

26/10/2004



## Press Release GA/DIS/3286

---

Fifty-ninth General Assembly  
First Committee  
17<sup>th</sup> Meeting (PM)

### **HAGUE CODE OF CONDUCT AGAINST BALLISTIC MISSILE PROLIFERATION**

### **WELCOMED IN TEXT APPROVED BY DISARMAMENT COMMITTEE**

### **One of Seven Drafts Approved for General Assembly Action**

(Issued on 27 October 2004.)

Concerned about the increasing security challenges caused by the ongoing proliferation of ballistic missiles capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction, the General Assembly would welcome the adoption of The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation and invite all States to subscribe to it, according to one of seven drafts approved today by the First Committee (Disarmament and International Security).

The draft resolution on The Hague Code of Conduct was approved by a recorded vote of 137 in favour to 2 against (Egypt, Iran), with 16 abstentions, as the Committee began its phase of action on all draft resolutions and decisions. (For details of the vote, see Annex VII.)

The Committee has organized its draft texts into subject “clusters” and this afternoon it approved many of the texts in its cluster concerning nuclear weapons.

The draft on The Hague Code of Conduct prompted debate in the Committee today after the representative of Chile, who had introduced the draft, announced that the text was not open to amendments. Declaring that delegations, of course, had the right to submit them, he, nevertheless, stated that the 114 co-sponsors had decided the Committee should act on the text in its original form, and that, therefore, any time spent on proposing changes would be a waste.

The representative of Iran responded that the decision to reject amendments was not one for the co-sponsors to make. That right belonged to the Committee. He later added that the fact that the text had not been open to any modifications went against the democratic spirit of the United Nations. He also criticized the fact that it had been drafted behind closed doors and presented to the Committee in a “take it or leave it” manner.

The speaker from Oman said he had supported the language of the draft resolution, and had come to today’s meeting with the intention of voting in favour of it. Nevertheless, after witnessing the Chilean’s delegation complete lack of flexibility and inability to behave in an amicable fashion, he had decided to abstain from the vote.

In the end, the Committee did have an opportunity to consider the amendments proposed by the Iranian delegation. By the first amendment, to preambular paragraph 7 would have been added the words “development and” and “in a comprehensive manner” so that the entire segment read “Mindful of the need to combat the development and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery, in a comprehensive

manner". The amendment was rejected by a recorded vote of 21 in favour to 103 against, with 8 abstentions (Belarus, Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Mauritius, Nepal, Philippines, Russian Federation, Singapore). (See Annex IV.)

The second amendment would have added the word "first" to operative paragraph 1, making the segment read, "Welcomes the adoption of The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation on 25 November 2002 at The Hague as a first practical step against the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery." It was rejected by a recorded vote of 17 in favour to 104 against, with 10 abstentions (Belarus, Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Guinea-Bissau, India, Mauritius, Nepal, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand) (Annex V).

The final amendment would have inserted the United Nations into operative paragraph 4, so that the whole phrase read, "encourages the United Nations to explore further ways and means to deal effectively with the problem of ballistic missiles capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction". It was rejected by a recorded vote of 23 in favour to 103 against, with 6 abstentions (Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Guinea-Bissau, Mauritius, Singapore, Thailand) (Annex VI).

Concerns related to missiles extended into discussions on a second draft resolution on the topic, entitled "Missiles", which was approved by a recorded vote of 98 in favour to 2 against (Israel, United States), with 60 abstentions (Annex VIII).

Speaking in explanation of his vote, the representative of Cuba said he had voted in favour because he was convinced that the United Nations was the appropriate forum for dealing with missiles, and that measures in the disarmament and arms control arena should not focus exclusively on horizontal proliferation. He also expressed the belief that greater involvement from developing countries could contribute to more open and productive discussions.

On the other hand, the speaker from the Netherlands said, on behalf of the European Union, that he had abstained from the vote, since he was not convinced that another panel of governmental experts, as proposed by the draft resolution, would be helpful.

The following additional drafts were also approved by recorded votes: a United Nations conference on eliminating nuclear dangers, 119 in favour to 6 against (France, Israel, Monaco, Poland, United Kingdom, United States), with 41 abstentions (Annex I); a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, 111 in favour to 46 against, with 12 abstentions (Annex II); and reducing nuclear danger, 106 in favour to 46 against, with 16 abstentions (Annex III).

By several texts approved without a vote, the Assembly would: include in the provisional agenda for its sixtieth session an item on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia; and urge all parties directly concerned to consider seriously taking the practical and urgent steps required for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

Also today, the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, Nobuyasu Abe, introduced a booklet to the Committee, which, among other things, contains the Advisory Board's report to the Secretary-General.

