mr. Luque Márquez (Ecuador) (*spoke in Spanish*): Ecuador would like to speak in explanation of its vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/71/L.21, A/C.1/71/L.29 and A/C.1/71/L.58.

With respect to draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.21, Ecuador believes transparency in weapons, including the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms, to be an important element of confidence-building measures among States. My country voted in favour of A/C.1/71/L.21, on transparency in arms transfers, as a whole, as it has traditionally done. However, my delegation regrets the inclusion of the seventh and eighth preambular paragraphs, which refer to the adoption and ratification of the Arms Trade Treaty in a way that is barely relevant to the content and purport of the draft resolution. We believe that including those contentious paragraphs, which relate to a non-universal instrument, is not conducive to unity among Member States on issues of common interest to all. The assertion in the eighth preambular paragraph that the entry into force of the Arms Trade Treaty may have brought greater transparency in armaments does not coincide with reality. For those reasons, my country abstained in the voting on those two preambular paragraphs.

With respect to draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.29, Ecuador supported the negotiations on an arms trade treaty from the outset. However, we abstained in the voting in the General Assembly, which adopted the Arms Trade Treaty in April 2013, because it contains several weaknesses, particularly an imbalance between the rights and obligations of importer and exporter States, its failure to cite fundamental principles of international law and their importance for the Treaty, the absence of an explicit prohibition of transfer to unauthorized non-State actors, the absence of an explicit reference to the crime of aggression, and the possibility that its articles related to criteria could be used as mechanisms for undue political pressure. My country has not signed or acceded to the Treaty, which is why we abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.29 on the Arms Trade Treaty.

Ecuador is following with great attention the implementation of the Treaty to see how it will be done, and particularly whether it will be transparent and free of double standards. In that regard, we followed the course of the Meeting of States Parties that took place in Geneva in August, and we have noted the content of the discussions there, including issues that, strangely enough, were excluded from the debate in spite of the fact that they were relevant to the implementation of the Treaty.

Regarding draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.58, Ecuador is of the view that States should improve their legislation and procedures relating to the transfer of arms, military equipment and dual-use goods and technology. Ecuador, as it has done in previous years, therefore supported the adoption of the draft resolution. My delegation nonetheless regrets the inclusion of the seventh and eighth preambular paragraphs, which refer to the Arms Trade Treaty, as well as the mention of the Treaty in operative paragraph 1. Its incorporation in those preambular paragraphs does little to promote a consensus on the draft resolution, since it cites a treaty that is not universal. The reference to the Arms Trade Treaty in operative paragraph 1 is strange, to say the least. It calls on States to comply with their obligations under international instruments, with explicit mention of the Arms Trade Treaty, whereas an intrinsic part of international law is that States are obligated to comply with the provisions of instruments to which they are party. Additionally, it is strange that the only explicit reference to an international instrument is to the Arms Trade Treaty, which, we repeat, is far from being universal.

Mr. Ri In Il (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.7/Rev.1, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction".

My delegation shares the humanitarian concerns associated with the use of anti-personnel mines, but due to the unique security environment of the Korean peninsula, especially regarding the United States' insistence on the use of landmines there, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is not in a position to give up the use of landmines, which is in keeping with its right to self-defence. The use of landmines by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is strictly for

self-defence purposes in the grave situation on the Korean peninsula, where the United States is increasing the risk of war.

Ms. Yoon Seong-mee (Republic of Korea): My delegation would like to speak on draft resolutions A/C.1/71/L.7/Rev.1, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction”, and A/C.1/71/L.22, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions”.

First, regarding A/C.1/71/L.7/Rev.1, the Republic of Korea sympathizes with the objectives and purposes of the Ottawa Convention and the draft resolution. However, in view of the security situation on the Korean peninsula, we are unable to accede to the Convention at the moment. We therefore abstained in the voting on the draft resolution. That does not mean that we are not concerned about the problems associated with anti-personnel mines. We are committed to mitigating the suffering caused by their use. In that respect, the Korean Government is exercising tight control over anti-personnel mines and has been enforcing an indefinite extension of the moratorium on their export since 1997. In addition, the Republic of Korea acceded to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons and its Amended Protocol II, under which we are participating in a range of discussions and activities in order to ensure their limited and responsible use. We also acceded to Protocol V, on explosive remnants of war, and are implementing all the relevant obligations.

