SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 15th MEETING

Wednesday, 18 September 1985, at 5.35 p.m.

President Mr. SHAKER (Egypt)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS AND PROPOSALS SUBMITTED UNDER AGENDA ITEM 13 (NPT/CONF.III/L.1 to L.4, NPT/CONF.III/59)

Draft resolutions NPT/CONF.III/L.1 to L.3

1. Mr. SENE (Senegal), speaking as co-ordinator of the Group of Non-Aligned and Neutral States, said that, in general, the members of that Group shared the ideas expressed in the draft resolutions under consideration which were basically derived from document NPT/CONF.III/32, concerning article VI of the Treaty, that had been submitted by their Group. Those draft resolutions, which recalled fundamental principles to which those States remained committed, dealt with important problems that were major causes of concern to the international community. As such, they deserved to be taken into consideration. With regard to the procedure for the adoption of decisions, as stipulated in rule 28 of the rules of procedure of the Conference (NPT/CONF.III/41), he reaffirmed that the Group of States of which he was the co-ordinator wished to adopt a conciliatory approach with a view to avoiding controversy and confrontation and showing a spirit of understanding during the consideration of those draft resolutions so that they could be adopted by consensus. However, if it proved impossible to reach a consensus, the Group of Non-Aligned and Neutral States would feel obliged to request that those draft resolutions be put to the vote in spite of the adverse consequences that such a vote would have in terms of the political impact of the Final Document of the Conference.

2. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico), introducing draft resolutions NPT/CONF.III/L.1 to L.3 on behalf of the Group of Non-Aligned and Neutral States, pointed out that those three texts, which were very short and concisely worded, were in no way controversial and related solely to questions with which the States Members of the United Nations had been familiar for many years.

3. Since, in the preamble to those draft resolutions, the sponsors had merely referred to provisions and instruments that were well known to all the States parties to the Treaty, he had decided to confine his comments to the contents of the operative paragraphs of those draft resolutions. In the draft resolution on a comprehensive nuclear test ban (NPT/CONF.III/L.1), the three Depositary States of NPT were merely requested to resume during 1985 the negotiations on a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty that they had suspended in 1980. The draft resolution on a nuclear test ban moratorium (NPT/CONF.III/L.2) only repeated what the General Assembly had been calling upon the three Depositary States to do for the past five years. No comment was needed on the draft resolution on a nuclear-arms freeze (NPT/CONF.III/L.3).
4. He recalled that, throughout the deliberations of the Main Committees of the Conference, the Mexican delegation had made every effort to convince the participants in the Conference that their Final Declaration should contain a simple recommendation to the three Depositary States of NPT concerning a comprehensive nuclear test ban, a moratorium on nuclear tests and a nuclear-arms freeze. Since those efforts had been to no avail, the Mexican delegation had decided to submit for consideration the three draft resolutions that had been approved by all the members of the Group of Non-Aligned and Neutral States. During the time that remained before the Conference was called upon to take a decision on those texts, the Group of Non-Aligned and Neutral States would continue to make every effort to ensure that those draft resolutions could be adopted by consensus and incorporated in the Final Declaration of the Conference. If such a consensus could not be reached, the Group would be compelled to request a vote on those texts in accordance with rule 28 of the rules of procedure.

5. The President drew the attention of the States parties to the provisions of rule 28 of the rules of procedure of the Conference and said that he would make every effort within 48 hours to secure general agreement on the questions that had not been settled. He expressed his great appreciation of the work carried out by the three Main Committees, whose reports represented an enormous joint effort, and were a striking demonstration of the goodwill that had been shown by all the parties. He was convinced that just a little more goodwill was all that was needed to achieve a consensus on the questions dealt with in the draft resolutions under consideration. Therefore, he strongly urged the participants to continue their efforts to that end since the success or failure of the Conference, which was concerned with a matter of vital importance to all and for which the States parties had been preparing for more than a year, would be decided during the following two days. He appealed to all States to do their utmost to ensure its success.

Draft resolution NPT/CONF.III/L.4

6. Mr. AL-KITAL (Iraq) expressed full support for draft resolutions NPT/CONF.III/L.1 to L.3 and for the views that had been expressed during their introduction.

7. Introducing draft resolution NPT/CONF.III/L.4, he drew attention to the fact that, in the preamble of that draft, the Conference would recall various provisions of NPT, together with the inalienable right to all the parties to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes (first to third preambular paragraphs); make a neutral declaration on the subject of the safeguards system operated by IAEA and mention the fact that Iraq was a party to NPT (fourth and fifth preambular paragraphs); take note of the relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions on the Israeli armed aggression against the Iraqi nuclear installations (sixth and seventh preambular paragraphs), as well as the IAEA General Conference resolutions which regarded the aggression in question as an attack on the Agency and its safeguards system (eighth preambular paragraph); and take note of the threat of further such attacks by Israel (eighth to twelfth preambular paragraphs).