The Committee will meet again at 3 p.m. Wednesday, 27 October, to continue taking action on all drafts texts.

### Background

When the First Committee (Disarmament and International Security) met this afternoon to begin its third and final phase of work, namely action on all draft resolutions and decisions, it had before it texts related to nuclear weapons, other weapons of mass destruction, outer space, conventional weapons, confidence-building measures, disarmament machinery, and other disarmament measures.

Expected to be acted on under cluster 1, which concerns nuclear weapons, are drafts on: missiles; a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia; a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East; a United Nations conference to identify ways of eliminating nuclear dangers; a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons; reducing nuclear danger; the Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation; and bilateral strategic nuclear arms reductions.

Action is also expected on a draft from cluster 2, which deals with other weapons of mass destruction. That draft concerns the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction (Chemical Weapons Convention). From cluster 3, outer space, action is expected on the draft resolution on prevention of an outer space arms race. The Committee is also expected to take up a draft decision from cluster 4, conventional weapons, on problems arising from the accumulation of conventional ammunition stockpiles in surplus.

From cluster 6, which concerns confidence-building measures, action is expected on the following two drafts: activities of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa; and information on confidence-building measures in the field of conventional arms. A draft on the report of the Disarmament Commission, from cluster 7, disarmament machinery, is also expected to be acted upon.

The Committee is also expected to take up three drafts from cluster 8, which deals with other disarmament measures. Those documents involve: developments in information and telecommunications; national legislation on transfers of arms, military equipment, and dual-use goods and technology; and the United Nations Disarmament Information Programme.

### Draft Summaries

#### Cluster 1

By the terms of a resolution on missiles (document A/C.1/59/L.6), sponsored by Egypt, Indonesia and Iran, the Assembly would request the Secretary-General to prepare a report, with the support of qualified consultants and the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research, as appropriate, taking into account the views expressed by Member States, to contribute to the United Nations endeavour to address the issue of missiles by identifying areas where consensus could be reached, and to submit that report to the General Assembly during its sixtieth session.

It would also request the Secretary-General, with the assistance of a Panel of Governmental Experts, to be established in 2007, to further explore ways and means to address, within the United Nations, the issue of missiles, including identifying areas where consensus could be reached, and to submit a report for consideration by the General Assembly at its sixty-third session.

A draft decision on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia (document A/C.1/59/L.7), sponsored by Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan, would have the Assembly decide to include in the provisional agenda for its sixtieth session an item on that subject.

A draft resolution on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East (document A/C.1/59/L.8), sponsored by Egypt, would have the Assembly urge all parties directly concerned to consider seriously taking the practical and urgent steps required for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly. To promote that objective, the Assembly would invite the countries concerned to adhere to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). It would also call on countries of the region that had not done so, pending the establishment of the zone, to agree to place all their nuclear activities under International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards.

By further terms, the Assembly would invite all countries of the region, pending the establishment of the zone, to declare their support for establishing such a zone and to deposit those declarations with the Security Council. It would also invite those countries, pending establishment, not to produce, test or otherwise acquire nuclear weapons or permit the stationing on their territories, or territories under their control, of nuclear weapons or

nuclear explosive devices. Additionally, the Assembly would invite nuclear-weapon States and all other States to render their assistance in the establishment of the zone and at the same time refrain from any actions that ran counter to both the letter and the spirit of the present resolution.

A draft decision sponsored by Mexico on a United Nations conference to identify ways of eliminating nuclear dangers in the context of nuclear disarmament (document A/C.1/59/L.15) would have the Assembly decide to include an item on that topic in the provisional agenda of its sixtieth session.

By a draft resolution entitled “Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons” (document A/C.1/59/L.29), the Assembly would reiterate its request to the Conference on Disarmament to commence negotiations in order to reach agreement on such an instrument.

The draft resolution is sponsored by Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Egypt, Fiji, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Jordan, Kenya, the Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libya, Malaysia, Mauritius, Myanmar, Nepal, the Sudan, Viet Nam and Zambia.

Considering that the hair-trigger alert of nuclear weapons carried unacceptable risks of unintentional or accidental use of nuclear weapons, which would have catastrophic consequences for all mankind, the General Assembly would call for a review of nuclear doctrines and, in that context, immediate and urgent steps to reduce the risks of unintentional and accidental use of nuclear weapons, by a text entitled “Reducing nuclear danger” (document A/C.1/58/L.304).

The Assembly would request the five nuclear-weapon States to take measures towards implementation of that provision and call upon all Member States to take the necessary measures to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons in all its aspects and to promote nuclear disarmament, with the objective of eliminating nuclear weapons.

The Secretary-General would be requested, among other things, to intensify efforts and support initiatives that would contribute towards the full implementation of the recommendations identified in the report of the Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters (document A/56/400) that would significantly reduce the risk of nuclear war.

