



General Assembly

Seventy-second session

First Committee

26th meeting

Tuesday, 31 October 2017, 10 a.m.
New York

Official Records

Chair: Mr. Bahr Aluloom (Iraq)

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

Agenda items 52 (b) and 90 to 106 (continued)

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

The Chair: I shall now give the floor to the remaining delegations that wish to make statements in explanation of vote or position following action on the draft resolutions under cluster 3, “Outer space (disarmament aspects)”.

Mrs. García Guiza (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.53, entitled “No first placement of weapons in outer space”.

Mexico supported the draft resolution, as it demonstrates the importance and urgency of preventing an arms race in outer space, in keeping with our commitment to preserving outer space for peaceful purposes and in line with the quest for general and complete disarmament, under strict international control. Mexico will continue fighting to ensure that no actor places weapons in outer space for any reason or under any circumstances. Similarly, Mexico reiterates that all nuclear weapons, in particular, must be banned and eliminated, regardless of their type or location. My country supports the formulation of new international agreements on the issue, as well as the start of negotiations on new treaties to complement existing ones, as they build trust and a safer world.

Finally, Mexico would like to underscore that the declaration of one or more countries that they will not be the first to place weapons in outer space should not be understood as a tacit endorsement or acceptance of a putative right to place weapons in outer space or launch them from Earth if another State has placed them first, or in response to an attack. That situation could lead to a de facto arms race in outer space, and could be used as a pretext for justifying the possible placement of weapons in outer space, which Mexico categorically opposes.

Ms. Bandhari (India): India voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.53, on no first placement of weapons in outer space. As a major space-faring nation, India has vital development and security interests in space. The draft resolution states that the legal regime applicable to outer space should be consolidated and reinforced. India supports that objective and the strengthening of the international legal regime in order to protect and preserve access to space for all, and to prevent the weaponization of outer space without any exceptions. We support the substantive consideration of the prevention of an arms race in outer space in the Conference on Disarmament. While not a substitute for legally binding instruments, transparency and confidence-building measures can play a useful and complementary role to legally binding instruments. We see the no first placement of weapons in outer space as an interim step only, not a substitute for adopting substantive legal measures to ensure the prevention of an arms race in outer space, which should continue to be a priority for the international community.

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>).

17-35461 (E)



Accessible document

Please recycle



Mr. Murray (Australia): I am taking the floor in explanation of vote on behalf of Canada, Japan and my own country, Australia.

Our countries abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.53, entitled “No first placement of weapons in outer space”. The draft resolution calls on States to make a political declaration not to be the first to place weapons in outer space. We have three concerns about the text.

First, the draft resolution does not deal adequately with the question of what constitutes a weapon in outer space. Because so much space technology is of a dual-use nature, any space object capable of manoeuvre could be considered a space-based weapon. That could lead to countries mistakenly deciding that another country has placed weapons in space.

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. We favour measures that have practical rather than just political effects. Without a means of verifying compliance, a no-first-placement pledge does not fulfil the criteria for space-based 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 (A/68/189).

Thirdly, the draft resolution is focused solely on space-based weapons. It does not address the threat of ground-based weapons currently being developed and tested, such as anti-satellite missiles and high-energy lasers. The draft resolution is silent on the arms-control benefits of discouraging anti-satellite missile tests that create space debris. Given those concerns, we were unable to support the draft resolution and abstained in the voting.

Australia, Canada and Japan also abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.54, entitled “Further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space”. The draft resolution provides for the establishment of a United Nations group of governmental experts to consider and make recommendations on a legally binding instrument on the prevention of the placement of weapons in outer space, among other things. We have two concerns about this draft resolution.

First, we believe that non-binding but verifiable measures to enhance the security and sustainability of outer space are the most likely to gain widespread acceptance and adherence within the international community. Such steps are necessary to create the confidence and transparency required for any potential legal measures in space. We are concerned that the design of the group of governmental experts would focus primarily on premature legally binding measures that will not contribute to greater international understanding of what constitutes responsible, peaceful behaviour in space.

Secondly, since China, the Russian Federation and the United States made their original proposal, outer space transparency and confidence-building measures are likely to be on the agenda for the United Nations Disarmament Commission’s 2018-2020 session. The Disarmament Commission is the United Nations deliberative body in this area and the appropriate venue for considering space issues. As part of its deliberations, it could determine the need for a new group of governmental experts or directly deliver recommendations to the Conference on Disarmament. Given the broad support for the United Nations Disarmament Commission’s consideration of space issues, we considered it premature to support another track of deliberation, which would require additional United Nations funding.

Given those concerns, we were unable to support draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.54, and therefore abstained in the voting.

Mr. Weisz (France) (*spoke in French*): I am taking the floor in explanation of our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.54, entitled “Further practical measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space”.

France acknowledges the efforts of the sponsors of the draft resolution to foster discussion about the issue of preventing the placement of weapons in outer space. My country’s position on the issue is well known. We share the concerns expressed by other delegations about the effectiveness and relevance of such initiatives. In particular, we believe that the conditions required for the development of a legally binding instrument do not currently exist. In addition, we regret the restrictive nature of the mandate of the sponsors for the group of governmental experts proposed. Furthermore, France is concerned about the financial repercussions of establishing a new group of governmental experts

while several disarmament forums continue to face major budgetary challenges. That is why France voted against draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.54.

France remains convinced that the international community's efforts to prevent an arms race in outer space must fit into a comprehensive framework. Without being opposed a priori reqwto a legal approach, we prioritize proposals that can be implemented immediately so as to respond urgently to the rapidly deteriorating outer-space environment. Practices aimed at enhancing transparency and trust among stakeholders and reducing the likelihood of misunderstandings or escalation are naturally in line with that goal. In that regard, France reaffirms its willingness to work with the entire international community to promote the adoption of transparency and confidence-building measures, as well as the development of standards that will guide the behaviour of stakeholders with a view to strengthening the security and sustainability of outer-space activities.

Ms. Leong (Singapore): Singapore firmly believes that outer space should remain a peaceful global commons, and we are committed to the efforts to prevent an arms race in outer space, which would pose a grave threat to international peace and security. In addition, it would endanger many essential services that rely on technologically advanced applications in space, including telecommunications, weather monitoring and global positioning. However, most of the existing treaties on outer space were drafted between the 1960s and 1980s. The international community must work together and build consensus on international norms in space, while taking into account advancements in space technology and applications since then. Singapore is committed to working with others on that endeavour and will continue to support United Nations efforts aimed at establishing an open and inclusive international framework that can ensure the long-term sustainability of the uses of outer space and of its security.

That is why Singapore voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.54. Our view is that the group of governmental experts proposed in the draft resolution must be both transparent and inclusive. It is important that they take into account the differing views of all countries when making their recommendations. To that end, we encourage all countries to participate in discussions in the group of governmental experts' process. Furthermore, the group should keep its focus broad and consider all existing discussions on the

peaceful uses of outer space, including, but not limited to, 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.

The Chair: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of position or vote following action on the draft resolutions under cluster 3, "Outer space (disarmament aspects)".

The Committee will now turn to informal paper 3, beginning with cluster 4, "Conventional weapons".

I shall now give the floor to delegations that wish to make general statements or to introduce draft resolutions under cluster 4. I remind delegations that statements are limited to five minutes.

Mr. Takamizawa (Japan): In accordance with rule 120 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, Japan has already circulated revisions to draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.56, entitled "The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects", drafted by Colombia, South Africa and Japan, to all States Members of the United Nations yesterday through the Secretariat. It is essential that the international community work together to address issues related to small arms and light weapons, which require an urgent global response. In that regard, ensuring that the draft resolution is adopted by consensus is a top priority for us. In that regard, based on delegations' comments, we deleted the ninth preambular paragraph, which stated,

"Recalling the adoption of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, including Goal 16 of the Sustainable Development Goals".

The draft resolution aims to define effective measures to tackle the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons. I call on all Member States to support this annual draft resolution so that it can once again be adopted by consensus.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the representative of Afghanistan to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.15/Rev.1.

Mr. Noori (Afghanistan): I am pleased to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.15/Rev.1, entitled "Countering the threat posed by improvised explosive devices", under sub-item (dd) of agenda item 99. I am doing so for the Committee's consideration on behalf of my country, Afghanistan, as well as the delegations of

Australia and France, as the main sponsors of the draft resolution, and of other sponsors of the draft resolution.

The main sponsors held two rounds of informal consultations with Member States, along with bilateral meetings and discussions with several States, including those that could not attend our informal consultations. This year's draft resolution is largely the same as last year's resolution 71/72, but preambular and operative paragraphs have been updated and added. Many of the additions are designed to address the evolving nature of the global threat posed by improvised explosive devices, which is increasingly being borne by civilians. The draft resolution therefore continues to be an important contribution to international security within the mandate of the First Committee.

It is important to mention that the previous resolutions on improvised explosive devices were adopted by consensus in the First Committee and the General Assembly under resolutions 70/46 in 2015, and 71/72 in 2016. We therefore hope that draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.15/Rev. 1 will again be adopted by consensus, thereby helping the global community in the fight against the scourge of improvised explosive devices.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the representative of Mali to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.21.

Mr. Diarra (Mali) (*spoke in French*): The delegation of Mali has the honour to introduce the annual draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.21, entitled "Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons and collecting them", on behalf of the 15 member States 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 country, Mali.

