
**2000 Review Conference of the Parties
to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation
of Nuclear Weapons**

28 November 2000

Original: English

Summary record of the 16th meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Saturday, 20 May 2000, at 11 a.m.

President: Mr. Baali..... (Algeria)

Contents

Review of the operation of the treaty as provided for in its article VIII, paragraph 3, taking into account the decisions and the resolution adopted by the 1995 NPT Review and Extension Conference (*continued*)

(c) Implementation of the provisions of the treaty relating to non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, safeguards and nuclear-weapon-free zones (*continued*)

(iii) Article VII (*continued*)

Reports of the main committees (*continued*)

Adoption of arrangements for meeting the costs of the Conference

Report of the Credentials Committee (*continued*)

Draft report of the Drafting Committee

Consideration and adoption of the final document(s)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections 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 one week of the date of this document* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza.

Any corrections to the record of this meeting and of other meetings will be issued in a corrigendum.

The meeting was called to order at 11.45 a.m.

Review of the operation of the treaty as provided for in its article VIII, paragraph 3, taking into account the decisions and the resolution adopted by the 1995 NPT Review and Extension Conference *(continued)*

(c) Implementation of the provisions of the treaty relating to non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, safeguards and nuclear-weapon-free zones *(continued)*

(iii) Article VII *(continued)*

1. **Mr. Westdal** (Canada), reporting on his consultations with key parties with a view to coming up with a consensus on the text of the regional issues paper, said that significant progress had been made. The key parties were actively engaged in good faith negotiations concerning the last few phrases and words of key texts with an eye to a larger goal that everyone shared. Participants would betray their responsibilities if they did not make one final effort to complete that vital work.

2. **Mr. Widodo** (Indonesia), speaking on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, called on all the countries most directly concerned to reach an agreement in order to achieve a historic and successful outcome of the 2000 Review Conference, an objective that was cherished by the entire international community.

3. **Mr. Soutar** (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the Western Group, said that the tremendous progress achieved over the course of the Conference had led to the development of agreed language covering all aspects of the Treaty and the strengthened review process. If agreement could be reached on that basis, it would not only demonstrate that the Conference had responded positively to the aspirations of the 1995 Review and Extension Conference, but it would also send a clear message to the international community that the nuclear non-proliferation regime remained vibrant and relevant. For that reason, the Western Group would like to call on the parties most intimately concerned to intensify their consultations with a view to reaching consensus within the next few hours. The international community would not readily understand if the Conference stumbled at that last fence.

4. **Mr. Bingre do Amaral** (Portugal), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the international community must not let the current historic opportunity slip from its grasp. In that regard, the European Union would back any efforts aimed at ensuring smooth negotiations between the key parties concerned. The final step must be taken in order to bring the Conference to a successful conclusion.

5. **Mr. de Icaza** (Mexico), speaking on behalf of the New Agenda Coalition, said the agreed language that the Conference had endeavoured to forge over the previous four weeks had brought together nuclear-weapon States and non-nuclear-weapon States on many fundamental issues. Those agreements could be built upon in the near future. Unfortunately, all those efforts could come to naught should the Conference fail to resolve the one pending issue. That would be unacceptable. He therefore appealed to the two States concerned in the matter to be more flexible and bear in mind the real priorities of the Conference.

6. **Mr. Noburo** (Japan) read out a message from his country's Minister for Foreign Affairs stressing the critical importance of the Conference's discussions to international peace and security, as well as to nuclear non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament, and expressing the hope that the negotiations between the parties concerned would bear fruit as soon as possible.

7. **Mr. Chomicki** (Poland), speaking on behalf of the countries associated with the European Union, endorsed the statement of the European Union and expressed the hope that the parties concerned could achieve a compromise that was satisfactory to all States parties to the Treaty.

8. **Mr. Sanders** (Netherlands) said that his delegation fully supported the ongoing efforts to reach agreement on the one remaining paragraph and called on the parties directly concerned to bridge the remaining gap.

9. **Mr. Kapralov** (Russian Federation) said that his delegation, too, was deeply concerned about the situation which had developed in the Conference and welcomed the appeals to the parties most intimately involved in the discussion of the remaining unresolved issue to come to an agreement and thus ensure the success of the Conference.

10. **The President** said that he would suspend the meeting for an hour in order to allow the representative

of Canada to hold consultations with the parties concerned.

The meeting was suspended at 12.05 p.m. and resumed at 3.05 p.m.

11. **Mr. Westdal** (Canada), reporting on the outcome of the consultations, announced that a key paragraph of the regional issues paper had been agreed. Should the Conference endorse the paragraph, the last obstacle to the conclusion of the Conference would be surmounted.