[Those recommendations are: de-alerting nuclear weapons; review of nuclear doctrines; further reduction of tactical nuclear weapons as an integral part of the nuclear arms reduction and disarmament process; enhancing security at a global and a regional level by promoting increased transparency of all nuclear weapons programmes; and creating a climate for implementing nuclear disarmament measures.]

The draft resolution is sponsored by Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cuba, Fiji, Haiti, India, Jordan, Kenya, Lesotho, Libya, Malaysia, Namibia, the Sudan, Viet Nam and Zambia.

Concerned about the increasing security challenges caused by the ongoing proliferation of ballistic missiles capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction, the Assembly would welcome the adoption of the Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation, according to a draft resolution about the Code (document A/C.1/59/L.50). By a further term, the Assembly would invite all States that had not yet done so to subscribe to the Code.

The draft is sponsored by Albania, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, the Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, the Congo, Costa Rica, Cote d’Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (federated States of), Monaco, Morocco, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova,

Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, the United Kingdom, the United Republic of Tanzania, the United States, Uruguay, Venezuela and Zambia.

A draft resolution on bilateral strategic nuclear arms reductions and the new strategic framework (document A/C.1/59/L.56), sponsored by the Russian Federation and the United States, would have the Assembly welcome the entry into force of the Treaty on Strategic Offensive Reductions (Moscow Treaty). It would also recognize specific steps taken by the Russian Federation and the United States to reduce their deployed strategic warheads.

The Assembly would also note with approval that, since the end of the Cold War, the Russian Federation and United States had halted the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons, and had committed to eliminate excess fissile material resulting from the dismantlement of weapons no longer needed for national security.

### Cluster 2

Under the terms of a draft resolution submitted by Poland on implementing the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction (Chemical Weapons Convention) (document A/C.1/59/L.16), the Assembly would underline that the Convention and its implementation contributed to enhancing international peace and security. It would emphasize that its full, universal and effective implementation would further contribute to that purpose by excluding completely, for the sake of all humankind, the possibility of the use of chemical weapons.

The Assembly would stress the importance to the Convention that all possessors of chemical weapons, chemical weapons production facilities or chemical weapons development facilities, including previously declared possessor States, should be among the States parties to the Convention, and welcomed progress to that end.

It would urge all States parties to the Convention to meet in full and on time their obligations and to support the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) in its implementation activities.

### Cluster 3

According to the draft resolution on the prevention of an arms race in outer space (document A/C.1/59/L.36), the Assembly, recognizing that the prevention of an outer space arms race would avert a grave danger for international peace and security, would reaffirm the importance and urgency of preventing such an arms race and the readiness of all States to contribute to that common objective.

The Assembly would reaffirm its recognition that the legal regime applicable to outer space did not, in and of itself, guarantee the prevention of an outer space arms race, that the regime played a significant role in the prevention of an arms race in that environment, that there was a need to consolidate and reinforce that regime and enhance its effectiveness and that it was important to comply strictly with existing agreements, both bilateral and multilateral.

It would call on all States, in particular those with major space capabilities, to contribute actively to the peaceful use of outer space and of the prevention of an arms race there and to refrain from actions contrary to that objective and to the relevant existing treaties in the interest of maintaining international peace and security and promoting international cooperation.

The Conference on Disarmament would be invited to establish an ad hoc committee, as early as possible, during its 2005 session.

The draft resolution is sponsored by Algeria, Bangladesh, Brunei Darussalam, China, Cote d'Ivoire, Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the Dominican Republic, Egypt, Indonesia, Iran, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Libya, Malaysia, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Yemen and Zambia.

#### Cluster 4

By a draft decision on problems arising from the accumulation of conventional ammunition stockpiles in surplus (document A/C.1/59/L.48), sponsored by Bulgaria, France and the Netherlands, the Assembly would decide to include the topic as an item in the provisional agenda of its sixtieth session.

#### Cluster 6

A draft resolution on the activities of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa (document A/C.1/59/L.3) would have the Assembly reaffirm its support for efforts aimed at promoting confidence-building measures at regional and subregional levels, in order to ease tensions and conflicts in Central Africa and to further peace, stability and sustainable development in the subregion.

The Assembly would also emphasize the need to make the early-warning mechanism in Central Africa operational so that it would serve as an instrument for analysing and monitoring political situations in the States members of the Standing Advisory Committee and as a technical body through which the Member States would carry out the Committee's programme of work, adopted in 1992. It would also appeal to Member States and organizations to make additional voluntary contributions to support the Committee's work.

The draft resolution is sponsored by Burundi, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Chad, the Congo, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Equatorial Guinea and Gabon.