With regard to the structure of the draft resolution, beyond the necessary technical updates, this year's version includes the exact same terms that were adopted by consensus last year. In that regard, the member States of ECOWAS sincerely hope that the draft resolution will be adopted by consensus again this year.

The draft resolution invites the international community to provide financial and technical assistance in order to build the capacity of civil society organizations as they combat the illicit trade in light weapons. In addition, this year's draft resolution invites

the international community to support the effective implementation of the ECOWAS Convention on Small Arms and Light Weapons, Their Ammunition and Other Related Materials, which, I remind the Committee, entered into force on 29 September 2009. Beyond the West African subregion, the draft resolution reflects the willingness of many countries all over the world to combat the illicit flow of small arms and light weapons.

On behalf of the member States of ECOWAS, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the additional States that have sponsored the draft resolution. I also encourage those that have not already done so to show their support by becoming sponsors.

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

The Chair: I shall now give the floor to delegations that wish to take the floor in explanation of vote or position before proceeding to take action on the draft resolutions listed under cluster 4. I remind delegations that explanations are limited to 10 minutes.

Ms. Hernández (Cuba): At the outset, our delegation would like to state that it does not support the paragraphs referring to the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) that are included in the various draft resolutions on which the First Committee will take action. We are concerned about the desire to forge artificial synergies between the ATT and other universally accepted instruments.

As in previous years, the Cuban delegation will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.27, entitled "The Arms Trade Treaty". We all know that the Arms Trade Treaty was adopted prematurely, when the negotiations on it had not yet been concluded, and that it is therefore not based on a consensus. Regrettably, it has a number of ambiguities, inconsistencies, imprecisions and legal gaps, all of which pose a threat to its effectiveness and efficiency. An arms trade treaty that does not prohibit, and therefore legitimizes, the transfer of weapons to unauthorized non-State actors — the main source of the illicit trade in weapons — cannot be effective.

The Treaty is an unbalanced instrument that benefits States that export weapons. The criteria those States use to approve or deny weapons transfers are subjective, and can therefore easily be manipulated for

political purposes. That infringes on the right of States to acquire and possess weapons for their legitimate defence, as stipulated in Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations.

In conclusion, we would like to reiterate that Cuba will continue to strictly implement all the measures it needs to prevent and combat the illicit arms trade.

Mr. Gallhofer (Austria): I have the honour to speak on behalf of Liechtenstein and my own country, Austria, with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.15, entitled “Countering the threat posed by improvised explosive devices”.

We are deeply concerned about the suffering that the use of explosive weapons brings upon civilians. Improvised explosive devices are particularly heinous. But it must be recalled that such devices are in a loose and poorly defined category of weapons. Many, and in some cases most, improvised explosive devices are mines. Munitions that are activated by the presence or proximity of people or by contact with them are anti-personnel mines. They are victim-activated munitions, covered by the legal framework of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention, which has 162 States parties. Its coverage is not dependent on the views of its States parties, as the text of the draft resolution erroneously reads. The legal norm against any use of anti-personnel mines by any actor and at any time is one that all States parties must uphold. They are legally bound to do so under the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention. The Convention clearly encompasses all anti-personnel mines, whether improvised or factory-produced, and regardless of who uses them.

This draft resolution clearly stipulates that there is a need for further work on disposal standards for improvised explosive devices. There is a need to avoid duplication with the International Mine Action Standards (IMAS). We also see a need for clarity on the scope and application of the proposed disposal standards, and for consultation with stakeholders, as required by the States Members of the United Nations. IMAS is the guiding framework for the humanitarian clearance of all explosive weapons, including those that are improvised, when accountability, coherence and transparency facilities are not available. Beyond that, in particular for security and force protection activities, there may be scope for United Nations improvised explosive device disposal standards, but not solely

based on a loose definition of ammunitions that are improvised.

We will vote in favour of this important draft resolution, but we hope that next year’s draft resolution will offer better language on those points, thereby allowing us to become a sponsor of it.

Ms. Seong-Mee (Republic of Korea): My delegation would like to speak on draft resolutions A/C.1/72/L.40 and A/C.1/72/ L.41.

The Republic of Korea sympathizes with the objectives and purposes of the Ottawa Convention and those of the Convention on Cluster Munitions. However, owing to the security situation on the Korean peninsula, we are currently not a party to either, and will therefore abstain in the voting on these two draft resolutions. That does not mean that we are less concerned about the problems associated with anti-personnel mines and cluster munitions. The Korean Government is exercising strict control over anti-personnel landmines and has been enforcing an indefinite extension of the moratorium on their export since 1997. In addition, the Republic of Korea signed the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons and its amended Protocol II, under which we participate in a range of discussions and activities for ensuring only limited and responsible use. We also joined Protocol V on Explosive Remnants of War and are implementing all its relevant obligations.

The Korean Government has also contributed more than \$9.6 million since 1993 for demining and victim assistance through the relevant United Nations programmes, including the United Nations Voluntary Trust Fund for Assistance in Mine Action, the international trust fund for demining and mine victims’ assistance. My delegation would also like to share with the member States of the Committee that, in accordance with a directive of our Ministry of National Defence, only cluster munitions equipped with safety activation devices that will not result in more than a one-person failure rate can be included in acquisition plans. The directive also recommends the development of an alternative weapon system that could replace cluster munitions over the long term.

We regret the fact that we cannot support draft resolutions A/C.1/72/L.40 and A/C.1/72/L.41 at the moment. The Republic of Korea will continue its constructive efforts to mitigate the humanitarian problems associated with the use of cluster munitions.

Mr. Margaryan (Armenia): Armenia has consistently supported the efforts to establish a negotiated, comprehensive international instrument that would regulate the trade in conventional arms and prevent and ultimately end their diversion into illicit markets and use for illegitimate purposes. We strongly believe that for the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) to be an inclusive, effective and viable international instrument, it should have been adopted by consensus. Armenia has expressed significant concerns about the Treaty's preamble and principles sections. We have advocated the importance of balanced and non-restrictive references to the principles of international law, in particular the inclusion of equal rights and the self-determination of peoples, in accordance with Article 1 of the Charter of the United Nations. The key objective of the Treaty, which is the encouragement and enforcement of the regulation of the conventional arms trade through strong national control systems, should have been promoted more vigorously.

We are deeply concerned about the possibility that in its current form, the Treaty may lead to political speculation about the exercise of the sovereign right to self-defence, and hinder legitimate access to relevant technologies. While remaining a staunch advocate of a robust and legally binding conventional arms-control regime, whether at regional or international levels, Armenia maintains its reservations about the Treaty and will abstain in the voting on resolution A/C.1/72/L.27, entitled "The Arms Trade Treaty". Our position on the ATT is applicable to all other draft resolutions of the Committee containing a reference to the Treaty, and we therefore dissociate ourselves from all paragraphs with such references.

Ms. Jenie (Indonesia): I would like to explain Indonesia's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.27, entitled "The Arms Trade Treaty", on which Indonesia will abstain. It should be noted that although Indonesia will abstain in the voting on the draft resolution, we nonetheless believe in the spirit of the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT), and our abstention should not be construed as dissociation from the ATT's objectives and goals. My delegation would like to inform the Committee that Indonesia is currently carefully studying the ATT in order to avoid any possible inconsistencies with Indonesia's national laws and regulations, should we decide to join the Treaty in future.

Mr. Hassan (Egypt): I am taking the floor to explain Egypt's position on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.27,

entitled "The Arms Trade Treaty", and on the references to the Treaty in other documents presented to the First Committee under cluster 4, "Conventional weapons".

Egypt continues to be at the forefront of all genuine efforts to combat illicit trafficking in arms and end arms transfers to terrorists and illegal armed groups. We call for immediate measures to be taken against the increasing State-sponsored flows of arms to terrorists and illegal armed groups, in particular in the Middle East and Africa. However, Egypt will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.27, based on our position regarding several shortcomings and loopholes in the Treaty.

Egypt reiterates its concern about the fact that the Treaty does not genuinely aim to prevent the continuing illicit supply of conventional weapons to unauthorized recipients, such as terrorists and illegal armed groups, as much as it is designed to give major exporters greater monopolistic power and ability to manipulate and obstruct legal arms transfers to States that desire them for legitimate purposes of self-defence.

As Egypt has pointed out on several occasions, the Treaty deliberately lacks clear definitions and relies on arbitrary criteria. Its actual impact on ending illicit arms transfers to unauthorized recipients will therefore be minimal, even if its membership is universal. Nevertheless, we will continue to closely monitor the implementation of the Treaty with a view to reviewing our position on it.

Mr. Al Habib (Islamic Republic of Iran): I am taking the floor to explain my delegation's position and vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/72/L.15/Rev. 1, on countering the threat posed by improvised explosive devices, and A/C.1/72/L.27, on the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT).