The Korean Government has also contributed more than \$9.1 million since 1993 towards demining and victim assistance through the relevant United Nations programmes, including the United Nations Voluntary Trust Fund for Assistance in Mine Action and the International Trust Fund for Demining and Mine Victims Assistance. The Republic of Korea will continue to contribute to international efforts in mine clearance and victim assistance.

Secondly, on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.22, the Government of the Republic of Korea fully shares the concerns of the international community about the humanitarian impact of cluster munitions and supports its efforts to address the humanitarian problems arising from their use. However, owing to the unique security situation on the Korean peninsula, my Government is not able to join the Convention on Cluster Munitions,

which bans the use of all cluster munitions. My Government therefore abstained in the voting on that draft resolution.

My delegation would like to inform Member States that the Ministry of National Defence of the Republic of Korea adopted a new directive on cluster munitions in 2008. According to the directive, only cluster munitions that are equipped with self-deactivation devices and that would not result in more than a 1 per cent failure rate can be included in the acquisition plans. The directive also recommends the development of alternative weapon systems that could replace cluster munitions in the longer term.

While it is regrettable that we cannot support the draft resolution at the moment, the Republic of Korea will continue its efforts to mitigate the humanitarian problems associated with the use of cluster munitions in a constructive manner.

Ms. Gambhir (India): I wish to explain India’s vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/71/L.7/Rev.1, A/C.1/71/L.9, A/C.1/71/L.21, A/C.1/71/L.29 and A/C.1/71/L.58.

I will start with draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.29, entitled “The Arms Trade Treaty”. India has strong and effective national export controls for defence items, and is still reviewing the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) from the perspective of its defence, security and foreign policy interests. We therefore abstained in the voting on the draft resolution contained in A/C.1/71/L.29 pending the review.

With regard to A/C.1/71/L.7/Rev.1, India supports the vision of a world free of anti-personnel landmines and is committed to their eventual elimination. The availability of cost-effective alternative military technologies that can perform the legitimate defensive role played by anti-personnel landmines will considerably facilitate the goal of the complete elimination of anti-personnel mines. India is a high contracting party to the Amended Protocol of the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons, which enshrines the approach of taking into account the legitimate defence environments of States, especially those with long borders. India has fulfilled its obligations under Amended Protocol II, including, among other things, ending the production of undetectable mines, as well as rendering all of its anti-personnel mines detectable. India is observing a moratorium on the export and transfer of anti-personnel landmines. We have taken a

number of measures to address 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 in mine clearance and the rehabilitation of mine victims, and is willing to contribute technical assistance and expertise to that end. India participated as an observer in the third Review Conference of the States Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction, held in Maputo in June 2014, and the fourteenth Meeting of States Parties, held in Geneva in 2015.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.9, India voted in favour of the draft resolution on preventing and combating illicit brokering activities, as it supports the objective this draft resolution seeks to promote. However, we were compelled to abstain in the voting on the eighth preambular paragraph, which contains a reference to the ATT, which, as explained with reference to A/C.1/71/L.29, India has kept under review. Pending completion of the review, India abstained in the voting on this preambular paragraph.

Concerning draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.21, entitled “Transparency in armaments”, we were compelled to abstain in the voting on the seventh and eighth preambular paragraphs, which contain references to the ATT. As explained with reference to A/C.1/71/L.29 on the ATT, India is conducting an internal review of its position and, pending its conclusion, abstained in the voting on A/C.1/71/L.29. Despite making a substantial contribution to past groups of governmental experts on this issue, India was excluded from the Group established pursuant to resolution 68/43. We are studying the report of the Group of Governmental Experts and its recommendations, and therefore abstained in the voting on operational paragraphs 3 and 4 of A/C.1/71/L.21.

India voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.58, because we support its broad objectives, but we were compelled to abstain in the voting on the seventh and eighth preambular paragraphs and operational paragraph 1, as they make references to the ATT. As explained with reference to A/C.1/71/L.29 on the ATT, India is conducting an internal review on its position and, pending its conclusion, abstained in the voting on A/C.1/71/L.29.

Ms. Aristotelous (Cyprus): I am taking the floor to explain our abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.22, 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 that may have indiscriminate effects. In this regard, Cyprus is a State party to all protocols of 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 relevant legislation for its ratification was forwarded to Parliament in 2011. However, the ratification process is still ongoing owing to considerations related to the abnormal security situation on the island. We remain hopeful that these issues will be resolved, which will then enable us to ratify the Convention and vote in favour of this resolution in the future.

