text of the IAEA General Conference resolution was also worth considering.

34. Mr. Tyson (Australia) said that his delegation felt that, in certain paragraphs, the previous text should be reinstated. With regard to section II B, concerning the safe transport of radioactive materials, his delegation had some difficulties with the first sentence of the new paragraph 9, and therefore supported the proposal by the representative of Japan to delete that sentence. The Japanese proposal to move the first sentence of paragraph 10 to the beginning of paragraph 12 was also reasonable, and his delegation supported the United Kingdom proposal that paragraph 9 should include a reference to the relevant standards of IAEA and IMO. It had no difficulty with the inclusion of the second sentence in paragraph 12, although it was not sure what the practical effect of that sentence would be. It would prefer to maintain the existing wording of section II D, concerning liability. His delegation was satisfied with the existing wording of the section on technical cooperation. It had no objection to the inclusion of a reference to power generation, as proposed by the representative of China, although there did not seem to be consensus in that respect. The Greek proposal to make a reference to the IAEA Statute instead of including a list of items should therefore be given careful consideration. His delegation would prefer to maintain the existing text of section III, paragraph 11. With regard to section IV, paragraph 3, concerning the conversion of nuclear materials to peaceful uses, his delegation supported the Canadian proposal to include a reference to the irreversible withdrawal of fissionable material. It also supported the Canadian proposal to delete paragraph 4 of that section, since it opened up a debate which was not germane to the work of the Committee.

35. Mr. Bompadre (Argentina) said that in general the revised draft report was a balanced document which was acceptable as it stood to his delegation. There was no doubt that the suggestions made during the debate could enrich it, provided that they did not depart too much from the minimum language acceptable to everyone, which was reflected in the current document. His delegation supported the proposal made by the representative of China with regard to section III, paragraph 2 that a reference should be made to power generation, although it recognized that the topic was not acceptable to all delegations. Like the representative of Australia, it believed that the Greek proposal to avoid specific descriptions and to refer to the IAEA Statute could be an acceptable solution for everyone.

36. Mr. Abe (Japan) proposed that, at the end of the first sentence of section II A, paragraph 6, the following words should be added: “in support of the actions taken by the Governments concerned”; that would meet the concerns expressed by the representative of Ukraine and by his own delegation. He could also support the deletion of the second sentence of that paragraph.

37. Mr. Hoey (Ireland), referring to section II B, paragraph 9, proposed that the word “full” should be deleted from the first sentence; the meaning of that sentence would not be changed. His delegation had no problem with the addition of the words “and obligations” in the second sentence of the same paragraph. With regard to section II B, paragraph 12, the delegations of Japan and of Trinidad and Tobago had made very valid points and, in the light of those points, his delegation proposed that the first sentence of paragraph 10 should be moved to the beginning of paragraph 12, replacing the word “welcomes” by the word “notes”, and that that sentence should be followed by a sentence along the following lines: “In this context, the Conference encourages States parties to continue working to formulate additional measures aimed at improving cooperation and the exchange of information among the States concerned in areas such as prior notification and consultation and environmental impact assessments”.

38. Mr. Al-Berkdar (Iraq) said that a few days earlier he had requested that some additions should be made to section III, paragraph 1, concerning agriculture and medicine. With regard to medicine in particular, he proposed that a reference should be made to cancer, the incidence of which had increased considerably in Iraq after the United States of America and the United Kingdom, in their attacks on that country, had used substances like enriched uranium and depleted uranium. An explanation was needed as to why there had been no mention at all of the amendment his delegation had proposed in that respect.

39. Mr. Pohan (Indonesia), referring to the proposal by the representative of Ireland concerning section II B, paragraph 12, said that the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries was proposing a new version of that paragraph, but remained flexible as to the final
wording. The new version of the paragraph would be along the following lines: “The Conference calls upon States parties to continue working through the competent international organizations to develop and enhance international measures and norms in relation to the international maritime transport of radioactive waste and spent fuel. In that respect, the Conference calls for the adoption of additional measures, such as measures to improve cooperation and the exchange of information among interested States, and for the consideration, along with the competent international organization, of an effective and detailed regime for prior notification and advance consultations with States which might be affected by the transport of radioactive materials”. His delegation also felt that it was very important to maintain the first sentence of section II A, paragraph 9.

40. Mr. Du Preez (South Africa) said that he supported the proposal by the representative of Indonesia, which incorporated valuable elements of the document submitted by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries (NPT/CONF.2000/MC.III/CRP.8) and better reflected the interests of the States parties, especially small island States and other coastal States like South Africa. He took note with satisfaction of the proposal made by the representative of Ireland with regard to paragraph 12, which was very close to the Indonesian proposal. He also supported the proposal made by the representative of Ireland with regard to the first sentence of section II A, paragraph 9. He agreed that a reference should be made to obligations in the second sentence of that paragraph. Lastly, associating himself with the Canadian proposal with regard to section IV, paragraph 3, he proposed that, after the words “Trilateral Initiative”, a phrase should be added along the following lines: “to cover the five nuclear-weapon-States in similar agreements and ensure the irreversible withdrawal of fissionable material from weapons programmes”.

41. Mr. Kerps (Suriname), speaking on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations belonging to the Caribbean Community, took note with satisfaction of the position of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries with regard to security in the transport of radioactive materials, expressed by Indonesia. He also commended Ireland for proposing a compromise solution for that difficult question, particularly in relation to section II B, paragraph 12. Lastly, he thanked South Africa for having shown the way to be followed to achieve progress.

42. Ms. Frederiksen (Denmark), referring to section I, paragraph 8, said that her text was based on the resolution of the General Conference of IAEA referred to by the representative of France, but was based on an operative paragraph, not a preambular paragraph.

43. Mr. Malolo (Tonga) said that he fully supported Ireland’s proposals with regard to section II B, paragraphs 9 to 12. He also supported the proposal to add “and obligations” to the second sentence of section II B, paragraph 9.

44. Mr. Cabiera (Peru), referring to section II B, paragraph 9 of the draft revised text, said that the current wording was better than that of the earlier version, but should include the main elements of the relevant paragraphs of the proposal made by the Caribbean Community, New Zealand and other countries. He also supported Ireland’s proposal that the word “full” should be deleted in the first sentence of that paragraph. Furthermore, and in order to contribute to a compromise solution, his delegation fully supported the proposal made by Indonesia on paragraph 12 of the same section.

45. The Chairman requested delegations, in view of the time constraints, to make compromise proposals on section I, paragraph 8, and section II A, paragraph 6; in relation to the latter paragraph, he called on the delegations of Japan and Ukraine to reach agreement. He would also welcome duly negotiated compromise proposals with regard to section II B, paragraphs 9 and 12, and called on the delegations of Indonesia and Ireland to try to formulate a joint proposal. He also wished to know about the position of delegations with regard to section III, paragraph 11. He would therefore adjourn the meeting so that delegations could try to reach agreement on the basis of consensus.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.