First, with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.15/Rev.1, Iran supports measures to counter the threat posed by the use of improvised explosive devices by illegal armed groups or terrorists. For that reason, we will join the consensus on adopting the draft resolution. In our view, preventing and combating the use of improvised explosive devices by terrorists and illegal armed groups is the draft resolution's primary purpose. Any interpretation of its provisions should therefore be consistent with that purpose. Furthermore, since it is almost impossible to define the scope of its items that can be used to manufacture improvised explosive devices and for civilian applications, any interpretation

beyond the exclusive purpose of the draft resolution that could restrict free access to or trade in such equipment and goods for civilian uses is unacceptable.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.27, Iran supports the prevention of the illicit arms trade in a non-discriminatory manner. However, my delegation will continue to abstain in the voting on the draft resolution on the Arms Trade Treaty for the following reasons.

First, the draft resolution continues to welcome the 2013 adoption of the ATT, an instrument in which the political and commercial interests of certain arms-exporting countries have a higher place and priority than respect for 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, by refraining from banning arms transfers to countries that commit acts of aggression and foreign occupation, the ATT failed to uphold it. That is a significant loophole and major legal gap. We therefore cannot welcome the adoption of such an instrument.

Secondly, paragraph 4 of the draft resolution calls on non-parties to accede to the Treaty. Such calls for the universalization of the ATT are unacceptable and lack credibility because the Treaty was not adopted by consensus, owing to its substantive flaws, to the fact that it ignores the concerns and interests of some Member States and to major violations of its provisions by some of its States parties, which export billions of dollars in arms to Israel and various countries in the Persian Gulf that are then used by the occupying forces in Palestine and Yemen to sow death and destruction, to cite only two examples of such violations.

Finally, our position on the ATT applies to paragraphs in all draft resolutions that include references to the ATT. We dissociate ourselves from all of them.

Mr. Alsaedi (Libya) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.40, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction”.

My country is not party to the Convention, but it supports the concerns of the international community

about the humanitarian impact of anti-personnel mines and their destruction and the fact that they hinder sustainable development. We need only look at the effects of anti-personnel mines since the Second World War. We are also well aware of the damage caused by occupation. However, the Convention does not make reference to the responsibility that occupying States bear for repairing the damage they have caused and assisting the countries they have colonized. That is why we will vote in favour of this draft resolution.

Mr. Salimi (Morocco): I am taking the floor to explain my delegation’s vote on draft resolution A/C.1/72/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”.

As it has done since 2004, Morocco has decided to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.7/Rev.1, in order to emphasize its support for the Convention’s humanitarian objectives, in particular that of protecting civilians from the unacceptable damage caused by anti-personnel mines. Morocco was an active contributor to the preparatory process of the Ottawa Convention and ratified the amended Protocol II of 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 in March 2002. We have submitted a national report on the implementation of the provisions of the Protocol since 2003.

Morocco applies the provisions of the Ottawa Convention in the field of demining, destruction of stockpiles, outreach and training, and assistance to the victims of anti-personnel mines, and regularly attends the meetings of States parties and the Review Conferences of the Convention. In that regard, I would like to highlight two elements that reflect Morocco’s support for the universal drive to eliminate anti-personnel mines. The first is the outstanding demining efforts of our armed forces, which have enabled the recovery and destruction of thousands of anti-personnel mines, anti-tank mines and unexploded devices. The second is the efforts of the Moroccan authorities to care for victims and address their medical, social and economic rehabilitation needs. We will continue to support countries in the region with demining, as well as in continuing dialogue with non-governmental organizations with the aim of pursuing the goals of the Convention. Morocco’s

accession to the Ottawa Convention is a strategic goal linked to security imperatives while ensuring respect for its territorial integrity.

Ms. Chan Shum (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): The delegation of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela is taking the floor to explain its abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/72.L.27, entitled “The Arms Trade Treaty”.

Venezuela is not party to the Treaty, and the reasons for that decision remain valid. As we have said on previous occasions, from the beginning Venezuela believed that the drafting of the Arms Trade Treaty was unbalanced in both its nature and scope. The Treaty itself is liable to political manipulation and does not include the elements it needs to become a universal instrument. The Treaty does not address the serious problems of the excess production and stockpiling of conventional weapons by the major producers and exporters. It does not recognize the right of all States to acquire, produce, export, import and stockpile conventional weapons for their legitimate defence and security, and ignores the threat posed by the transfers of such weapons to unauthorized non-State actors.

The Treaty also includes a series of criteria that could be used by countries that export conventional weapons to limit other States’ sovereign right to acquire such weapons for their legitimate security and defence needs, and it uses arbitrary and subjective arguments citing putative violations of human rights.

In conclusion, our delegation would like to reiterate that Venezuela is fully committed to preventing, combating and eradicating the illicit trade in conventional weapons. It has always believed that the best way to achieve those goals is through a solid multilateral regime that can result in a balanced, objective and non-discriminatory treaty.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on the draft resolutions under cluster 4.

The Committee will first turn to draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.15/Rev.1, entitled “Countering the threat posed by improvised explosive devices”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.15/Rev.1 was submitted by the representative of Afghanistan on 24 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document

A/C.1/72/L.15/Rev.1. The additional sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.15/Rev.1 are Azerbaijan, the Niger and Ghana.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.15/Rev.1 have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.15/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.16/Rev.1, 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.1/72/L.16/Rev.1 was submitted by the representative of Pakistan on 23 October. The sponsor of the draft resolution is listed in document A/C.1/72/L.16/Rev.1.

I will now read out an oral statement with regard to the draft resolution. The present statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. Under the terms of paragraphs 13 and 14 of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.16/Rev.1, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to render the assistance necessary and to provide such services as may be required for the annual conferences and expert meetings of the High Contracting Parties to the Convention and of the High Contracting Parties to Amended Protocol II and Protocol V, as well as for any continuation of the work after the meetings. It 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 12 and the Protocols.

The Secretary-General wishes to draw the attention of the States Members of the United Nations to the fact that the costs of the annual conferences and expert meetings of the high contracting parties to the Convention and of the high contracting parties to amended Protocol II and Protocol V under the current financial regime would be borne by the high contracting parties and

States not parties to the Convention participating in the meetings, in accordance with the United Nations scale of assessments, adjusted appropriately.

It should be noted that all activities related to international conventions or treaties, which, under their respective legal arrangements, ought to be financed by the States, may be undertaken by the Secretariat only when sufficient funding is received in advance. Furthermore, in line with the established practice, the Secretariat will prepare cost estimates for any continuation of the work after the conferences, for the approval of the high contacting parties. Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.16/Rev.1, no additional requirements would arise under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2018-2019.

The Chair: The sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.16/Rev.1 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.1/72/L.16/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.21, 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.1/72/L.21 was submitted by the representative of Mali, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Economic Community of West African States, on 10 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/72/L.21. The additional sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.21 are the Niger and Uganda.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.21 have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.21 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.27, 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.1/72/L.27 was submitted by the representative of Japan on 11 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/72/L.27. The additional sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.27 are Paraguay, Saint Kitts and Nevis and Guinea.

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, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, 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, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, 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, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Zambia

Against:

None

Abstaining:

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.27 was adopted by 144 votes to none, with 29 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.40, 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.1/72/L.40 was submitted by the representative of Austria on 12 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/72/L.40.

I will now read out an oral statement with regard to the draft resolution, in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraph 10 of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.40, 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 seventeenth 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 seventeenth meeting of the States parties as observers.

In accordance with article 14 of the Convention, the cost of the seventeenth meeting of the States parties would be borne by the States parties and States not parties to the Convention participating therein,

in line with the United Nations scale of assessment, adjusted appropriately. The preliminary cost estimates for servicing the 2018 seventeenth meeting of the States parties will be prepared by the Secretariat and submitted for the approval of the States parties at the sixteenth meeting of States parties, to be held in Vienna from 18 to 21 December.

It is recalled that all activities related to international conventions or treaties, which, under their respective legal arrangements, ought to be financed outside the regular budget of the United Nations, may be undertaken by the Secretariat only when sufficient funding is received in advance from States parties and States not parties participating in the meetings. Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.40, no additional requirements would arise under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2018-2019.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, 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, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland,

Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, 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.1/72/L.40 was adopted by 158 votes to none, with 16 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.41, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.41 was submitted by the representative of Germany on 12 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/72/L.41. The additional sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.41 is Zambia.

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, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica,

Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, Germany, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, 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, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, 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), Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Russian Federation, Zimbabwe

Abstaining:

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.41 was adopted by 134 votes to 2, with 36 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.43, entitled "Problems arising from the accumulation of conventional ammunition stockpiles in surplus".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee) Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.43 was submitted by the representative of Germany on 12 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/72/L.43.

I will now read out an oral statement with regard to the draft resolution. The present statement is made in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraphs 13, 15 and 16 of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.43, the General Assembly would ask the Secretariat to assist States, upon their request, within existing resources, by developing options for such indicators that may serve as voluntary examples for those States interested in adopting additional national, regional and subregional indicators on ammunition management; encourage States to participate in open, informal consultations within the framework of the present draft resolution, focusing on matters of coordination between the various existing initiatives and approaches relating to conventional ammunition management within the United Nations system and beyond, and with a view to identifying those urgent issues pertaining to draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.43 on which progress can be made and that may constitute a basis for convening a group of governmental experts; and request the Secretary-General to convene a group of governmental experts in 2020 on problems arising from the accumulation of conventional ammunition stockpiles in surplus, taking into account discussions in the open, informal consultations.