Mr. Alokly (Libya) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/71/L.4, 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,” and A/C.1/71/L.7.Rev.1, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction”.

We share the concern of many delegations vis-à-vis the use of conventional weapons that may be deemed to be excessively injurious or to have indiscriminate effects. However, the Convention and its Protocols do not take into consideration many national defence concerns, especially the lack of alternative weapons that have the same effect or at least an effect that can be controlled. The Protocols do not take into consideration countries, including Libya, that are affected by wars and are still dealing with the consequences of such wars and conflicts, as well as the effects of mines planted during the Second World War. There has been no repatriation or compensation for the victims. Nonetheless, Libya joined the consensus on the draft resolution, even though it does not take into consideration Libya’s previously expressed concerns.

With regard to A/C.1/71/L.7.Rev.1, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition

of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction”, Libya is not party to the Convention, but it shares the international community’s concerns, especially its humanitarian concerns, regarding anti-personnel mines in the light of their extremely destructive effects in humanitarian terms, their environmental impact and the obstacles they pose to development. We suffer from mines and explosives that have remained on our territory since the Second World War. While we believe that the Convention plays a positive role in limiting the use of mines, we stress once again that the Convention ignores the damage done to the countries that have been affected by mines, in particular those that have been a theatre of war for other countries. It also ignores the colonial Powers that planted the mines and that should remove or demine those territories at their own expense.

Despite what has been said, and in the light of the very dangerous repercussions of the use of anti-personnel mines, Libya has changed its voting since the sixty-eighth session of the General Assembly in 2013. In the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/68/L.3, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction”, we switched from abstaining to voting in its favour. During this session, we also voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.7/Rev.1. However, in the future we will consider all developments and take into consideration our national concerns.

Mrs. Schneider Calza (Brazil): I wish to explain Brazil’s abstention in the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.22, which is 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. We have actively participated in the negotiations in the framework of the Group of Governmental Experts of that Convention, 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 to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons was consistent neither with the objective of strengthening the Convention nor with the goal of

promoting the adoption of universal, balanced effective and non-discriminatory arms-control instruments. We consider 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 is a party to Protocol V of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, on explosive remnants of war and has never used cluster munition. Not having joined the Oslo Convention does not imply that Brazil is not bound by any regulation applicable to the possible use of cluster munitions, which would in any case be subject to international humanitarian law.

Mr. Ammar (Pakistan): My delegation abstained in the voting on the draft resolution entitled “Implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions”, contained in document A/C.1/71/L.22. Pakistan participated in the first Review Conference of the States Parties to the Convention on Cluster Munitions last year as an observer. It is important to note that the Convention on Cluster Munitions was negotiated outside the United Nations system. As a matter of principle, Pakistan does not support efforts to conclude important international treaties, especially those related to arms control, outside the United Nations framework.

Pakistan feels that the multilateral framework of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons is the most appropriate forum for considering the issue of cluster munitions. The strength of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons lies in its legal framework, which strikes a delicate balance between the need to minimize human suffering without sacrificing the legitimate security interests of States. Pakistan participated actively and constructively in the Group of Governmental Experts under the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons framework in 2011, which held substantive discussions on a draft protocol on cluster munitions. It is unfortunate that the negotiating process bore no fruit in the end. Pakistan considers cluster munitions to be legitimate weapons with a recognized military value in our regional context. We therefore look

at the military utility of cluster munitions differently from States whose neighbourhoods are peaceful.

Pakistan supports international efforts to address the issue of the irresponsible and indiscriminate use of cluster munitions and, as such, welcomes efforts to mitigate their negative consequences. Pakistan has never used cluster munitions in any military conflict or internal operations and is strongly opposed to their use against civilians. Strict adherence to international humanitarian law would help address the humanitarian concerns arising from the indiscriminate use of cluster munitions. Pakistan also supports efforts for improving the reliability of cluster munitions so that the issue of explosive remnants of war is addressed.

I now turn to an explanation of vote on the draft resolution entitled “Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction”, contained in document A/C.1/71/L.7/Rev.1. My delegation abstained in the voting on this draft resolution. We wish to reiterate that landmines continue to play a significant role in the defence needs of many States. Given our security demands and the need to guard our long borders that are not protected by any natural obstacle, the use of landmines forms an important part of our self-defence strategy. The objective of the total elimination of anti-personnel landmines can best be promoted, inter alia, by making available non-lethal military and cost-effective alternative technologies.

