

contained a very important concept which should be retained in the text. With regard to subparagraph 5, he believed that the first sentence contained a very important element, which should be retained, and agreed with the rationale put forward by the representative of the United Kingdom for retaining the phrase "nuclear energy". His delegation felt that it was very important to retain the last sentence of subparagraph 4. If the sentence was deleted for the sake of logical consistency, it should appear somewhere else in the document. Canada could accept the other proposals concerning subparagraph 4. Those points were covered to some extent by the inclusion of the words "without delay" in subparagraph 49.

40. **Mr. Zahran** (Egypt) said that, with regard to subparagraph 3, his delegation was in favour of deleting the words "and dialogue", because mere dialogue was not enough: what mattered was enhanced cooperation, which, of course, could be preceded by dialogue. He could agree to the use of the word "energy" in subparagraph 5 for the sake of consistency, but would understand it to mean material.

41. **Mr. Ikeda** (Japan) said that his delegation reserved the right to revert to some points, such as the proposal to delete certain sentences in subparagraphs 4 and 5. If those sentences were restored elsewhere in the text, his delegation could be flexible. Japan associated itself with the delegations which had expressed support for subparagraph 7. It felt that IAEA was the basic mechanism and should not be changed. The concerns expressed about the IAEA decision-making process could be addressed at some point. His delegation would make specific comments about the references to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in subparagraphs 6 and 11 at a later stage.

42. **Mr. Coelho** (Portugal) said that his delegation supported the retention of subparagraph 7, and of the first sentence of subparagraph 5.

43. **The Chairman** said that the suggestions made by delegations should be viewed in the context of the entire report; some of them were already covered in the last section of the report.

44. **Mr. Hossein** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that the section on safeguards (paras. 8-18) was too long and was inconsistent with other parts of the draft report. There was also a certain amount of repetition.

45. **Mr. Kuchinov** (Russian Federation) said that since subparagraph 8 referred to States parties to the Treaty, the word "parties" should be added after the word "States" in each case. In the second sentence, it should be specified that the safeguards were the 1995 safeguards. Moreover, the safeguards did not help strengthen collective security, but strengthened trust among States. The words "reaffirms the conviction" should be changed to "considers".

46. **Mr. Zahran** (Egypt) said that the members of IAEA consisted of States parties and States which were not parties to the Treaty. While non-States parties had Safeguards Agreements with IAEA, they did not cover all nuclear facilities. It was therefore correct to refer to "States".

47. **Mr. Biggs** (Australia) said that Safeguards Agreements with States which were not parties to the Treaty were important for security and mutual confidence. The reference to States in subparagraph 8 was therefore appropriate.

48. **Mr. Wiranata-Atmadia** (Indonesia), speaking on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, proposed that, in the first sentence of subparagraph 10, the phrases "the continued pursuit by States parties of the principle of" and "parties in accordance with the provisions of the Treaty once the complete elimination of nuclear weapons has been achieved" should be deleted; and that the words "peaceful nuclear activities" should be changed to "sources of special fissionable materials".

49. **Mr. Fu Zhigang** (China) said that the first sentence of subparagraph 10 was somewhat repetitive and should be reworded to read: "The Conference reiterates the call of the States Parties that safeguards should be universally applied once the complete elimination of nuclear weapons has been achieved.". The text would then correspond to paragraph 13 of the Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament.

50. **Mr. Ikeda** (Japan) said that the long sentence at the beginning of subparagraph 10 had been put together from various texts. He would prefer to follow the wording of paragraph 13 of the Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament and delete the phrase "once the complete elimination of nuclear weapons has been achieved", which changed the meaning of the paragraph. The