12. **The President** thanked the representative of Canada on behalf of all the States parties for a job well done under extremely difficult circumstances.

Reports of the main committees (*continued*)

Report of Main Committee I

13. **The President** said that agreement had been reached on section A, paragraph 12, of the report of Main Committee I. The new version would read: "The Conference reiterates the call on those States that operate unsafeguarded nuclear facilities and that have not yet acceded to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons to reverse clearly and urgently any policies to pursue any nuclear-weapon development or deployment and to refrain from any action which could undermine regional and international peace and security and the efforts of the international community towards nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear weapons proliferation."

14. He took it that the Conference wished to adopt the paragraph.

15. *It was so decided.*

Report of Main Committee II

16. **The President** said that former paragraph 59 had been deleted and replaced by the following: "The Conference, taking note of all initiatives by States Parties, believes that the international community should continue to promote the establishment of new nuclear-weapon-free zones in accordance with the relevant United Nations Disarmament Commission guidelines and in that spirit welcomes the efforts and proposals that have been advanced by the States Parties since 1995 in various regions of the world."

17. He took it that the Conference wished to adopt the new paragraph.

18. *It was so decided.*

19. **Mr. Sukanuma** (Japan), reporting on the results of informal consultations held on the portions in boldface of the current revised version of document NPT/CONF.2000/MC.II/CRP.13, dated 17 May, said that paragraph 24 should be deleted. In paragraph 31, the words "including in particular nuclear-weapon States" should be replaced by "noting their common but differentiated responsibilities". Paragraph 35 had been amended to read: "The States Parties, recalling the obligations of all States Parties under articles I, II and III of the Treaty, call upon all States Parties not to cooperate with or give assistance in the nuclear or nuclear-related field to States not party to the NPT in a manner that assists them or for the manufacturing of nuclear explosive devices."

20. Paragraphs 40, 41, 42, 62, 72 and the part of paragraph 73 in bold should be deleted.

21. **Mr. Awaad** (Egypt) said that paragraph 56 would now read: "The Conference welcomes the consensus reached in the General Assembly since its thirty-fifth session that the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East would greatly enhance international peace and security. The Conference urges all parties directly concerned to consider seriously taking the practical and urgent steps required for the implementation of the proposal to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and, as a means of promoting this objective, invites the countries concerned to adhere to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and, pending the establishment of the zone, to agree to place all their nuclear activities under IAEA safeguards."

22. **The President** said that he would suspend the meeting in order to allow the Drafting Committee to consider the small amendments.

The meeting was suspended at 3.25 p.m. and resumed at 4.45 p.m.

Adoption of arrangements for meeting the costs of the Conference (NPT/CONF.2000/26)

23. **The President** drew attention to document NPT/CONF.2000/26 containing the schedule of division of costs based on the actual participation of

States parties in the Conference. The document must be seen in conjunction with rule 12 of, and the appendix to, the rules of procedure adopted by the Conference on 24 April 2000.

24. He took it that the Conference wished to adopt document NPT/CONF.2000/26.

25. *It was so decided.*

Report of the Credentials Committee (*continued*)
(NPT/CONF.2000/CC/1)

26. **Mr. Widodo** (Indonesia), speaking as Chairman of the Credentials Committee, introduced the final report of the Credentials Committee (NPT/CONF.2000/CC/1). The Committee had met thrice to examine the credentials of representatives participating in the Conference. On the basis of the information received from the Secretary-General of the Conference, the Committee had decided at its third and last meeting on 16 May to accept the credentials of 155 States parties participating in the Conference, on the understanding that those delegations which had not presented their credentials in the form required by rule 2 of the rules of procedure would do so as soon as possible. The Committee had then adopted its report to the Conference.

27. **The President** said he took it that the Conference wished to take note of the report of the Credentials Committee.

28. *It was so decided.*

Draft report of the Drafting Committee
(NPT/CONF.2000/DC/CRP.2)

29. **Mr. Erdős** (Hungary), speaking as Chairman of the Drafting Committee, introduced the draft report of the Drafting Committee. The Committee had held five meetings, had considered the reports of the Main Committees as well as various proposals put forward by delegations with a view to achieving a consensus final document. The Committee had also considered the draft Final Document of the Conference and agreed to recommend it to the Conference for adoption.

30. **The President** said he took it that the Conference wished to take note of the report of the Drafting Committee.