Pakistan is a party to the Amended Protocol II of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, which regulates the use of landmines in both internal and external conflicts to prevent civilians from falling victim to them. We continue to implement the Protocol in full earnestness. As one of the largest troop contributors to United Nations-led peacekeeping operations, Pakistan has actively contributed to demining operations in several affected countries in the past. We are prepared to promote training facilities in such countries as our national resources permit. Pakistan has a unique record in that we have succeeded in clearing all minefields after the three wars in South Asia, and no humanitarian situations have been caused by such mines. We remain committed to ensuring that mines in our military inventory will never result in civilian casualties.

I will now give an explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.29, on the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT), which Pakistan voted in favour of. The present death and destruction caused by the supply and misuse of conventional weapons in several parts of Africa, the Middle East, Asia and elsewhere are disconcerting and raise potential concerns about the efficacy of the ATT and other plurilateral and regional mechanisms. Resolving issues such as the absence of definitions and the lack of accountability of exporters as soon as possible will be vital to making the ATT effective. The rhetoric and reality will have to be reconciled if the ATT is to gain global public support and ownership. Even as we continue our national review of the Treaty, we believe that its success, effectiveness and universality will be evaluated based on the degree of its non-discriminatory implementation, in particular its criteria and strict adherence by its States parties to its principles.

I will now give an explanation of vote of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.21, entitled “Transparency in armaments”. Pakistan supports the broader objectives of pursuing transparency in armaments, including by reporting on exports and imports of arms, including procurement through national production. Such measures have the potential to serve as an early-warning system to assess global armaments-accumulation trends and as a potential force that should put some moral pressure on States responsible for destabilizing arms transfers, production and stockpiles. Pakistan has also been regularly reporting to the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms. However, there can hardly be a one-size-fits-all approach for all regions or subregions. If transparency measures are to gain broader traction and acceptability, the recognition of different political and security considerations in various regions is essential. Such measures should also be pursued in tandem with others, such as confidence-building measures and conflict resolution. We acknowledge the recognized value of all entry measures outlined in the draft resolution and have therefore voted in favour of it.

Transparency is a means to an end and not an end in itself. The ultimate objective should be to seek restraints, promote confidence-building measures, ease tensions and resolve disputes through negotiation and mediation at the regional, subregional and global levels. With regard to the Group of Governmental Experts to be convened in 2019 to review the operation and further development of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms, we share the broad expectation

that the composition of that register and, indeed, all groups of governmental experts established within the United Nations in the field of disarmament, will strictly conform to the principle of equitable geographical representation, particularly from developing countries. We recognize the financial constraints being faced by the United Nations system but those should not limit opportunities for participation, particularly from diverse regions and perspectives.

Mr. Toro-Carnevali (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): Venezuela abstained in the voting on the eighth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.9; the seventh and eighth preambular paragraphs of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.21; and the seventh and eighth preambular paragraphs and operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.58. Similarly, Venezuela abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.29 as a whole. Those draft resolutions all made reference to the Arms Trade Treaty.

We would like to recall that Venezuela abstained in the voting on the draft Arms Trade Treaty in the General Assembly for four reasons.

First, the Treaty does not prevent the transfer of conventional weapons to non-State actors. Secondly, the Treaty does not address the problem of the excessive production of conventional weapons. Thirdly, the Treaty does not address the development and production by highly developed countries of sophisticated conventional weapons that could have a humanitarian impact as devastating as that of weapons of mass destruction. Fourthly, my country abstained in the voting because the Treaty does not include the crime of aggression as a criterion for the non-transfer of conventional weapons. For those reasons, we abstained in the voting on paragraphs that refer to the Arms Trade Treaty.

Mr. Hallak (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.21, entitled “Transparency in armaments”. Syria affirms its readiness to take part in any international effort that seeks in good faith to achieve the objective of freeing the international community from the use or threat of use of force. We note that the draft resolution is unbalanced.

Regarding the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms, we stress that the Register is not comprehensive and does not include developments in

the area of conventional weapons. Moreover, it does not take into consideration the special situation in the Middle East, where the Arab-Israeli conflict has been perpetuated by Israel’s ongoing occupation of Arab territories and failure to implement the relevant Security Council resolutions. Furthermore, major Powers are providing Israel with weapons, particularly weapons of mass destruction. Israel possesses the most up-to-date and lethal weapons there are, and is capable of manufacturing various types of high-tech, including nuclear weapons, and stockpiling them.

My delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.29, entitled “The Arms Trade Treaty”. Syria continues to be one of the leading members of the United Nations opposed to the arms trade, owing to its impact on international peace and security. Arab, regional and international parties are causing great strife in my country by illegally providing the terrorist groups responsible for the bloodshed in Syria with conventional and non-conventional weapons and ammunition of every kind, as is well known. And most of those countries are parties to the Arms Trade Treaty.

My delegation has made every effort to achieve a balanced Arms Trade Treaty that cannot be used to pressure other countries, as other instruments are. Syria will accede to the Treaty if it is comprehensive and balanced, because that would benefit the international community. However, the Treaty as it stands serves the interests only of some parties, at the expense of other Member States. The Treaty in its current form was not reached by consensus and does not take into consideration the positions of a number of countries, including Syria. In that respect, I would like to address several points.

The Treaty ignores the proposals put forward by various countries, including Syria, with respect to including a reference to foreign occupation. The Treaty does not include any language that relates to the danger of exporting weapons to terrorist groups, which is especially important in the light of the suffering in my country and elsewhere produced by a phenomenon that threatens international peace and security. The Arms Trade Treaty does not define aggression as cited in international instruments. Certain countries that called for the Treaty’s adoption are arming terrorist groups, as United Nations reports have indicated, and parties to the Treaty are violating its clauses by selling weapons through mediators.

My country's delegation would like to express its reservations about all paragraphs that refer to the Arms Trade Treaty in all draft resolutions that have been adopted today or will be adopted in the future.

Mr. Alotaibi (Saudi Arabia) (*spoke in Arabic*): My country abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.29, entitled "The Arms Trade Treaty", for the following reasons.

It is the right of all countries to buy weapons and defend their territory. The right of self-defence is guaranteed by international law and the international community, but Iran and other countries are buying and distributing weapons to terrorists, in violation of international law. Iran is providing the Houthis and coup d'état militias in Yemen with weapons, in violation of Security Council resolutions that prohibit the provision of weapons to the Houthis, who use them to attack border villages and launch missiles against cities in Saudi Arabia, most recently Mecca. All Islamic countries, with the exception of Iran, which is supporting the militia, condemn such attacks. Ever since the revolution led by Khomeini, Iran has sought to destabilize the security of Arab countries and smuggled weapons into those countries with a view to their being used in terrorist attacks.

In conclusion, my country would like to enjoy good-neighbourly relations with all countries, but our neighbour Iran is attacking other countries and causing destruction within them, particularly since the Khomeini revolution.

Ms. Chai (Singapore): I am taking the floor to explain my delegation's vote in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/71/L.7/Rev.1 and A/C.1/71/L.22.

Singapore voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.7/Rev.1, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction". Our position on anti-personnel landmines has been clear and open. As in past years, Singapore supports and will continue to support all initiatives against the indiscriminate use of anti-personnel landmines, especially when they are directed at innocent and defenceless civilians. With that in mind, in May 1996 Singapore declared a two-year moratorium on the export of anti-personnel landmines without self-neutralizing mechanisms. In February 1998, Singapore expanded that moratorium to include to all types of anti-personnel landmines — not

just those without self-neutralizing mechanisms — and extended the moratorium indefinitely. We also support the work of the Convention by regularly attending the meetings of States parties to the Convention.

Singapore also voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.22, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions", because we support initiatives against the indiscriminate use of cluster munitions, especially when directed at innocent, defenceless civilians. With that in mind, Singapore declared an indefinite moratorium in November 2008 on the export of cluster munitions. We also support the work of the Convention on Cluster Munitions by regularly attending the meetings of the States parties to the Convention. At the same time, like several other countries, Singapore firmly believes that the legitimate security concerns and the right to self-defence of any State cannot be disregarded. A blanket ban on all types of anti-personnel landmines and cluster munitions may therefore be counterproductive. Singapore supports international efforts to resolve humanitarian concerns about anti-personnel landmines and cluster munitions. We will continue to work with members of the international community towards a durable and truly global solution.

The Chair: We have heard from the last speaker in explanation of vote after the vote on cluster 4, "Conventional weapons".

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

I give the floor to delegations wishing to make general statements or to introduce draft resolutions under cluster 5.