A draft resolution on information on confidence-building measures in the field of conventional arms (document A/C.1/59/L.52) would have the Assembly welcome confidence-building measures in that field already undertaken by Member States, as well as the information on such measures voluntarily provided. It would encourage Member States to continue to adopt and provide information on confidence-building measures and to also engage in a dialogue on such measures. It would, in addition, request the Secretary-General to establish with the financial support of States in a position to do so, an electronic database containing information provided by Member States and to assist them, at their request, in the organization of seminars, courses and workshops aimed at enhancing the knowledge of new developments in the field.

The draft resolution is sponsored by Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Bangladesh, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, the Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Kenya, Liberia, Latvia, Lithuania, Madagascar, Malawi, Malta, Mexico, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, the United Kingdom, the United States, the United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela and Zambia.

#### Cluster 7

A draft resolution on the report of the Disarmament Commission (document A/C.1/59/L.42) would have the Assembly reaffirm the role of the Commission as the specialized, deliberative body within the United Nations multilateral disarmament machinery that allowed for in-depth deliberations on specific disarmament issues, leading to the submission of concrete recommendations.

The Assembly would also request the Commission to meet for a period, not exceeding three weeks, during 2005, namely, from 18 July to 5 August.

The draft is sponsored by Bosnia and Herzegovina, Costa Rica, Cote d'Ivoire, Georgia, Ireland, Israel, Peru, the Republic of Korea and Uzbekistan.

#### Cluster 8

A draft resolution on developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security (document A/C.1/59/L.2/Rev.1), sponsored by the Russian Federation, would have the Assembly call upon Member States to promote further at multilateral levels the consideration of existing and potential threats in the field of information security, as well as possible measures to limit the threats emerging in this field, consistent with the need to preserve the free flow of information.

A draft resolution on national legislation on transfer of arms, military equipment and dual use goods and technology (document A/C.1/59/L.5), sponsored by the Netherlands, would have the Assembly invite Member States in a position to do, without prejudice to the provisions contained in Security Council resolution 1540 (2004) of 28 April 2004, to enact or improve national legislation, regulations and procedures to exercise effective control over the transfer of arms, military equipment and dual use goods and technology, while ensuring that such legislation, regulations and procedures were consistent with the obligations of States parties under international treaties.

The Assembly would also encourage Member States to provide, on a voluntary basis, information to the Secretary-General on their national legislation, regulations and procedures on the transfer of arms, military equipment and dual use goods and technology.

By the terms of the draft resolution on United Nations Disarmament Information Programme (document A/C.1/59/L.51) the Assembly would take note with appreciation of the report of the Secretary General on that topic.

The Assembly would recommend that the programme continue to inform, educate and generate public understanding of the importance of multilateral action and support for it, including action by the United Nations and the Conference on Disarmament, in the field of arms limitation and disarmament, in a factual, balanced and objective manner, focusing on: continuing to publish the Yearbook in all official languages and posting the 2002 and 2003 English editions on the Internet; continuing to maintain the Disarmament Internet Web site as part of the United Nations web site and producing new versions of the site in as many official languages as feasible; continuing to intensify interaction with the public, principally non-governmental organizations and research institutes, to help further an informed debate on topical issues of arms limitations, disarmament and security; and continuing to organize discussions on topics of interest in the field of arms limitation and disarmament.

The Assembly would, in addition, invite Member States to make contributions to the Voluntary Trust Fund for the United Nations Disarmament Information Programme with a view to sustaining a strong outreach programme.

The draft resolution is sponsored by Argentina, Armenia, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala, Indonesia, Liberia, Mexico, Myanmar, New Zealand, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines and South Africa.

#### Statements

YURI ARIEL GALA-LOPEZ (Cuba) said that a number of the draft resolutions under the first cluster made reference to the NPT and the treaty banning of nuclear weapons in Latin America and Caribbean or the Tlatelco Treaty. His country rejected the selective application to the NPT. Cuba had taken additional steps that reflected its readiness to comply with both treaties. It had made detailed reference in the general debate to its commitment. Cuba would continue on ad hoc basis to evaluate how it would vote on the various draft resolutions. Achieving complete nuclear disarmament under strict international verification system was a priority.

MOHAMED ISSA ABUSHAHAB (United Arab Emirates) said nuclear disarmament continued to be the Committee's primary concern, especially since some States insisted on maintaining their nuclear arms, and others attempted to develop their arsenals to make them even deadlier. Deeply concerned about some countries' non-compliance with the NPT, he attached great importance to efforts aimed at strengthening global disarmament and non-proliferation regimes. Focusing on his own region, he renewed his call to the international community to help establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East and Arabian Gulf. He also called on Israel to dismantle its dangerous nuclear facilities after subjecting them to inspections by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), and requested other States seeking to pursue such weapons to refrain from doing so.