Pursuant to the requests included in paragraphs 15 and 16, it is envisaged that a group of governmental experts on problems arising from the accumulation of conventional ammunition stockpiles and surplus would hold three sessions, two in New York and one in Geneva, consisting of 10 meetings, each lasting five days over the course of 2020 and 2021. The aforementioned 30 meetings, to last 15 days, would require interpretation in all six languages and would constitute an addition to the meetings' workload of the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management in 2020 and 2021. That would entail additional resource requirements in the amount of \$264,000 for meeting services in 2020-2021. In addition, a provision of \$3,500 would be required for a sound technician and recording services for the meetings in Geneva.

Furthermore, the request for documentation contained in paragraph 16 would constitute an addition to the documentation workload of the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management of six pre-session documents with a total of 18,000 words, six in-session documents with a total of 18,000 words and three post-session documents with a total of 31,000 words, to be issued in all six languages in 2020 and 2021. That would entail additional resource requirements in the amount of \$227,400 for documentation services in 2020 and 2021. In addition, non-conference services requirements for the travel of experts to the above-mentioned three sessions have been estimated at \$607,000.

Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.43, the additional resource requirements in the amount of \$1,101,900 — composed of \$491,400 under section 2, "General Assembly and Economic and Social Council affairs and conference management"; \$607,000 under section 4, "Disarmament"; and \$3,500 under section 29 F, "Administration, Geneva" — would be included in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2020-2021.

With regard to paragraph 13, the attention of the Committee is drawn to the provisions of section VI of resolution 45/248 B, of 21 December 1990, and subsequent resolutions, the latest of which is resolution 70/247, of 23 December 2015, in which 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 underscored the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

That brings me to the end of the oral statement.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.43 have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.43 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.56/Rev.1, 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.1/72/L.56/Rev.1 was submitted by the representative of Japan on 24 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/72/L.56/Rev.1. The main sponsors have informed the Secretariat of the deletion of the ninth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution.

I will now read out an oral statement in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

Under the terms of paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.56/Rev.1, the General Assembly would recall the decision of the second 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, and decide to convene 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 New York from 18 to 29 June 2018, preceded by the meeting of the preparatory committee in New York from 19 to 23 March 2018.

The requirements for the convening of the conference and the preparatory committee meeting envisaged in paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.56/Rev.1 are included in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2018-2019. Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.56/Rev.1, no additional requirements would arise under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2018-2019.

The additional sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.56/Rev.1 are Monaco, Paraguay, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Papua New Guinea and Guinea-Bissau.

The Chair: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.56/Rev.1 have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.56/Rev. 1, as orally revised, was adopted.

The Chair: I shall now give the floor to those delegations that wish to explain their position or vote

following the adoption of the draft resolutions under cluster 4.

Mr. Luque Márquez (Ecuador) (*spoke in Spanish*): Ecuador voted in favour of all resolutions that called for the process that led to the Arms Trade Treaty, and took an active part in its negotiation. Regrettably, it should be noted that the text was finally adopted through a vote by the General Assembly in April 2013 (see A/67/PV.71), after no consensus had been reached in the second conference convened for its negotiation, despite the fact that reaching consensus was very important for some who support the Treaty. The Treaty entered into force with a few shortcomings, specifically the clear imbalance between the rights and obligations of exporters and importers; the importance of the fundamental principles of international humanitarian law and of their inclusion in the Treaty; no mention of an express prohibition of transfers to unauthorized non-State actors; the absence of an explicit reference to the crime of aggression; and the likelihood that the articles on criteria could be used subjectively and with double standards. It is for those reasons that Ecuador abstained in the voting on the Treaty.

As the delegation of Ecuador stated at the time when it explained its position, my country's Government will continue to study the text of the Treaty, its implications and how it will be implemented. We regret the fact that the recent meeting of States parties to the Treaty and other Treaty-related activities lead us to believe that the warning that we issued at the time with regard to the likelihood that the Treaty would be used for political purposes and implemented with double standards was warranted. That should lead to reflection, in particular on the part of the States that were seen to be the Treaty's champions during the negotiations and after its entry into force. That is why my delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.27.

Mr. Hassan (Egypt): I am taking the floor to explain Egypt's vote on two draft resolutions adopted today under cluster 4, "Conventional weapons"

First, Egypt abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.40, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction", because that instrument, which was developed and concluded outside the framework of the United Nations, lacks balance.

Mindful of the humanitarian considerations surrounding landmines, Egypt imposed a moratorium on its capacity to produce and export landmines beginning in the 1980s, long before the conclusion of the Ottawa Convention. We believe that the Convention lacks balance between the humanitarian concerns related to anti-personnel landmines and their legitimate military uses for border protection, particularly in countries that have long borders and deal with exceptional security challenges. Furthermore, the Convention does not make States legally responsible for removing anti-personnel mines that they have placed on the territory of other States, thereby rendering it almost impossible for many States to meet demining requirements on their own. That is particularly true in the case of Egypt, which is one of the countries most affected by this problem, with more than 22 million landmines placed on its territory during the Second World War.

Secondly, Egypt has continued its support to draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.15, entitled “Countering the threat posed by improvised explosive devices”, which attempts to address a significant threat, particularly in countries such as Egypt, where improvised explosive devices are often the preferred weapon of choice for terrorists. In spite of our support for the draft resolution in its entirety and its overall objectives, we would like to place on record some observations about the language used in the twelfth preambular paragraph.

That paragraph introduces a collection of issues and principles that are far removed from the real scope and objectives of the draft resolution from the perspective of disarmament. It adds notions that would sit better in a draft resolution on the root causes of terrorism, and attempts to create cause-and-effect relationships that are very distorted, to say the least. We believe that the whole paragraph undermines the value of the draft resolution and could be misused as a pretext for limiting its implementation through an implicit justification of the use of improvised explosive devices by terrorists. We appreciate the efforts of the delegation of Afghanistan in leading the consultations on the draft resolution, and we look forward to improving it by reviewing the text of that particular paragraph in future.

Mr. Wood (United States of America): My delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.27, entitled “The Arms Trade Treaty”. The United States is conducting standard reviews of various international agreements, including the Arms

Trade Treaty, and, as such, is not in a position to vote in favour of the draft resolution. Our abstention in no way prejudices the outcome of our policy review.

The United States shares the aims of the States parties to the Arms Trade Treaty. We continue to support efforts to improve international standards for regulating the international trade in conventional arms, preventing and eradicating the illicit trade in conventional arms and preventing their diversion. We continue to offer cooperation and assistance to the States Members of the United Nations in order to achieve that objective, including by assisting in the establishment of robust transfer controls and the enhancement of conventional weapons stockpile security and management so as to contribute to international peace and security. We look forward to continuing our engagement with Member States, both parties and non-parties to the Arms Trade Treaty alike, to prevent conventional arms from falling into the wrong hands.

Ms. Bhandari (India): I am taking the floor to explain India’s vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/72/L.27 and A/C.1/72/L.40.

First, with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.27, entitled “The Arms Trade Treaty”, India has strong and effective national export controls on defence items. India fully subscribes to the objective of the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT), and our export control system is broadly aligned to its requirements. As part of its commitment to international transparency measures, India submits an annual report under the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms for the same categories of conventional arms that the ATT regulates. We will continue to keep the ATT under review from the perspective of our defence, security and foreign policy interests. We therefore abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.27, pending that review.

Secondly, with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.40, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction”, India supports the vision of a world free of anti-personnel landmines and is committed to their eventual elimination. The availability of effective alternative technologies that can cost-effectively perform the legitimate defensive role of anti-personnel landmines will considerably facilitate the goal of the complete elimination of such mines. India is a high contracting party to the amended Protocol II of the

Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, which stipulates an approach that takes into account the legitimate defence requirements of States, particularly those with long borders.

India has fulfilled its obligations under the Convention's amended Protocol II, which include stopping the production of non-detectable mines and rendering all of our anti-personnel mines detectable. India is also observing a moratorium on the export and transfer of anti-personnel mines. 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 increased international cooperation and assistance for mine clearance and to 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 Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction, held in Maputo in 2014, as well as the fifteenth meeting of the States parties to the Convention, held in Santiago in 2016.

Ms. Mac Loughlin (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Republic of Argentina abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.41, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions". The Republic of Argentina does not possess such banned weapons and continues to call for their total prohibition, without exceptions, or for their considerable reduction without bias. It is well known that the Republic of Argentina has not yet signed the Convention on Cluster Munitions. We took an active part in the entire negotiation process with a view to adopting an international instrument that would lead to the total prohibition of such weapons and meet high humanitarian standards. However, we believe that the text adopted was not ambitious enough, and that articles 2 and 21 in particular were at variance with the goal of the total prohibition and the principle of non-discrimination. That situation has not changed. Nonetheless, considering that Argentina's vision is of promoting a total ban on such weapons, in line with our national policy on the issue, my country attends the meetings of the States parties to the Convention as an observer.

Ms. Hernández (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): After taking action on all the draft resolutions under cluster 4, "Conventional weapons", my delegation would like to

explain its position on three of them, and may therefore require an additional few minutes to speak.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.43, entitled "Problems arising from the accumulation of conventional ammunition stockpiles in surplus", the Cuban delegation joined the consensus. However, that does not mean that we agree with the entire text. We are concerned about the fact that the text does not include measures that would allow for better management of existing conventional ammunition stockpiles and prevent their diversion to unauthorized non-State actors, who are primarily responsible for the illicit trade in weapons and ammunition. Furthermore, it was not emphasized that the implementation of the kind of measures that are most essential to ensuring better management of existing ammunition stockpiles should be a priority in countries recovering from conflict.

Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.43 calls for the establishment of a group of governmental experts to address the topic, and therefore ignores the repeated calls that have been made for such groups to be an exception rather than a rule. These are security-related issues for States that everyone should be able to discuss in an inclusive manner. A proposal has been made to develop indicators for managing existing ammunition stockpiles, but it ignores the fact that every region and country has its own specific security issues and situations. Efforts should be focused on greater international assistance and cooperation on the issue rather than on assessment indicators.

We must respect the principle of every State's wish and right to determine how to manage its existing ammunition stockpiles in line with its national security requirements. The text of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.43 still includes references to the Arms Trade Treaty, an instrument that is not universally accepted. In our view, this does not help States to work together to pay due and effective attention to the challenges posed by the accumulation of surplus conventional ammunition stockpiles. I would like to conclude this point by underscoring that Cuba maintains and implements a strict and effective national system of ammunition control that is fully in line with our country's legitimate defence needs.

The Cuban delegation also voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.15/Rev.1, entitled "Countering the threat posed by improvised explosive devices". However, our overall support for the draft resolution

does not mean that we agree with the entire text. We believe it will be particularly important to ensure that the scope of its provisions is limited to the use of such devices by terrorists, illegal armed groups and other unauthorized recipients, and we reiterate the inherent right of States to legitimate self-defence, in line with the provisions of Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations. That approach has made the draft resolution acceptable to all States Members of the United Nations. We are concerned about the fact that the draft resolution restricts the transfers of dual-use materials without recognizing the legitimate right of States to have access to such materials. We are also very concerned about the numerous improvised explosive device-related initiatives proposed in paragraphs 25, 26 and 28. It is our view that several of those initiatives duplicate efforts already under way, bearing in mind that this issue is already being addressed by the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons.

With regard to the eighteenth preambular paragraph and paragraph 23, on mines, we believe that this is not the right framework for classifying and defining mines. Classifications and definitions should be considered within the context of the relevant instruments and based on corresponding consensus among all States. Instead of creating new structures and reports, which require additional human and financial resources from States, it would be better to try to make the most effective possible use of existing forums. We stress that measures and the means to implement draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.15/Rev.1 should be in line with the provisions of the United Nations Charter.

The Cuban delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.40, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction". Cuba fully shares the legitimate humanitarian concerns about the indiscriminate and irresponsible use of anti-personnel mines. Our country is a State party to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, including its Additional Protocol II, and fully complies with its provisions on the prohibitions and restrictions on mine use. For more than five decades, Cuba has been subjected to an ongoing policy of hostility and aggression on the part of a military super-Power.

It has therefore not been possible for our country to renounce the use of mines as a way to preserve sovereignty and territorial integrity, in line with the

right of legitimate defence recognized in the United Nations Charter. Cuba will continue to support efforts to maintain the necessary balance between humanitarian issues and national security issues, while striving to eliminate the terrible effects produced on civilian populations and the economies of several countries by the indiscriminate and irresponsible use of anti-personnel mines. Similarly, we join calls for all States to provide the financial, technical and humanitarian support necessary to remove mines and ensure the social and economic rehabilitation of victims.

Mr. Broilo (Poland): I am speaking on behalf of the following countries: Estonia, Finland, Greece, Romania and my own country, Poland, to explain our abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.41, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions. The reasons for our position, which have been outlined in the General Assembly at its past two sessions, have not changed. Let me remind the First Committee of them.

We 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, particularly when they are directed at innocent and defenceless civilians. We believe firmly that respect for relevant international law is crucial to ensuring the protection of civilians in armed conflict. In that regard, we support the humanitarian goal of the Convention on Cluster Munitions.

At the same time, we believe that humanitarian concerns must be balanced with States' legitimate security concerns, as well as their military and defence requirements. 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 covers the main producers, possessors and users of such weapons, as well as non-users. As high contracting parties to the CCW and its five additional protocols, we remain firmly committed to fulfilling all our obligations under the CCW umbrella.

Bearing in mind those reasons, we abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.41.

Ms. Georgiou (Cyprus): I am taking the floor to explain our abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.41, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions".

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

Mr. Saeed (Pakistan): I am taking the floor to explain my delegation's vote on five draft resolutions just adopted by the First Committee under cluster 4, "Conventional weapons".

First, we joined the consensus on the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.15/Rev.1, entitled "Countering the threat posed by improvised explosive devices". We share the concerns about the indiscriminate effects arising from the use of improvised explosive devices by illegal armed groups and terrorists, which has inflicted grave suffering on many Pakistani civilians and security personnel. However, several issues that the draft resolution seeks to address can best be solved through existing frameworks. The Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW), in particular its amended Protocol II, provides the most appropriate forum for considering improvised explosive device-related issues. The CCW forum has the right expertise and technical focus for addressing them in the most effective manner. It also provides pathways for international assistance and cooperation, critical to addressing the challenges associated with improvised explosive devices. While it is important to take measures to prevent access by illegal armed groups or terrorists to explosives and other materials and components that can be used to manufacture improvised explosive devices, it will be crucial to ensure that access to such materials for trade, development, research or for other peaceful purposes is not restricted.

Pakistan voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.27, entitled "The Arms Trade Treaty". Pakistan also voted in favour of resolution 68/31, which adopted the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT). As we continue

our national review of the Treaty, we believe that its success, effectiveness and universality will depend on its non-discriminatory implementation, and in particular on strict adherence by its States parties to the Treaty's principles. The death and destruction caused by the supply and misuse of conventional weapons in several parts of Africa, the Middle East, Asia and elsewhere are very worrying and raise potential concerns about the efficacy of the ATT and other multilateral and regional mechanisms. The rhetoric and reality should be reconciled if the ATT is to gain global public trust and ownership.

My delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.40, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction". Landmines continue to play a significant role in meeting the military needs of many States. Given our security issues and need to guard our long borders, which are not protected by any natural barriers, reliance on landmines is an integral part of Pakistan's defence. Pakistan is a party to the amended Protocol II of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, which regulates the use of landmines in order to protect civilians from their indiscriminate and lethal effects. There are no uncleared mines in Pakistan's territory. We remain committed to ensuring that mines in our military inventory will never become a source of civilian casualties.

Pakistan is one of the countries contributing the largest numbers of troops to United Nations peacekeeping operations. We have successfully undertaken demining operations in various parts of the world and remain committed to providing further assistance to advance global humanitarian demining efforts.

My delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.41, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions". Pakistan participated in the 2015 Review Conference of the Convention on Cluster Munitions (CCM) as a non-signatory observer State. As a matter of principle, Pakistan does not support the conclusion of important international treaties outside the United Nations framework, in particular those related to arms control and disarmament, such as the CCM.

Pakistan believes the multilateral framework of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons is the most appropriate forum for addressing the issue

of cluster munitions. The strength of the CCW lies in its legal framework, which strikes a delicate balance between minimizing human suffering while avoiding sacrificing the legitimate security interests of States. Pakistan took an active and constructive part 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 that negotiating process did not lead to a fruitful outcome.

Although Pakistan has never used cluster munitions in military conflict or internal operations, we consider cluster munitions to be legitimate weapons with recognized military utility. We support international efforts to address the irresponsible and indiscriminate use of cluster munitions and, as such, welcome efforts to mitigate their negative consequences. Strict adherence to international humanitarian law would help address the humanitarian concerns arising from the indiscriminate use of cluster munitions. Pakistan also supports efforts to improve the reliability of cluster munitions so that the issue of explosive remnants of war is adequately addressed.

My delegation joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.43, entitled “Problems arising from the accumulation of conventional ammunition stockpiles in surplus”, and we would like to highlight a few points about the draft resolution.

First, the largest stockpiles of conventional armaments and their ammunition are maintained by the major military Powers. They should therefore take the lead in assessing surplus stockpiles and their safe disposal.

Secondly, such efforts could be supplemented by action at the regional and subregional levels to prevent excessive accumulation, as well as imbalances in conventional armaments and military forces.

Thirdly, while a universal definition of surplus stockpiles of armaments and their ammunition may not be possible, some general guidelines could be developed on the basis of previous work done under the auspices of the United Nations.

Pakistan has been working assiduously to promote the shared goal of conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels. Notwithstanding its current difficulties, the Treaty on Conventional

Arms Forces in Europe represents a good model for a comprehensive approach.

Mr. Giacomelli (Brazil): I would like to explain Brazil’s abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.41, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions”.

Brazil has supported efforts to address cluster munitions within the United Nations, in particular discussions on the adoption of a protocol to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW). We have actively participated in negotiations in the framework of the Group of Governmental Experts on the Convention, whose objective was the adoption of a legally binding instrument that would lead to the gradual prohibition of cluster munitions.

Brazil did not participate in the Oslo process. It is our view that the establishment of a negotiating process parallel 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 a universal, balanced, effective and non-discriminatory arms control instrument. We believe 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. Such mechanisms are present only in munitions manufactured in a small number of countries with more advanced defence industries. The effectiveness of the Convention is also undermined by article 21, known as the interoperability clause.