31. *It was so decided.*

Consideration and adoption of the final document(s)
(NPT/CONF.2000/DC/WP.1 and NPT/CONF.2000/CRP.1/Rev.1)

32. **The President** said that because of time constraints it had not been possible to have the documents reissued with the changes agreed by the Drafting Committee. He would nevertheless take it that the Conference wished to adopt its final document, as contained in documents NPT/CONF.2000/DC/WP.1 and NPT/CONF.2000/CRP.1/Rev.1 and as orally revised, by consensus.

33. *It was so decided.*

34. **Mr. Hasan** (Iraq) welcomed the spirit of solidarity and courage demonstrated by the Conference in thwarting the attempt of the United States of America to sabotage the Conference. Since his country was a party to the NPT and complied fully with the full scope safeguards regime, there was no reason to include a reference to Iraq in the final document. Unfortunately, the United States had somehow managed to impose such a reference, the wording of which had nothing to do with the NPT, the mandate of the Conference or the safeguards regime. While his delegation had not opposed the consensus adoption of the document, it nevertheless wished to express its reservations concerning the paragraph containing that reference.

35. **Mr. Olbrich** (Germany) welcomed the adoption of the final document without a vote. Referring to the section of document NPT/CONF.2000/DC/CRP.1/Rev.1 entitled "Article IV and preambular paragraphs 6 and 7", he said that, because of the overriding importance that Germany attached to a successful non-proliferation policy, it would accept the inclusion of paragraph 8. However, in his delegation's view, the peaceful use of nuclear energy did not contribute to sustainable development.

36. **Ms. Schneebauer** (Austria), said that her delegation could accept the wording of the paragraph in question, which was the same as the wording of the report of Main Committee III of 1995. At the same time, she wished to reiterate her delegation's statement to Main Committee III that only non-power applications of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy could contribute to sustainable development. In her Government's view, nuclear power could not play a role in the context of sustainable development. However, Austria was willing to continue to meet its

obligations under article IV of the NPT in those areas in which it was able to contribute, in particular the humanitarian aspects of development and prosperity in the world.

37. **Mr. Toftlund** (Denmark) said that his delegation fully shared the views expressed by the representative of Austria with regard to the relationship between sustainable development and the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

38. **Mr. Mungra** (Suriname), speaking on behalf of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM), said that CARICOM remained firmly committed to the elimination of all nuclear weapons. It believed that there was no justification for the retention of weapons of mass destruction, which should be dismantled in the shortest possible time. Concerning the issue of maritime transport of radioactive materials, although CARICOM had put forward proposals calling, inter alia, for prior notification and consultation, environmental impact assessment and the establishment of an effective liability regime in respect of accidental or deliberate damage, it was deeply concerned that a comprehensive liability or compensation regime still did not exist. Until a moratorium on the transport of radioactive materials was achieved, CARICOM would continue to press for prior notification and consultation on such transport and for a comprehensive liability regime that incorporated the Community's just demand for compensation in the event of damage. In that context, the Caribbean Community applauded the relevant regulations of the Treaties of Bangkok and Pelindaba.

39. Although the CARICOM States had joined in the consensus on the adoption of the final document, they still remained opposed to the persistent use of the Caribbean sea for the transshipment of highly toxic nuclear materials, which were a threat to the fragile ecosystems and marine and coastal environment of the Caribbean, and hence to the very survival of the communities living in that region. Support of the CARICOM position demonstrated the importance that a vast majority of countries in the international community attached to that issue.

40. **Mr. Noboru** (Japan) said that his Government would redouble its efforts in order to promote nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament on the basis of the very valuable document adopted by the Conference. In that regard, it was his delegation's understanding that

future work would be pursued on the basis of the reaffirmation of the Principles and Objectives of 1995, as well as of the document adopted at the current Review Conference.

41. **Mr. Alborzy** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his delegation had a reservation with respect to the paragraph relating to the peace process in the section dealing with the Middle East and to any other references which might be construed as recognition of Israel.

42. **Mr. Pradhan** (Bhutan) said that, even though his delegation had difficulties with paragraphs 9 and 11 of the section dealing with articles I and II, it had gone along with the wording of those paragraphs in order not to prevent the achievement of a consensus.

43. **Mr. Wehbe** (Syrian Arab Republic) expressed his delegation's disappointment that, notwithstanding the establishment of Subsidiary Body 2 on regional issues, including the implementation of the 1995 Resolution on the Middle East, the Conference had been unable to come up with language clearly calling on Israel to accede to the NPT and to submit all its nuclear installations to the IAEA safeguards regime in order to implement Security Council resolution 487 (1981). That was all the more regrettable since it meant that the Conference had failed to meet the basic conditions for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

44. Moreover, the credibility of the Treaty could not be revived unless those States that persisted in applying a double standard mended their ways. Indeed, he did not see how States which were not parties to the Treaty, such as India and Pakistan, could be urged to accede to it, while there was a clear unwillingness to demand that Israel should also accede to the Treaty and submit its nuclear installations to the safeguards regime.