In that regard, he urged all delegations to support the two draft resolutions on his region, namely on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East (document A/C.1/59/L.8) and the risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East (document A/C.1/59/L.37). Those two texts reflected the sense that peace, security, stability, and sustainable development were the legitimate rights of all peoples everywhere.

#### Action on Texts

Speaking before the vote, the representative of Israel said that his country had joined the consensus on draft resolution on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East (document A/C.1/59/L.8), as it had done for over 20 years, notwithstanding substantive and important reservations regarding certain elements in it. The policy of Israel had always maintained that the nuclear issue, as well as all regional security issues, conventional and non-conventional, should be dealt with in the context of the peace process.

His country supported the eventual establishment of a mutually verifiable nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East that should also be free of chemical and biological weapons, as well as ballistic missiles. It believed that the political realities in the region mandated a practical step-by-step approach. That should begin with modest confidence building measures followed by establishment of peaceful relations and reaching reconciliation, and possibly, complemented by conventional and non-conventional arms control measures. That process could eventually lead to more ambitious goals, such as establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

As the international community had recognised, the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone should be based on arrangements freely arrived at among all the States in the region concerned. Such a zone could be established through negotiations between States in a region, after they had recognized each other and had established full peaceful relations. It could not be established in situations where some States maintained that they were in a state of war with each other, refused in principle to maintain peaceful relations with his country or even recognise his country's right to exist. There were continuing threats in the region and beyond against the very existence of Israel. Those threats were multiplied by the reckless behaviour of some States concerning weapons of mass destruction related technologies and discrepancies between the commitments of those States and their actual behaviour.

The representative of Germany, on the decision on a United Nations conference to identify ways of eliminating nuclear dangers in the context of nuclear disarmament (document A/C.1/59/L.15), said that his country sympathized with the concerns about the slow pace of progress on the proposal to convene the United Nations Conference and reaffirmed his country's determination to contribute to the implementation of article VI of the NPT. His country stressed the need for full implementation of certain practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to implement that article, as agreed at the 2000 NPT Review Conference. It considered the pursuit of that objective of key importance. It was also of the utmost urgency to overcome deadlock in work of Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. Germany, however, did not feel that it was appropriate at this juncture to hold a conference to identify ways of eliminating nuclear danger. Thus, Germany was not in a position to support the draft decision. It had, however, decided not to vote against it, but to abstain.

The Committee took up the draft decision on establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia (document A/C.1/59/L.7). It was approved without a vote.

Turning to the draft resolution on establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East (document A/C.1/59/L.8), the Committee also approved it without a vote.

The Committee then took up the draft decision on a United Nations conference to identify ways of eliminating nuclear dangers in the context of nuclear disarmament (document A/C.1/59/L.15). The text was approved by a recorded vote of 119 in favour to 6 against (France, Israel, Monaco, Poland, United Kingdom, United States), with 41 abstentions (Annex I).

Taking up the draft resolution on a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons (document A/C.1/59/L.29), the Committee approved it by a recorded vote of 111 in favour to 46 against, with 12 abstentions (Annex II).

Acting on the draft resolution on reducing nuclear danger (document A/C.1/59/L.30), the Committee approved it by a recorded vote of 106 in favour to 46 against, with 16 abstentions (Annex III).

The Committee then turned to the draft resolution on the Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation (document A/C.1/59/L.50).

After the representatives of Iran and Egypt raised some questions on amendments to the draft, the representative of Chile said the text was not open to amendments. Delegations had the right to submit them, he added, but the 114 co-sponsors had decided the Committee should act on the text in its original form.

The representative of Iran said the decision to reject amendments was not one for the co-sponsors to make; that right belonged to the Committee. At the same time, however, the representative of Chile advised the Committee not to waste its time, since the amendments would be dismissed by the co-sponsors anyway.

The representative of Egypt, supported by the representative of Iran, proposed suspending the meeting for five minutes of consultations, with the representative of Chile speaking out against that proposal. Nevertheless, the Chairman decided to allow the suspension.

Following the resumption of the meeting, the representative of Iran proposed the following amendments to the draft resolution on the Code Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation (document A/C.1/59/L.50) and requested separate votes on those amendments:

The seventh preambular paragraph: add the words “development and” before the word “proliferation” in first line and add “in a comprehensive manner” at the end of the paragraph, to now read “Mindful of the need to combat the development and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery”;

Operative paragraph 1: add the word “first” before the word “practical” in line 2, to now read, “welcomes the adoption of the Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation on 25 November 2002 at the Hague as a first practical step against the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery”; and

Operative paragraph 4: change the word “exploration” in line 1 to “United Nations to explore” after the word “encourages” to now read, “encourages the United Nations to explore further ways and means to deal effectively with the problem of ballistic missiles capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction”.