Mr. Hellgren (Sweden): I have the honour to make the following general statement with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.17, entitled "Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security". My statement is made on behalf of Austria, Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Georgia, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mexico, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Tunisia and my own country, Sweden.

We will join the consensus on the draft resolution and would like to underline some relevant aspects in this context.

International deliberations on cyberspace issues and the use of information and communication technology (ICT) in an international security context need to continue to evolve as we seek a greater common understanding globally. The adoption in July 2015 of the report of the fourth United Nations Group of Governmental Experts on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security (see A/70/174) was an important development in that regard. We also welcome the work started in August by the new Group of Governmental Experts and emphasize the importance of constructive and cooperative work within that forum. The reports of United Nations groups of governmental experts remain the leading reference setting out norms for responsible State behaviour in cyberspace.

The 2015 report of the Group of Governmental Experts made a significant contribution to developing a common understanding with regard to norms of responsible behaviour for States, confidence-building measures, capacity-building and the application of international law to the use of ICT by States. We welcome the report's adoption by consensus. We also encourage States to continue to build on that important body of work while taking certain crucial principles and concepts fully into account. One example of such work is the adoption by the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe of a new set of confidence-building measures in March, building on the principles laid out in the 2015 report.

Our delegations believe that it is crucial that the Internet remain open, free, equal and secure, thereby facilitating a free flow of information in cyberspace. The same rights that individuals have offline — in particular freedom of expression, including the freedom to seek, receive and impart information and the right to privacy — must also be protected online. Careful consideration must be paid in balancing fundamental human rights, including freedom of speech, and the restriction of the use of the internet by terrorists, if the latter is necessary.

The exercise of the right to privacy is important for the realization of the right to freedom of expression and the right to hold opinions without interference, as well as for the right to peaceful assembly and association.

That is part of the foundations of a democratic society. We therefore welcome resolution 20/8, adopted by consensus at the twentieth session of the Human Rights Council in 2012, which affirms that basic understanding. We also welcome the follow-up resolutions that have been adopted in the Human Rights Council since then. Reaffirming the main messages of the 2012 resolution, they also include important additions on the importance of Internet access for global development and the Sustainable Development Goals, as well as the need to have a comprehensive, human rights-based approach in order to provide and expand access to the Internet. This year, the Human Rights Council has requested that the High Commissioner prepare a report on ways to bridge digital divides between and within countries, including between women and men.

Our societies' increasing dependence on information technology has brought new challenges. Security in an increasingly interconnected world will, to a great extent, revolve around protecting information flows and the integrity of critical ICT infrastructure. Cyberattacks, cyberespionage and cybercrime are realities today. Malicious activities in cyberspace can potentially have a highly destabilizing effect from political, societal, economic and national security perspectives. Such risks and vulnerabilities need to be addressed, which implies challenges, as our traditional tools for addressing those risks have yet to adapt to the global and boundless nature of cyberspace, and they must be addressed within the framework of international law and human rights.

It is clear, furthermore, that threats to our freedom and security in cyberspace can be tackled effectively only through global cooperation among States, as well as through cooperation with the private sector, the technical community and civil society. We welcome the reference to the role of the private sector and civil society in the Group of Governmental Experts' report and emphasize the crucial importance of taking all relevant stakeholders into account, on an equal and appropriate footing, while advancing this important issue. We also welcome the reference to the importance of capacity-building for securing ICTs and their use, and will welcome further international commitments in that regard.

We strongly support the affirmation by the Group of Governmental Experts that voluntary norms relevant to the use of ICTs by States are essential to reducing risks to international peace, security and stability.

We also welcome the recommendation on the need to further study how such norms should apply to State behaviour and the use of ICTs by States. The Group's report emphasizes the fact that voluntary confidence-building measures can promote trust and assurance among States and help reduce the risk of conflict by increasing predictability and reducing misperceptions. Such measures can make an important contribution to addressing States' concerns about the use of ICTs by States and could be a significant step in promoting international security.

We support such recommendations and encourage further work along those lines, including in regional security and confidence-building frameworks. We engage in such discussions based on the assumption that existing international law applies to State action in cyberspace and that our universal values of human rights, democracy, and the rule of law guide our deliberations on norms in cyberspace. We call for those crucial aspects to guide further work in the cyber area, including in the context of addressing the international security aspects of the use of ICTs within the forum of the Group of Governmental Experts.