45. As long as Israel remained outside the Treaty and refused to comply with United Nations resolutions, despite repeated appeals by the General Assembly, the situation would remain a cause for concern for many Arab countries. If that situation persisted, it would threaten peace and security, not only in the region but also in the rest of the world. Instead of paragraph 9 under the section concerning the Middle East, particularly implementation of the 1995 Resolution on the Middle East, the Conference should have set up a specific mechanism to address the subject of Israel. His

delegation therefore wished to register its reservation with respect to that paragraph. Previous conferences as well as the current one had provided ample opportunities for Israel to accede to the Treaty and to submit its installations to IAEA safeguards. It had availed itself of none of them.

46. He wished to emphasize, once again, his country's commitment to stability and peace throughout the region. The Syrian Arab Republic, which had complied with the provisions of the Treaty over the previous 30 years, believed that the mere reference in paragraph 3 of the document on the Middle East to the importance of Israel's acceding to the Treaty and placing its nuclear facilities under comprehensive IAEA safeguards was not commensurate with the Conference's objectives. That was regrettable, because it sent the wrong message to Israel and encouraged it to continue its occupation of the Arab territories. Moreover, it felt no pressure to commit itself to the establishment of peace in the region. The foregoing notwithstanding, and in view of the efforts made by all delegations to achieve positive results, his delegation would go along with the consensus.

47. **Mr. de Icaza** (Mexico), speaking on behalf of the New Agenda Coalition (NAC), said that the Coalition resolutions of 1998 and 1999, which had attracted 35 and 60 sponsors, respectively, as well as the support of the overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations, had clearly demonstrated the international community's desire for a new and unequivocal commitment by nuclear-weapon States to the total elimination of their nuclear weapons, coupled with a commitment to an accelerated process of negotiations concerning nuclear disarmament to which all States were committed under article VI. The results of the Conference had made explicit what had always been implicit, thus reinforcing and revitalizing the Treaty as the cornerstone of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. The NAC countries acknowledged and welcomed the important political step that the nuclear-weapon States had undertaken and now had greater faith in the prospects for nuclear disarmament. While the Conference had not achieved all that would have been wished, its results constituted an important stage in the endeavour to build a nuclear-weapon-free world. The NAC countries would, for their part, persevere in the efforts to translate into reality the solemn commitments entered into at the Conference.

48. **Mr. Hu Xiaodi** (China) said that, while his delegation had not objected to the adoption of the Final Document, it believed that the document had a number of shortcomings. It had failed to call for the removal of fundamental obstacles to nuclear disarmament, such as plans on the part of one country to establish a national missile defence system, a move that could sabotage global strategic stability by undermining the ABM Treaty and sparking an arms race in outer space. Moreover, not enough emphasis had been put on some necessary principles and measures in the field of nuclear disarmament, such as calling upon nuclear-weapon States with the largest stockpiles to take the lead in nuclear disarmament by reducing their nuclear arsenals and delivery systems and pledging unconditionally not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States or nuclear-weapon-free zones.

49. Since his delegation believed that a fissile-material cut-off treaty should be conducive to nuclear weapons non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament, it supported negotiations on and the conclusion of a cut-off treaty. In view of the very real likelihood of a nuclear weapons race in outer space as a result of the planned missile defence system, China believed that the prevention of an arms race in outer space was more urgent than the negation of a cut-off treaty. Accordingly, the Conference on Disarmament should deal with at least three issues, namely, the prevention of an arms race in outer space, nuclear disarmament and a fissile material cut-off treaty in a balanced and comprehensive manner. His delegation supported the early conclusion of the fissile material cut-off treaty in accordance with an agreed programme of work in the Conference on Disarmament. However, in view of the many uncertainties in that regard, setting an artificial timeframe would be not only unreasonable but also impracticable.

50. In his delegation's view, in order to reduce the danger of nuclear warfare, nuclear-weapon States must guarantee unconditional no first-use of weapons and provide unconditional negative security assurances to all non-nuclear-weapon States. Moreover, the withdrawal of all nuclear weapons deployed outside the borders of nuclear-weapon States and the elimination of the nuclear umbrella must also be guaranteed. Without such assurances, transparency and confidence-building measures would not be feasible. Furthermore,

the implementation of the relevant measures would require an environment of strategic stability.