The representative of Chile, speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that there had been a delicate balance in conceptual terms in preparing the draft text. The proposed amendments upset that balance. That was why his delegation did not support it.

The proposed amendment to the seventh preambular paragraph was rejected by a recorded vote of 21 in favour to 103 against, with 8 abstentions (Belarus, Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Mauritius, Nepal, Philippines, Russian Federation, Singapore) (Annex IV).

The proposed amendment to operative paragraph 1 was rejected with a recorded vote of 17 in favour to 104 against, with 10 abstentions (Belarus, Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Guinea Bissau, India, Mauritius, Nepal, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand) (Annex V).

The proposed amendment to operative paragraph 4 was rejected with a recorded vote of 23 in favour to 104 against, with 6 abstentions (Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Guinea-Bissau, Mauritius, Singapore, Thailand) (Annex VI).

Speaking in explanation of his vote, before the vote on the original draft on The Hague Code of Conduct (document A/C.1/59/L.50), the representative of Brazil said he had observed growing global adherence to the Code, but had also recognized the need to “discipline” it. Lamenting that the Code did not address technological developments vis-à-vis the peaceful use of outer space, especially with respect to satellite-launching vehicles, he expressed disappointment with the way in which negotiations on the instrument were conducted. Declaring that those negotiations should have featured more debates, he said he expected the international community to continue work on a non-discriminatory instrument on missiles. He added that he would abstain in the upcoming vote on the draft in its original form.

The representative of Cuba, also explaining his vote before the vote, said that, in 2002, his country had actively participated in meetings on The Hague Code of Conduct. However, he had been disturbed by the lack of transparency in negotiations, and the fact that the process leading towards adoption had taken place outside the United Nations. In that regard, he stressed that the manner in which the Code was adopted must not set a precedent for future international negotiations on disarmament and non-proliferation.

He added that, because the parties who had drafted the instrument had been unprepared to accept substantive changes to the text, the Code did not appropriately reflect the main interests of a major group of countries. For example, it did not address the peaceful use of missile technology or the need for cooperation in that realm. In that regard, he told delegates that socio-economic development was not just the privilege of a few countries, but rather something to which all humankind was entitled.

Lamenting that the Code’s scope was limited to horizontal proliferation, he emphasized that missile proliferation was just one part of a larger problem. In that context, nuclear disarmament had to also be addressed. He concluded by declaring that, since the Code was not a product of multilateralism, his delegation would abstain from the vote.

The representative of Oman said he supported the language of the draft resolution. However, he criticized the fact that the Code had been negotiated in a non-transparent manner outside the auspices of the United Nations. He then added that, having come to the present meeting intending to vote in favour of the draft, he had changed his mind, after witnessing the Chilean’s delegation complete lack of flexibility and inability to behave in an amicable fashion. He would, therefore, abstain from the vote.

The representative of India said that, although his delegation would abstain, his country would continue to maintain its exemplary record in non-proliferation. He also stated that, because he believed in transparent, equitable and non-discriminatory procedures, which involved all countries, he could not support exclusivist, ad hoc, club-based approaches.

The representative of Indonesia added that he would abstain because he did not want his country’s national security interests to be compromised. In that context, he said he preferred any negotiations on missiles to be multilateral and within the auspices of the United Nations.

The representative of Mexico said she would abstain because negotiations on missiles should be the product of extensive negotiations involving all countries wishing to participate, and faithfully reflect the views of all

States. She also criticized the fact that The Hague Code of Conduct did not address the issue of missiles in all its aspects, but rather dealt with the theme in a selective manner. It did not, for example, even touch upon disarmament approaches or international cooperation for peaceful purposes. Noting that her country's inputs had never been taken into account during negotiations leading to the Code's adoption, she reaffirmed the need for all Member States to be involved in such processes.

The representative of Pakistan said he would abstain because, due to the complexity of the issue, missiles had to be addressed in a multilateral forum, so that the views and concerns of all countries could be taken on board. In that regard, he noted that the Code, given the ad hoc nature of its negotiations, had not gained the acceptance of several missile-possessing States. Additionally, his country, which was obliged to respond to the missile threat in his region, had security concerns that had never been addressed. He noted that, if some effort had been made to involve other countries, the draft at hand might have received more support today.

The Committee then approved the draft on The Hague Code of Conduct (document A/C.1/59/L.50) by a recorded vote of 137 in favour to 2 against (Egypt, Iran), with 16 abstentions (Annex VII).