The Chair: Before giving the floor to the next speaker, I would ask delegations to note that due to time constraints, the First Committee will take action on the proposals under cluster 5 on the morning of November 1.

I now call on those delegations wishing to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I remind all delegations that the first intervention is limited to 10 minutes and the second intervention to five minutes.

Mr. Yermakov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The Russian delegation would like to exercise its right of reply with regard to the comments directed at Russia on Friday (see A/C.1/71/PV.23). They were absurd accusations that had no relevance to the resolutions being voted on. The delegation representing the current Government in Kyiv made a statement about its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/71/L.18. That draft resolution simply encourages dialogue on the non-first placement of weapons in outer space, but for some curious reason Ukraine falsely accused Russia of withdrawing from the Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE) Treaty, violating the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty and withdrawing from bilateral agreements concerning plutonium with the United States. To ensure that none of our colleagues gets

the wrong idea, I will not make any political comments. I would simply like to address some indisputable facts.

First and foremost, Russia has not withdrawn from the CFE Treaty. It has simply suspended its participation in the Treaty. I hope that all Committee members will recall that this Treaty dates back to the Cold War. It was reached between the former socialist States that were members of the Warsaw Pact, and was therefore between the Warsaw Pact countries, on the one hand, and NATO, on the other. It is unlikely that anyone here has any doubts about the fact that we now live in a completely different era. We are all aware that there have been attempts to adapt the Treaty to modern reality. Agreements have been reached and Russia has ratified them, but our Western partners have not done the same. It is therefore unclear as to why comments continue to be made about Russia not upholding its obligations under the CFE.

In order to understand how absurd that is, we should look at the text of the Treaty, which contains a number of interesting elements that members of the Committee probably have not seen or do not recall. For example, under the old CFE, admirable, now fully independent sovereign States such as Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania were part of the Leningrad Military District of the Soviet Union. Imagine that. Surely no one seriously wants to return to that situation. Under the old CFE, the State of Ukraine did not exist. So let us say no more about Russia withdrawing from the Treaty or being in breach of anything. We are living in a completely different world. Let us act accordingly.

Secondly, Russia was accused of breaching the INF Treaty. While in the past two years we have certainly heard accusations from our American partners that we are allegedly in violation of something, no proof of it has been provided and no specifics put forward. Naturally, we believe that the accusations are completely unfounded. On the other hand, we have long had well-justified concerns about whether the INF Treaty is being upheld by the Americans themselves, and they are well aware of our own long-standing concerns about issues such as the production and use of ballistic missiles banned under the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty as targets for testing the United States ABM system and the use and production of unmanned combat aerial vehicles that can be defined as land-based nuclear-delivery vehicles. That too is banned under the Treaty, but the most important aspect at issue here is the placement in a neighbouring country of facilities or

equipment banned under the Treaty, such as the MK-41 launcher, which is capable of launching cruise missiles with nuclear warheads. That is completely unacceptable in today's international relations.

However, it is clear that there has been a violation and that the United States intends to continue to expand and deploy such equipment in Poland. Why do our European neighbours need it? That is not clear at all. Instead of engaging in constructive dialogue within the framework of the INF Treaty, Washington has seemingly decided to provoke a completely unnecessary propaganda-based confrontation and to voice its opinion through the Kyiv authorities. We obviously do not approve of that, but we have no choice in the matter. We will therefore continue to work with our American colleagues on the issue. We firmly believe that we will find a mutually acceptable agreement.

Thirdly, some completely absurd accusations have been levelled at Russia with regard to the Plutonium Management and Disposition Agreement with the United States. Russia suspended its participation in the agreement but did so fully in line with article 62 of the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties. The main reason was the fact that since the agreement came into force there has been a very significant change in circumstances owing to Washington's recent unfriendly steps against Russia, such as imposing political and economic sanctions, actively deploying and expanding a military presence near Russia's borders, unilaterally and unrestrictedly developing an anti-ballistic-missile system that would damage Russia's national interests and adopting United States laws designed to interfere in Russia's domestic affairs, destabilize its domestic political situation and encourage extremism and separatism. Another very significant reason was the fact that the United States itself did not uphold the agreement on plutonium.

I shall now conclude my statement, although I could go on for a long time on this topic and I think that many would find it very interesting.