Brazil is party to the CCW’s Protocol V, on explosive remnants of war. We have never used cluster munitions. The fact that we have not joined the Oslo Convention does not imply that we are not bound by the regulations applicable to the possible use of cluster munitions, which in any case would be subject to international humanitarian law.

Mr. Khant Ko Ko (Myanmar): I am taking the floor to explain my delegation’s position on draft resolutions A/C.1/72/L.40, 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.1/72/L.41, entitled “Implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions”.

In principle, Myanmar supports the provisions of the Mine Ban Treaty and the Convention on Cluster Munitions. We recognize the initiative taken under those instruments to prevent the indiscriminate use of landmines and cluster munitions, which can lead to vulnerability and serious humanitarian impact. We note that it is essential to make an effective, efficient and coordinated contribution to resolving the challenge of removing the anti-personnel mines and cluster munitions scattered throughout the world, and to ensure their destruction. I have to underscore that Myanmar has not signed those Conventions so far. However, the relevant officials in Myanmar are reviewing them to gain a better understanding of them with a view to joining them in future. We therefore abstained in the voting on those draft resolutions this year.

Mr. Masmejean (Switzerland) (*spoke in French*): I am taking the floor to explain Switzerland's position on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.15/Rev.1, entitled "Countering the threat posed by improvised explosive devices".

Switzerland is gravely concerned about the increasing number of humanitarian challenges posed by improvised explosive devices. Preventing the illicit use of improvised explosive devices is crucial. Although we joined the consensus to adopt the draft resolution, my delegation would like to highlight three specific points.

First, in its second preambular paragraph the draft resolution describes non-State actors as "illegal armed groups, terrorists and other unauthorized recipients". Switzerland would like to put it on record that this terminology does not affect rights and obligations under international law, in particular international humanitarian law and human rights law applicable to non-State actors. In that regard, we welcome the inclusion of the sixth preambular paragraph.

Secondly, paragraph 23 raises some concerns. The elimination of improvised explosive devices for humanitarian purposes following a cessation of hostilities falls within the purview of the scope of the International Mine Action Standards (IMAS), which are and should continue to be the chief guidelines for the humanitarian demining of all munitions, including improvised explosive devices. We welcome the efforts made by some Member States within a United Nations framework to develop standards for eliminating improvised explosive devices. The scope of such standards should be limited to protection or security

operations within the framework of United Nations efforts. They should not be applied to humanitarian demining, as that would result in the duplication of IMAS's efforts, create confusion and encroach on the space needed for humanitarian demining activities. We call on the United Nations Mine Action Service and Member States that assist with the development of standards for eliminating improvised explosive devices to hold consultations with a view to developing a clear definition of the scope of such standards.

Lastly, with regard to the eighteenth preambular paragraph, we would like to recall that the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Treaty defines the term "mine" as a munition designed to be placed under, on or near the ground or other surface area and to be exploded by the presence or proximity of a person or vehicle or by contact with them. The provisions of the Convention also refer to improvised explosive devices activated by victims in all States parties to that instrument. We hope that those concerns will be addressed in the draft resolution to be submitted next year.

Ms. Leong (Singapore): I am taking the floor to explain my delegation's vote in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/72/L.40 and A/C.1/72/L.41.

Singapore voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.40. Our position on anti-personnel landmines has been clear. As in previous years, Singapore will continue to support all initiatives against the indiscriminate use of anti-personnel landmines, particularly when they are directed at innocent and defenceless civilians. With that in mind, in 1996 Singapore declared a two-year moratorium on the export of anti-personnel landmines without self-neutralizing mechanisms. In 1998, Singapore expanded the moratorium to include all manner of anti-personnel landmines and extended it indefinitely. We also support the work of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention by regularly attending the meetings of States parties to the Convention.

Singapore also voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.41, as we support initiatives against the indiscriminate use of cluster munitions, particularly when directed at innocent and defenceless civilians. Singapore declared an indefinite moratorium in 2008 on the export of cluster munitions. We also support the work of the Convention on Cluster Munitions by regularly attending the meetings of States parties to the Convention. Like several other countries, Singapore

firmly believes that legitimate security concerns and the right to self-defence of States 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, and we will continue to work with members of the international community to reach a durable and truly global solution.

Mr. Al Habib (Islamic Republic of Iran): I am taking the floor to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/72/L.40, 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.1/72/L.41, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on Cluster Munitions".

First, with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.40, anti-personnel mines have been used irresponsibly during civil wars in various regions of the world, claiming numerous innocent lives, especially of women and children. We welcome every effort to stop that trend. However, the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Treaty focuses mainly on humanitarian concerns and does not take adequate account of the legitimate military requirements of many countries, particularly those with land borders, for responsible and limited use of such mines to defend their territories. Owing to the difficulties of monitoring vast, sensitive areas from permanent guardposts or of establishing effective warning systems, anti-personnel mines therefore unfortunately continue to be an effective way for those countries to ensure minimum border security requirements. While such defensive devices should be used under strict rules in order to protect civilians, more national and international efforts should be made to explore new alternatives to them. My delegation appreciates the objectives of the draft resolution. However, due to our particular concerns and considerations, we abstained in the voting on it.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.41, as a general principle we believe that negotiations on important disarmament issues, such as the security concerns and interests of States, require a balanced and comprehensive approach, a progressive, transparent and all-inclusive process and a consensual decision-making procedure in order to ensure every State's right to security, as well as to ensure that no individual State or group of States can gain advantages over others at any stage, as is stressed in the Final Document of the

first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (resolution A/S-10/4),

We continue to share the view, held by many delegations, that, by bypassing the United Nations disarmament machinery, the process leading to the conclusion of the Convention on Cluster Munitions disregarded the interests and concerns of many States. Circumventing the United Nations disarmament machinery and later agreeing an instrument that was negotiated and concluded in an exclusive process outside that machinery is neither acceptable nor in line with the objectives of the United Nations. We therefore believe that the General Assembly should not encourage or promote such a process. My delegation abstained in the voting on the draft resolution because, first, Iran did not participate in its negotiation and is neither a signatory nor a party to it, and, secondly, we do not want to legitimize instruments that are negotiated outside the framework of the United Nations or that disregard States' principal security concerns and interests.

Finally, I would once again like to stress that we dissociate ourselves from all references to the Arms Trade Treaty in draft resolutions and decisions that the First Committee has already adopted or will adopt this year.

Mr. Hallak (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.27, entitled "The Arms Trade Treaty".

Given the impact of arms trafficking on international peace and security, the Syrian Arab Republic, as a State Member of the United Nations, continues to seek to codify the trade in arms. The impact of such trafficking is best seen through the prism of the suffering in my country. Such suffering has been caused by the bloody actions of terrorist groups that illegally acquire all forms of conventional and non-conventional weapons, munitions and military equipment from Arab, regional and international parties well known to us all. Several of those States are parties to the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT).

My delegation has worked assiduously to conclude a sound treaty on arms trafficking, but not one that can be used to exert pressure on other States, as has occurred with other instruments. Syria has never been opposed to the Treaty. If it had been adopted by the necessary consensus, it would have greatly benefited the international community. However, regrettably, the

ATT has been used to protect the interests of certain States that produce weapons at the expense of the concerns and security of numerous Member States. It was not adopted by consensus and does not take account of the positions and views of many States, including Syria. I will highlight a few points.

First, the Treaty overlooked the proposal by several States, including Syria, for including a reference to foreign occupation. Secondly, it did not include explicit language that absolutely prohibited providing weapons to non-State actors or terrorist groups, especially in view of the terrible suffering of my people and many others caused by such actors and the grave threat they pose to international peace and security. Thirdly, the ATT made no reference to acts of aggression, as defined in resolution 3314 (XXIX), of 1974.

The most serious problem in this regard is the fact that certain States that advocated for the Treaty's adoption have continued to supply arms, munitions and equipment to groups that are on the Security Council's list of terrorist groups — and that those States are now parties to the Treaty. In that regard, they violate their obligations by selling weapons through brokers. In addition, some States that are parties to the Treaty transport and sell weapons and munitions to armed groups linked to well-known terrorist organizations.

In conclusion, my delegation would like to express its reservations on all paragraphs that include references to the ATT in the draft resolutions and decisions that have been or will be adopted by the First Committee.

The Chair: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote or position on the draft resolutions adopted under cluster 4.

The Committee will now turn to cluster 5, "Other disarmament measures and international security". I shall first give the floor to delegations that wish to make general statements or to introduce draft resolutions. Delegations are reminded that general statements are limited to five minutes.

I now give the floor to the representative of India to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.52/Rev.1.

Ms. Bhandari (India): On behalf of my own country, India, and the other sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.52/Rev.1 — Angola, Austria, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brazil, Canada, Croatia, Finland, Germany, Italy, Mauritius, the Netherlands, Sierra Leone, Spain and Switzerland — I would like to thank

all the delegations that showed interest in our initiative on science and technology.

The high-level engagement on this initiative at this session of the First Committee attests to the importance of the issue and the desire of a large number of delegations to seize the moment for a cross-cutting assessment of science and technology developments that could have implications for international security and disarmament efforts. During the course of consultations on the initiative, we received requests from several delegations for some adjustments to the text, chiefly with a view to proceeding step by step, starting with a request to the Secretary-General for a report that would include the views of Member States, among other things, which would enable all interested States and the Secretariat to contribute to this important debate from the outset, with a view to pointing out the potentially most fruitful areas for a future assessment, perhaps by a panel of independent experts, as initially proposed in the draft resolution.

