

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

Exchange of views (continued)

1. **The Chairman** invited the Committee to begin consideration of the Chairman's draft of the Report of Main Committee II (NPT/CONF.2000/MC.II/...). The draft was a starting point which took into account all views that he believed would be generally acceptable. He urged delegations to continue consultations with him and other delegations and in the informal open-ended meeting in order to arrive at an acceptable text. He suggested that delegates first give their comments on the text in general, after which the Committee would examine the draft item by item.

2. **Mr. Coelho** (Portugal), speaking on behalf of the European Union, welcomed the draft report as an excellent basis for discussion. He recalled the points raised by his delegation in introducing working paper NPT/CONF.2000/MC.II/WP.10 on behalf of the European Union and stressed that the European Union and its States members were committed to a successful outcome for the Committee's deliberations.

3. **Mr. Biggs** (Australia), speaking also on behalf of Austria, Canada, Denmark, Hungary, Ireland, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway and Sweden, welcomed the draft report as a good basis for discussion. He noted that the draft referred to both backward-looking and forward-looking elements at various points and suggested that, if those notions were retained in the final version of the document, care should be taken to organize the text in such a way as to clearly distinguish between the two categories. He expressed satisfaction that the draft reaffirmed the importance of the Principles and Objectives adopted in 1995.

4. **Mr. Wiranata-Atmadia** (Indonesia), speaking on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and in his capacity as Chairman of the Movement's working group on disarmament, welcomed the draft report as a good basis for discussion. The Non-Aligned Movement's official position would be presented the next day.

5. **Mr. Fu Zhigang** (China) said that the draft report was an excellent basis for discussion which reflected the delegations' various positions. The document was somewhat long however, and could be shortened, for example by eliminating the list of documents.

6. **Mr. Lee Kie-cheon** (Republic of Korea) said that the draft did a good job of taking into account the various working papers, key issues, relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and the views of delegations. As such, it was an excellent starting point.

7. **Mr. Rosenthal** (United States of America) said that he associated himself with the statement made by the representative of Australia and stressed the importance of reaffirming the 1995 Principles and Objectives.

8. **Mr. Nederlof** (Netherlands) said that he supported the statement made by the representative of Australia and felt that the draft report was an excellent basis for discussion. Some elements might require redrafting, for example in the specific action-oriented recommendations beginning in subparagraph 45, the language did not always seem especially action-oriented or forward-looking and those paragraphs might therefore require revision.

9. **Mr. Hossein** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that he associated himself with the statement made by the representative of Indonesia but, with reference to the section on export controls reiterated that his delegation was not in a position to discuss that issue on the basis of the current draft.

10. **Mr. Al-Hadithi** (Iraq) regretted that the draft report did not seem to take into account a number of the points raised by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the Group of Arab States, including points raised by the representative of Egypt. Nor did it refer to the Resolution on the Middle East and the need for Israel to immediately implement the Non-Proliferation Treaty, abandon its nuclear arsenal and subject its nuclear facilities to the safeguards regime. He took exception to the reference in paragraph 6 of the conclusions and recommendations to Iraq's alleged non-compliance with its safeguards agreements. He stressed that the Committee was not the appropriate forum to discuss implementation of Security Council resolutions on such questions and warned against attempts by the United States and the United Kingdom to involve the Committee in matters which did not concern it. Those delegations were simply trying to cover up their own violations of Security Council resolutions and the Non-Proliferation Treaty.