The representative of Egypt said, in his explanation after the vote, that his country had supported active United Nations involvement in addressing the issue of missiles because it believed that the United Nations was the appropriate forum for addressing such issues. Since receiving the first draft of regarding The Hague Code of Conduct, Egypt had expressed concerns that there was a lacuna. Egypt was concerned about the lack of comprehensive scope of that document. It addressed missiles, but did not address cruise missiles and did not address the continued development of nuclear weapons. It also did not address the issue of missiles in a comprehensive manner. Egypt had supported the amendments that had been proposed to the draft resolution, because it wished to see a balance in that draft. It had, however, noted the overwhelming vote against the any further United Nations involvement in that issue. That development was regrettable. For those reasons, his country voted against the draft resolution.

The draft resolution on missiles (document A/C.1/59/L.6/Rev.1) was approved by a recorded vote of 98 in favour to 2 against (Israel, the United States), with 60 abstentions (Annex VIII).

Speaking in explanation of his vote, the representative of Cuba said that his country voted in favour of the draft resolution. Cuba was convinced that the United Nations was the appropriate forum for dealing with missiles in all its aspects and was opposed to having measures in the disarmament arena and arms control focus exclusively in non-proliferation. Such measures needed to take into account all the aspects of proliferation, both vertical and horizontal. His country was convinced that greater involvement of developing countries in the work of the governmental group of experts under the draft resolution would contribute to the process that was envisaged. The work of that group should emphasise the need to also deal with high precision cruise missiles with conventional high explosive warheads. Cuba would be looking forward to the report to be submitted by the Secretary-General under the resolution.

The representative of the Netherlands, on behalf of the European Union, said that the European Union decided to abstain from the draft resolution, but not because of a lack of commitment on the issue. The Union was convinced that proliferation of ballistic missiles capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction put at risk the security of states and peoples. Last year, the Union had stated that it was "not convinced that another panel of governmental experts, as proposed by the resolution under consideration, to assist in preparation of a report on the issue of missiles in all its aspects, is an effective next step". The Union remained of the opinion that a panel of experts would only be meaningful based on an agreed specific mandate, which ensured that added value could be offered.

The representative of China said that his country voted in favour of the resolution. China agreed with the non-proliferation objectives of the Code and had participated in the negotiations on the Code. Since some of China's concerns had not been addressed at that time, it did not join the code. China would, however, continue to work with the members of the Code. The role of the United Nations should be fully utilized.

The representative of Syria said that his country supported the United Nations Charter and the need to work in a multilateral framework to rid the world of all weapons of mass destruction. Syria voted against the draft resolution because it was selective and dealt with one single category of missiles and did not deal with others because those belonged to certain countries. The draft resolution dealt with proliferation from one angle and was contrary to the pluralism that was the foundation of the United Nations. It also did not study in-depth the question of what would be acceptable to all. It undermined disarmament and weakened the non-proliferation instruments.

The representative of Algeria said that his country gave special attention to the question of the means of delivery of weapons of mass destruction, as well as nuclear and chemical weapons. Algeria was not able to vote in favour of the resolution, because the draft had not been the subject of discussion with other members of the General Assembly and did not emphasize the role of the United Nations. Non-selective treatment of the question of missiles meant going above the horizontal proliferation to such other areas as testing and improvement, which were vertical. The natural framework for negotiation and adoption of instruments

on the question of missiles was the United Nations and the Conference on Disarmament.

The representative of the Sudan said that his country voted in favour of the resolution because it was party to the Code of Conduct. One hundred and seventeen countries were in favour of it. That did not, however, mean that the sponsors should stop being flexible when it came to considering the concerns of other delegations.

The representative of Iran said that his country was forced to vote against the draft resolution because it was unprecedented that a draft resolution would be introduced and the sponsors would reject the consideration or discussion of improvements from other delegations. Taking the position that the draft resolution was not open to any modifications was against the spirit of the United Nations and was against the rule of the democratic right of States. The draft resolution had been drafted behind closed doors and had been brought before the Committee on a “take it or leave it” basis.

(annexes follow)

## ANNEX I

### Vote on Conference on Eliminating Nuclear Dangers

The draft decision on a United Nations conference to identify ways of eliminating nuclear dangers in the context of nuclear disarmament (document A/C.1/59/L.15) was approved by a recorded vote of 119 in favour to 6 against, with 41 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: France, Israel, Monaco, Poland, United Kingdom, United States

Abstain: Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Tuvalu

Absent: Botswana, Central African Republic, Comoros, Côte d’Ivoire, Dominica, Federated States of Micronesia, Grenada, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Namibia, Nauru, Niger, Palau, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Somalia, Swaziland, Tajikistan, Togo, Tonga, Turkmenistan

(END OF ANNEX I)

