

PROVISIONAL
For participants only

NPT/CONF.2000/PC.II/SR.16
19 May 1998

Original: ENGLISH

Second session

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 16th MEETING*

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Friday, 8 May 1998, at 11.25 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. WYZNER (Poland)

CONTENTS

ADOPTION OF THE FINAL REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PREPARATORY COMMITTEE
TO THE REVIEW CONFERENCE

CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

* No summary records were prepared for the 5th to 15th meetings.

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within two weeks of the date of this document to the Official Records Editing Section, room E.4108, Palais des Nations, Geneva.

The meeting was called to order at 11.25 p.m.

ADOPTION OF THE FINAL REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PREPARATORY COMMITTEE
TO THE REVIEW CONFERENCE

The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the draft report of the Preparatory Committee on its second session (NPT/CONF.2000/PC.II/CRP.2) and pointed out that in section I, paragraph 3, Bhutan should be added to the list of participants. The gaps in paragraphs 6 and 7 would be filled by the Secretariat.

Section I, as orally revised, was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN, referring to section II, said that the list of documents in paragraph 13 would be updated by the Secretariat to include his second working paper and other documents issued at a later stage for the session. The end of paragraph 16 would be reworded to read "and decided to defer a decision on the draft rules of procedure to the third session".

The paragraph on background documentation would be replaced by a new paragraph, concerning other procedural matters, based on the text which had already been circulated. The new version of paragraph 18 would thus read: "During the Second Preparatory Committee, discussions took place with regard to procedural preparations for the next Review Conference, pursuant to paragraph 4 of the 1995 Decision on 'Strengthening the Review Process for the Treaty'. In that context, certain recommendations were put forward concerning such procedural preparations, in particular proposals pursuant to paragraph 6 of the 1995 Decision. At this stage, no decision was taken with regard to these proposals, which the Committee decided to refer to the Third Preparatory Committee for further consideration".

Section II, as orally revised, was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN said that, in view of the lack of agreement, he took it that the Committee wished to delete the remaining parts of the draft report.

It was so decided.

Mr. BAIDI-NEJAD (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that, despite the inconclusive nature of the debate, the second session had nevertheless encouraged new ideas and provided valuable material for future deliberations. It was clear that certain delegations had made insufficient preparations for the session and had underestimated the importance of some of the matters raised, for example the resolution on the Middle East, which should remain an integral part of all decisions regarding the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation

of Nuclear Weapons. His delegation failed to understand why two simple paragraphs on the Middle East question had provoked such passionate objections. Israel was not a State party to the Treaty and had not placed its nuclear facilities under International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards. It was developing a nuclear-weapons programme and thereby endangering the security of the entire region. The international community should put pressure on Israel to renounce its nuclear option and accede to the Treaty.

Mr. WULF (United States of America) said that his delegation was disappointed but not discouraged by the result of the session, at which it had been prepared to address substantive issues including the question of nuclear disarmament. Nevertheless it had brought to the attention of the Committee the important steps currently being taken to ban the production of dangerous materials for use in nuclear weapons. Those and other related matters were a major goal of the strengthened review process.

Mr. GARCIA (Colombia), speaking on behalf of the Group of Non-Aligned and other States parties to the Treaty, expressed the hope that more substantive progress could be made at the third session.

Mr. SINGYE (Bhutan) said that it was regrettable that the current session had not achieved the desired result. His delegation nevertheless endorsed the working paper submitted by the members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries Parties to the Treaty (NPT/CONF.2000/PC.II/5), but felt that it was inappropriate and incorrect to refer to South Asia in paragraph 28 of that document in connection with the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, not least because no such proposal had been made on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the countries in the region. That reference could lead to misunderstandings because, for purposes of disarmament and security, the perception of South Asia as a distinct zone was not shared by all Parties to the Treaty. For the same reason, his delegation also had reservations about references to South Asia as a region in the Chairman's second working paper and in other official documents of the Preparatory Committee.

Mr. ELARABY (Egypt) said that his delegation was disappointed at the outcome of the Preparatory Committee's second session. The proceedings raised questions about the future work of the Committee, and all delegations should therefore recommit themselves to ensuring the success of the third session. The threat of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East was a particularly sensitive issue. The Israeli nuclear programme was a daily

reminder of where the global non-proliferation regime had failed, and his delegation had been surprised to find that its concerns in that area were not universally shared. In particular, his delegation hoped that the integrity of the decisions of the 1995 Review and Extension Conference, including the resolution on the Middle East, would be honoured by all States parties.

Mr. SOUTAR (United Kingdom) said that he considered the second session to be a setback but not a disaster. All delegations should redouble their efforts to make the third session and the 2000 Review Conference itself a success.

Mr. LAM CHIOU YEE (Mauritius) said that the lack of tangible results at the Committee's second session was not conducive to the realization of the noble goal of complete nuclear disarmament. His delegation furthermore wished to place on record its reservations concerning the reference to South Asia in paragraph 28 of the working paper submitted by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and to all similar references in official documents of the Preparatory Committee.

Mr. LI Changhe (China) said that the failure to reach agreement at the current session was disappointing and ran counter to his delegation's expectations. The lack of a substantive outcome could conceivably damage the Treaty regime. However, some results had been achieved in consultations among the parties concerned and he trusted that account would be taken of them in the Committee's future work.

CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

The CHAIRMAN said that the second session as a whole had been useful and, while the results were less than satisfactory in some areas, owing the lack of time available, what the Committee had accomplished could be considered as a modest contribution to making tangible progress on questions of the utmost importance to the international community, since the nuclear threat was still one of the biggest threats to the survival of humankind. The discussions clearly showed the urgent need for decisive efforts and he hoped that the Committee, again inspired by a spirit of genuine cooperation and compromise, would move forward at the third session towards the goals it had set.

After an exchange of courtesies, he declared the second session of the Preparatory Committee closed.

The meeting rose at midnight.