The revised version of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.52, which is before the Committee, reflects those suggestions. We hope that the text will be adopted without a vote and will thereby underscore the potential of an objective science and technology review to contribute to bridging existing divisions on issues of international security and disarmament.

Ms. Sánchez Rodríguez (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): Under cluster 5, "Other disarmament measures and international security", and together with the member States of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries (NAM), Cuba has the honour to be a sponsor of the following draft resolutions on issues that are important to the international community: draft resolutions A/C.1/72/L.30, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development"; A/C.1/72/L.31, entitled "Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control"; and A/C.1/72/L.32, entitled "Promotion of multilateralism in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation".

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.30, we reiterate that disarmament and development are two of the major challenges facing humankind. It is unacceptable that military expenditure stands at \$1.7 trillion while 700 million people live in abject poverty, a total of 815 million people suffer from chronic hunger, 5 million children die each year from diseases

that can be prevented or cured and 758 million adults are illiterate. We reiterate the proposal for creating a United Nations-managed fund to which at least half of current military spending would be allocated, with a view to supporting the development of Member States and achieving the Sustainable Development Goals.

As outlined in draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.31, Member States should strictly adhere to environmental standards as they implement disarmament and arms-control treaties and measures.

We believe that draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.32 is an important contribution to the quest for multilateral, effective and lasting solutions in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation. We ask all delegations to support the draft resolutions submitted by NAM under this cluster. We believe that they will be supported by all delegations and adopted by a majority vote, as in previous years.

Mr. Sparber (Liechtenstein): I am taking the floor to make a general statement on cluster 5, "Other disarmament measures and international security".

Liechtenstein is a consistent and strong advocate for the rule of law at the international level, including in the area of disarmament. Legally binding multilateral instruments are the bedrock of our collective disarmament and non-proliferation efforts. The acquis of international disarmament and non-proliferation obligations comes with tangible collective security gains and has proved its potential for de-escalating and reducing tension time and again. It goes without saying that compliance with such obligations is essential to preserving those security gains and the confidence built as a result. That is why Liechtenstein continues to support and sponsor the draft resolution on compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments, as contained in document A/C.1/72/L.7.

One of the most significant recent achievements in applying the rule of law to the area of disarmament and non-proliferation is the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA). The agreement includes far-reaching safeguards and control measures, including Iran's implementation of its Additional Protocol, which strengthens the existing international legal framework. As the product of painstaking negotiations among the parties and as subsequently endorsed by the Security Council, the agreement also serves as an important showcase of how dedicated diplomatic efforts can

help overcome confrontation and the risk of military clashes. As sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.7, we all have a special responsibility to provide political backing to agreements such as the JCPOA and to unequivocally support full compliance with their terms. That includes supporting those mechanisms that have been created to monitor and ensure compliance in the framework of the International Atomic Energy Agency. Otherwise, we risk undermining the central role of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the authority of the International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards machinery, on which we all rely for our collective security.

The Chair: The Committee will now hear statements from delegations that wish to explain their positions or votes before we take action on the draft resolutions and decision listed under cluster 5.

Mr. Wood (United States of America): I have asked for the floor to offer an explanation of position on two draft resolutions in cluster 5, draft resolutions A/C.1/72/L.30 and A/C.1/72/L.31.

The United States will not participate in the Committee's action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.30, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development". My Government believes that disarmament and development are two distinct issues. Accordingly, we do not consider ourselves bound by the final document of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, adopted in September 1987.

Neither will the United States participate in the action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.31, entitled "Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control". The United States operates under stringent domestic environmental impact regulations for many activities, including the implementation of arms control and disarmament agreements. We see no direct connection between general environmental standards and multilateral arms control as stated in this draft resolution, and do not consider that a matter germane to the First Committee.

Ms. Sánchez Rodríguez (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Cuban delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.7, entitled "Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments".

This year, following recent announcements, the subject of this draft resolution came up frequently during our work in the First Committee. The international community has expressed great concern about lack of commitment to upholding important agreements and has demanded compliance with them. Cuba has always underscored the importance of protecting and strengthening multilateralism and of ensuring the strict observance of all disarmament and non-proliferation agreements. Nonetheless, we believe that draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.7 does not address the issue adequately.

Draft resolutions on this topic are usually adopted by consensus, but the language of this text began being negatively modified as long ago as 2005, undermining its potential for unanimity. The current draft resolution brings us no closer to consensus. On the contrary, it merely reiterates the main shortcomings. The text lacks the cooperation-based approach that should underpin the way in which the topic is addressed. The language was formulated with the specific intention of highlighting non-proliferation to the detriment of disarmament. The number of references to the phrase “States parties”, which appeared until 2005, has continued to decrease and has been completely eliminated from the operative section of the draft resolution.

The draft resolution has still not reinstated the reference to the importance of resolving State compliance issues in accordance with the compliance mechanisms provided for in the relevant agreements, the Charter of the United Nations and international law. Subjective and unilateral assessments of non-compliance and any claim to use them for political purposes would only undermine multilateral efforts to strengthen disarmament and non-proliferation. The role of the United Nations in restoring the integrity of agreements on disarmament, arms limitation and non-proliferation, and in promoting negotiations on those agreements, is marginalized. The draft resolution disregards the basic principle of the indivisibility of compliance with obligations, which was inexplicably eliminated from the text, beginning with resolution 57/86. Based on that principle, all States parties should be encouraged to fully comply with the provisions of agreements. By ignoring it, draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.7 again paves the way for unacceptable interpretations of treaty law, in the sense that it could enable States parties to renounce compliance with some of their treaty obligations.

The draft resolution presupposes non-compliance by States with their obligations and encourages them to take a strategic decision to return to complying with them, despite the fact that the principles of law require a logical sequence of events. Consequently, an appeal to a State in non-compliance to comply should be preceded by a declaration of non-compliance, pursuant to the provisions of each treaty. The text ignores the fact that every treaty and agreement has its own characteristics, modalities and mechanisms that determine the circumstances that can be interpreted as non-compliance. It is therefore counterproductive to attempt to assess and address all cases from a similar angle. It is for those reasons that the Cuban delegation cannot support draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.7 and will abstain in the voting on it.

Mr. In Il Ri (Democratic People’s Republic of Korea): I am taking the floor to explain my delegation’s position before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.7, entitled “Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments”, submitted by the United States.

There are elements in the draft resolution that threaten our interests. The United States made it clear during the thematic discussion that the draft resolution is directed at the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea. My delegation therefore believes that draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.7 would be used for impure political purposes. We totally reject it and confirm that we will vote against it.

Mr. Al Habib (Islamic Republic of Iran): I am taking the floor to explain my delegation’s vote on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.7, entitled “Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments”.

Iran strongly supports the fundamental principle that all States should comply with their respective obligations under the provisions of the treaties to which they are parties. The application of that principle is even more important in the area of disarmament and international security. We stress that compliance with treaty obligations should be decided objectively and in strict accordance with the provisions of the relevant treaties. More important, such judgments should be made only by the relevant, competent international organizations. That is vital to preventing a subjective and unilateral assessment of others’ non-compliance by

any State, usually used as political and foreign policy leverage. We have witnessed politically motivated attempts in the past, and are well aware of current examples. Adopting such an approach would result in unilateralism and undermine the multilaterally agreed verification mechanisms. It should therefore be avoided.

In that context, we note with concern that the central role of the relevant international organizations — the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons and the International Atomic Energy Agency — as the sole competent international bodies for verifying States parties' compliance with certain disarmament and non-proliferation instruments, has been overlooked. We agree with the draft resolution's statement that compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements can help to strengthen international peace and security. However, another important factor in strengthening international peace and security, particularly with regard to international instruments banning weapons of mass destruction, is the universalization of such instruments, which, regrettably, is not reflected in the draft resolution.

The reason for that is crystal clear. Israel is one of the sponsors of the draft resolution, and its principal patron, the United States, is the main sponsor. It is also ironic and paradoxical that Israel, which is not a party to any international instrument banning weapons of mass destruction, is a sponsor of the draft resolution calling for compliance with such treaties. Instead of being hypocritical and preaching to others, Israel should heed the repeated and urgent calls from the international community to accede to all such instruments.

In paragraph 8, the draft resolution urges States not currently in compliance with their respective obligations and commitments to make a strategic decision to return to compliance. We fully support that statement. The first country subject to that call is the draft resolution's lead sponsor, whose non-compliance with its nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation obligations under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and its unequivocal commitment to abolish all its nuclear weapons is well known to everyone in the First Committee. Of course, that is only one example of its non-compliance. It should return to compliance with those obligations, including the total destruction of its chemical weapons.

Although nuclear disarmament is the international community's top priority, for obvious reasons, draft

resolution A/C.1/72/L.7 fails to prioritize it. It is for those and other reasons that my delegation will abstain in the voting on the draft resolution.