Mr. Robotjazi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I would like to exercise my right of reply with regard to the irrelevant comments made by the representative of Saudi Arabia, who once again read out a statement full of lies and baseless, ludicrous accusations aimed at Iran with no connection to the cluster that we were considering. It was a reflection of the irresponsible behaviour of the representative of a regime has been unable to distinguish

between military targets and civilian objects in its military aggression against Yemen. It bombs markets, hospitals, schools and funerals and has no respect for its international obligation to protect civilians and civilian infrastructure. We therefore call on arms-exporting countries, in particular those that are party to the Arms Trade Treaty, not to send weapons to a regime that so easily flouts its international obligations, commits serious violations of the 1949 Geneva Conventions and attacks civilians and civilian infrastructure.

Mr. Wood (United States of America): I am taking the floor to exercise my right of reply to respond to some of the charges made by my colleague from the Russian Federation. I too could stay in this room all day to list a number of concerns that we have about Russian behaviour in various areas, but I will limit my comments to some of the things that were said today.

First and foremost, the United States remains committed to securing Russia's return to compliance with the the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty (INF). We have engaged the Russian Federation at a number of different levels to try to press it to engage substantively in finding a diplomatic solution to this issue. The United States does not want an action-reaction cycle and Russia can help prevent such a cycle by returning to compliance with the INF Treaty.

With regard to the accusation that the United States is violating the INF Treaty, the United States has been and remains in full compliance with all its INF Treaty obligations. Instead of addressing its own violation, Russia has made baseless allegations about the United States in a clear attempt to deflect attention from Russian non-compliance. We have directly and substantively refuted such allegations on multiple occasions.

With regard to the placement of missiles in Poland, these missiles are not subject to the INF Treaty. This system is not capable of launching any offensive type of missile such as the Tomahawk cruise missile, and is therefore fully consistent with United States obligations under the INF Treaty. I wanted to make that clear.

With regard to the Plutonium Management and Disposition Agreement, as many representatives recall, Russia raised this early on in the First Committee. It was a political statement, a political stunt. We have had many consultations and conversations with the Russian Federation on the issue. If it is serious about trying to resolve these issues, it should raise them through

normal diplomatic channels instead of conducting publicity stunts in the First Committee.

Ms. Bila (Ukraine): I would like to draw the attention of the Committee to the absurdity of Russia's comments. I refer to the comments made by the representative of the Russian Federation on Friday (see A/C.1/71/PV.23). He said that Russia had suspended its implementation of the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe. Today we heard the representative of the Russian Federation explain that Russia has not withdrawn its participation in this Treaty. I would therefore like to advise the representative of the Russian Federation to be more attentive while preparing his comments.

Mr. Yermakov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): I will try to take up just one more minute of the Committee's precious time. Frankly, I do not have much to say. Everything was said by my colleague from the United States. He could not provide any proof to back up his accusations against the Russian Federation and he was not able to justify the clear violations by the United States, which have continued for many years.

I fully agree with my American colleague that this is not the right place to discuss everything. The only reason I raised it was because I was surprised by what I heard from the current Ukrainian regime, which has nothing to do with that at all. I can assure the Committee that we will continue to work on a fruitful dialogue with the United States and I am sure we will find a solution to it all.

Mr. Alotaibi (Saudi Arabia) (*spoke in Arabic*): The Iranian regime continues to shed crocodile tears over

Yemen. My country strives to protect civilians and has supported the building of infrastructure in Yemen for many years now. Iran, however, is providing weapons to some sites in Yemen. That is the difference between our two countries. Iran is under an economic embargo and has been for a long time now because of its support for terrorism.

Mr. Wood (United States of America): I apologize for taking the floor a second time and I will be very brief. I would just say to my colleague from the Russian Federation that fruitful dialogue should have priority over political stunts.

Mr. Robotjazi (Islamic Republic of Iran): Once again, Saudi Arabia's representative has tried to avoid responding and addressing our main concern. He says that Saudi Arabia tries to protect civilians in Yemen, but well-documented evidence from the United Nations and international humanitarian organizations indicates that to date 3,000 civilian targets have been bombed by Saudi Arabia and its coalition in Yemen. I therefore leave it to my colleagues in the First Committee to judge how they are trying. Apparently they are trying as hard as they can.

With regard to accusations that Iran is sending arms to Yemen, that is completely false and wrong. Yemen is under a brutal air, land and sea blockade. There is no movement of arms into Yemen except that conducted by Saudi Arabia and its partners in their attacks on Yemeni civilians.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.