## ANNEX II

### Vote on Convention Prohibiting Nuclear-Weapon Use

The draft resolution entitled “Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons” (document A/C.1/59/L.29) was approved by a recorded vote of 111 in favour to 46 against, with 12 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syria, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Federated States of Micronesia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States

Abstain: Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Ukraine, Uzbekistan

Absent: Botswana, Central African Republic, Comoros, Côte d’Ivoire, Dominica, Grenada, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Namibia, Niger, Palau, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Somalia, Swaziland, Tajikistan, Tonga, Tuvalu

(END OF ANNEX II)

### ANNEX III

#### Vote on Reducing Nuclear Danger

The draft resolution on reducing nuclear danger (document A/C.1/59/L.30) was approved by a recorded vote of 106 in favour to 46 against, with 16 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syria, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United

Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Federated States of Micronesia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States

Abstain: Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, China, Ecuador, Georgia, Israel, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Paraguay, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Ukraine, Uzbekistan

Absent: Botswana, Central African Republic, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Dominica, Grenada, Kiribati, Mauritania, Namibia, Niger, Palau, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Somalia, Swaziland, Tajikistan, Tonga, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu

(END OF ANNEX III)

#### ANNEX IV

##### Vote on Preambular Paragraph 7/Hague Code of Conduct

Proposed amendment to the seventh preambular of the draft resolution on The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation (document A/C.1/59/L.50) was rejected by a recorded vote of 21 in favour to 103 against, with 8 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Cuba, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran, Jamaica, Kuwait, Malaysia, Mexico, Pakistan, Syria, Thailand, Turkmenistan, Viet Nam

Against: Albania, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malta, Marshall Islands, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Abstain: Belarus, Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Mauritius, Nepal, Philippines, Russian Federation, Singapore

Absent: Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Botswana, Central African Republic, China, Comoros, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gambia, Grenada, Iraq, Jordan, Kiribati, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Niger, Oman, Palau, Qatar, Saint Kitts and

Nevis, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Tajikistan, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Yemen

(END OF ANNEX IV)

#### ANNEX V

##### Vote on Operative Paragraph 1/Hague Code of Conduct

The amendment to operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution on The Hague Code of Conduct (document A/C.1/59/L.50) was rejected by a recorded vote of 17 in favour to 104 against, with 10 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Algeria, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cuba, Egypt, Indonesia, Iran, Kuwait, Malaysia, Mexico, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Syria, Viet Nam

Against: Albania, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malta, Marshall Islands, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Abstain: Belarus, Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Guinea-Bissau, India, Mauritius, Nepal, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand

Absent: Afghanistan, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belize, Botswana, Central African Republic, China, Comoros, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gambia, Grenada, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kiribati, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Niger, Oman, Palau, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Tajikistan, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Yemen

(END OF ANNEX V)

#### ANNEX VI

##### Vote on Operative Paragraph 4/Hague Code of Conduct

The amendment to operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution on The Hague Code of Conduct (document A/C.1/59/L.50) was rejected by a recorded vote of 23 in favour to 103 against, with 6 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Algeria, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, China, Cuba, Egypt, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Kuwait, Malaysia, Mexico, Nepal, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Sri Lanka, Syria, Viet Nam.

Against: Albania, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malta, Marshall Islands, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstain: Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Guinea-Bissau, Mauritius, Singapore, Thailand.

Absent: Afghanistan, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Botswana, Central African Republic, Comoros, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gambia, Grenada, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kiribati, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Niger, Oman, Palau, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Tajikistan, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Yemen.

(END OF ANNEX VI)

#### ANNEX VII

##### Vote on Hague Code of Conduct

The draft resolution on The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation (document A/C.1/59/L.50) was approved by a recorded vote of 137 in favour to 2 against, with 16 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, 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, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Zambia.

Against: Egypt, Iran.

Abstain: Algeria, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cuba, Gambia, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mexico, Pakistan, Qatar, Syria, Tuvalu.

Absent: Afghanistan, Bahrain, Botswana, Central African Republic, Comoros, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Dominica, Grenada, Kiribati, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Maldives, Mauritania, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Niger, Oman, Palau, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Swaziland, Tajikistan, Tonga, Turkmenistan, United Arab Emirates, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe.

(END OF ANNEX VII)

### ANNEX VIII

#### Vote on Missiles

The draft resolution on missiles (document A/C.1/59/L.6/Rev.1) was approved by a recorded vote of 98 in favour to 2 against, with 60 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia.

Against: Israel, United States.

Abstain: Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom, Uruguay, Uzbekistan.

Absent: Botswana, Burundi, Central African Republic, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Dominica, Ethiopia, Federated States of Micronesia, Gambia, Grenada, Kiribati, Mauritania, Namibia, Nauru, Niger, Palau, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Swaziland, Tajikistan, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu, Zimbabwe.

\* \* \* \* \*