Mr. Weisz (France) (*spoke in French*): As the United States representative mentioned in his statement on behalf of France, the United Kingdom and the United States itself in explanation of our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.6, entitled "Taking forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations" (see A/C.1/72/PV.24), France will vote against all draft resolutions that make explicit reference to the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, adopted on 7 July, to which France is opposed. In the First Committee of the General Assembly at its seventy-second session, that includes draft resolutions A/C.1/72/L.6, A/C.1/72/L.17, A/C.1/72/L.18, A/C.1/72/L.19, A/C.1/72/L.28, A/C.1/72/L.45 and A/C.1/72/L.57. In addition, I would like to emphasize that France will continue to voice its opinions on draft resolutions that have been amended this year to include references to the Treaty. Nonetheless, France rejects all texts that include references to the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, in particular draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.32.

The Chair: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolutions under cluster 5.

We turn first to draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.7, entitled "Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.7 was submitted by the representative of the United States on 6 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/72/L.7.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo,

Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, 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, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea

Abstaining:

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.7 was adopted by 165 votes to 1, with 11 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.24, entitled "Objective information on military matters, including transparency of military expenditures".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.24 was submitted by the representative of Romania on 11 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/72/L.24.

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

Under the terms of paragraphs 8 (h), (i) and (j) of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.24, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General, within available resources, to promote international and regional or subregional symposiums and training seminars and to support the development of an online training course by the Office for Disarmament Affairs of the Secretariat, with the financial and technical support of interested States, with a view to explaining the purpose of the standardized reporting system, facilitating the electronic filing of reports and providing relevant technical instructions; to report on experiences gained during such symposiums and training seminars; and to provide, upon request, technical assistance to Member States lacking the capacity to report data and to encourage Member States to voluntarily provide bilateral assistance to other Member States.

The requirements for the implementation of the request contained in paragraph 8 (h) would be carried out within the resources provided under section 4, "Disarmament", of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2018-2019, and by extrabudgetary resources provided by interested States Members of the United Nations. The report requested in paragraph 8 (i) would be part of the annual report of the Secretary-General entitled "Objective information on military matters, including transparency of military expenditures", for which requirements for documentation have been included in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2018-2019. The implementation of the activities envisaged in paragraph 8 (j) would be carried out with extrabudgetary resources provided by interested Member States. Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.24, no additional requirements would arise under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2018-2019.

That brings me to the end of the oral statement.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.24 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.30, entitled “Relationship between disarmament and development”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.30 was submitted by the representative of Indonesia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, on 11 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/72/L.30.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.30 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.31, entitled “Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.31 was submitted by the representative of Indonesia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, on 11 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/72/L.31.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.31 was adopted.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.32, entitled “Promotion of multilateralism in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.32 was introduced by the representative of Indonesia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, on 11 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/72/L.32.

The Chair: *A recorded vote has been requested. A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

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

Against:

Israel, Micronesia (Federated States of), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.32 was adopted by 120 votes to 4, with 49 abstentions.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft decision A/C.1/72/L.44, entitled “Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security”.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/72/L.44 was submitted by the representative of the Russian Federation on 12 October. The sponsors of the draft decision are listed in document A/C.1/72/L.44. The additional sponsors of draft decision A/C.1/72/L.44 are Vanuatu and the Congo.

The Chair: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras,

Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, 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, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Uganda, 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

Ukraine

Draft decision A/C.1/72/L.44 was adopted by 173 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The Chair: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.52/Rev.1, entitled “Role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament.”

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Elliott (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.52/Rev.1 was submitted by the representative of India on 26 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/72/L.52/Rev.1. The additional sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.52/Rev.1 are Sweden and Paraguay.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.52/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chair: I shall now give the floor to those delegations that wish to make statements in explanation of vote or position on the draft resolutions and decision just adopted.

Mr. Luque Márquez (Ecuador) (*spoke in Spanish*): The delegation of Ecuador would like to express its total respect for, and commitment to, disarmament, non-proliferation and arms limitation. Ecuador is a signatory to all international instruments on such issues, including on weapons of mass destruction and conventional weapons. Ecuador understands that the mechanisms facilitating compliance with the commitments undertaken by States under those instruments are outlined in their texts. The delegation of Ecuador is concerned about paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.7, entitled “Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments”, which could be interpreted as a possible justification for the application of unilateral sanctions or actions agreed on by a group of States, outside the framework of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations and in contravention of its Article 2. Ecuador reiterates that it rejects the imposition of sanctions decided on unilaterally with extraterritorial scope, because they are contrary to international law. My delegation therefore abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.7.

Ecuador believes that all parties should comply with agreements and commitments on non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament, as well as all other international covenants, and that any modification or amendment to them can take place only with the consent of each of the parties to those agreements or international commitments, or under the provisions of the relevant international instruments. We reiterate our call to all States to comply with their international agreements and commitments in the areas of non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament, beginning with high-priority nuclear-disarmament instruments, including the provisions of article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

Mr. Saeed (Pakistan): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.7, entitled

“Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments”. We share the view that all States must comply with their obligations arising from the treaties to which they are parties, and that such compliance is essential to regional and global peace, security and stability. However, we would like to underscore that questions of compliance, verification and enforcement must be strictly in accordance with the legal provisions of the relevant applicable treaties and must be addressed within the framework and mechanisms provided by them. We would also like to say that other agreed obligations imply only those obligations that have been undertaken by States voluntarily and in exercise of their sovereignty.

Mr. Wang Chang (China): The Chinese delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.7, entitled “Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments”. I would like to take this opportunity to reiterate China’s position on the issue. *Pacta sunt servanda* — agreements must be kept — is a basic principle of international law. Based on respect for the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, countries should fulfil the treaty obligations and commitments they have undertaken in good faith, in keeping with the provisions of the relevant compliance mechanisms of the non-proliferation, arms-limitation and disarmament treaties to which they are parties. No country may dishonour its international treaty obligations.

It is incumbent on all countries and international organizations to uphold the authority of international legal regimes. It is especially important to ensure the accurate and uniform application of treaties, renounce double standards and refrain from the practice of implementing rules that serve only political purposes and forsaking those that do not. International peace and security would otherwise be adversely affected. What merits special emphasis is the fact that China opposes the use of compliance as a political tool against a particular country. By the same token, we also strongly oppose interference by any country under the pretext of non-compliance in the internal affairs of others, by means of military intervention or the imposition of unilateral sanctions.

Ms. Schneider Calza (Brazil): The Brazilian delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.7, entitled “Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments”, because we believe that

in order to eradicate weapons of mass destruction, all States must fully implement and comply with the relevant agreements on disarmament and non-proliferation, as encouraged to in paragraph 2.

Compliance with treaties must not be selective. As another review cycle of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) is under way, Brazil would like to reiterate the importance of full compliance with article VI, by which the nuclear-weapon States undertook to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures aimed at bringing a speedy end to the nuclear arms race, achieving nuclear disarmament and a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control. It is our view that the compliance deficit harms the integrity of the NPT regime and jeopardizes the success that has been achieved in the field of non-proliferation. We also believe that effective verification mechanisms constitute an essential aspect of compliance with relevant disarmament and non-proliferation agreements.

Although the draft resolution's seventh preambular paragraph recognizes that verification and compliance are inextricably linked, Brazil believes that it could have benefited from bolder language with regard to the importance of verification mechanisms for non-proliferation and disarmament agreements.

We would also like to take this opportunity to lament the fact that some States parties to the Biological Weapons Convention are still not in a position to resume negotiations on a universal legally binding and non-discriminatory verification protocol.

Lastly, in paragraph 6 of the draft resolution, my delegation would have preferred the language of resolution 66/49, which stipulates that the United Nations should play an active role in fostering negotiations on disarmament and non-proliferation agreements.

Ms. Chan Shum (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela): The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.7, entitled "Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments", as just adopted.

For Venezuela, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, particularly nuclear weapons, requires that States Members of the United Nations honour their obligations under legally binding instruments. Our

delegation abstained in the voting on the draft resolution submitted by the United States because it is unbalanced and subjective in its approach to full compliance in the areas of non-proliferation and disarmament. In that regard, the text does not adequately reflect the responsibilities of some nuclear-weapon States with regard to non-compliance with their obligations in the area of non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament. Nor does it address concerns about weapons of mass destruction generally and nuclear weapons in particular.

Lastly, Venezuela reiterates its commitment to adopting multilateral measures leading to the total elimination of nuclear weapons, pursuant to article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and other relevant legal instruments.

Mr. Mahomed (South Africa): I am taking the floor to explain South Africa's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/72/L.7, entitled "Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements and commitments".

South Africa voted in favour of the draft resolution, given our belief that compliance with disarmament, non-proliferation and arms-control obligations and related commitments is critical to maintaining confidence in the multilateral system and among parties to such agreements. It is only when all States have confidence in the compliance of others that a climate of cooperation and trust can become a reality. In that regard, we remain deeply concerned about the selective focus of some States on certain preferred aspects of international agreements in the realm of disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control.

Such selectivity not only causes an imbalance in the implementation of such instruments, it also leads to divisions and distrust among parties that could undermine the integrity of such instruments. We regret that the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which remains the cornerstone of the nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation regime, has been subjected to such stress. We therefore call on all States parties to honour their obligations and related commitments in a non-discriminatory manner. Efforts to reinterpret or treat certain obligations as aspirational elements will serve only to divide States parties and undermine the integrity of vital international instruments.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.