51. His Government believed that all countries had the right to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. When exporting nuclear material to non-States parties, all States parties to the NPT should strictly abide by the provisions of the Treaty, in particular article III, in order to ensure that the exported items were under IAEA safeguards and were used only for peaceful purposes. China, for its part, would faithfully fulfil its obligations under the NPT and would continue to work towards the realization of the three main objectives of nuclear disarmament, nuclear non-proliferation and the peaceful use of nuclear energy.

52. **Mr. Grey** (United States of America) welcomed the fact that over 150 States parties to the NPT had clearly reaffirmed the vital importance of the Treaty to the promotion of international peace and security and had agreed to continue to work together in order to achieve its universality. The Conference had expressed profound concern about cases of non-compliance and had reaffirmed that strict observance of the Treaty remained central to achieving its objectives.

53. It had been agreed that any addition to the five nuclear-weapon States was unacceptable and would serve only to heighten instability and security concerns among States, making the world a more dangerous, uncertain place. Moreover, the five nuclear-weapon States had agreed on the need for further efforts to reduce nuclear arsenals and to work towards a world free from nuclear weapons.

54. Full agreement had been reached in many other areas. Thus, the critical importance of nuclear safety in realizing the many peaceful benefits of nuclear technology had been recognized, and strong support had been expressed for the work of IAEA, including its technical cooperation programme. The need for strong, effective international safeguards had been underscored and agreement had been reached to work towards further strengthening the review process for the Treaty. Finally, he wished to stress the importance of cooperation, compromise and consensus among States parties in the continued implementation of the Treaty and called upon the international community to rededicate itself to the fundamental goals of the NPT, to use nuclear techniques to build prosperity in a world made ever more secure with each step achieved under the Treaty towards the elimination of nuclear weapons.

55. **Mr. Widodo** (Indonesia), speaking on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, said the deliberations of the Review Conference had shown that States parties to the NPT had reached a critical stage in their concerted efforts to further strengthen the non-proliferation regime. In that regard, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries fervently hoped that, as a result of the decisions taken by the Conference, all the substantive issues contained in the working paper that had been submitted by the Movement would be addressed, so that the international community as a whole could lay a more solid foundation for non-proliferation that would serve the interests of all States parties to the Treaty. The highlight of the Review Conference had undoubtedly been the adoption of practical steps designed to bring about a systematic and progressive implementation of article VI of the NPT, as well as paragraphs 3 and 4 (c) of the 1995 Decision on Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament.

56. In the context of the strengthened review process, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries had noted the introduction of new principles and approaches in the context of nuclear and related issues. However, the Movement was at the same time conscious of various conditionalities that were often attached to action on disarmament matters. The challenge was how to further strengthen the consensus that already existed in order to achieve the goals enshrined in the Treaty. While the Conference might not have lived up to all expectations, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries was optimistic about the future viability of the Treaty. It hoped that the Conference would give a fresh impetus to efforts to build a world without nuclear weapons, where security and equality were guaranteed to all nations.

57. **Mr. Alborzy** (Islamic Republic of Iran) welcomed the Final Document adopted by the Conference, which provided the basis and framework for future work on non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament. Indeed, the document reaffirmed, *inter alia*, that no new nuclear-weapon State should be recognized; that States not parties to the Treaty should accede to it as non-nuclear-weapon States; and that nuclear-weapon States should refrain from assisting States not parties to the Treaty to acquire nuclear weapons. Agreement had also been reached on strengthened safeguards, while Israel had been called upon to accede to the NPT and to place all its nuclear

facilities under IAEA safeguards. Indeed, IAEA was the only competent authority responsible for verifying and ensuring the compliance of all States parties with their safeguards agreements. It was also the body to which all concerns regarding non-compliance with those safeguards agreements should be addressed.

58. Moreover, the document emphasized that unhindered nuclear cooperation for peaceful purposes should be promoted. No allegations of proliferation could deprive a State party to the Treaty of its inalienable right to develop, conduct research on, produce and use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. It had also been decided that a transparent and open framework was needed for nuclear export controls. In that regard, his delegation expected the current Italian and future French presidencies of the Nuclear Suppliers Group to take practical steps to give effect to that desire of the Conference, which had also emphasized that the ABM Treaty should continue to be preserved as the cornerstone of global strategic stability. Finally, nuclear-weapon States had committed themselves to a further reduction of their nuclear arsenals through bilateral, plurilateral and multilateral arrangements, including the conclusion of START III as soon as possible. His delegation was confident that the agreed framework for strengthening the review process would provide a mechanism for facilitating the implementation of the Review Conference's decisions.

59. **Mr. Reguieg** (Algeria) said that Algeria was committed not only to strengthening the NPT, but also to the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. He hoped that the historic final consensus document would help to achieve the universality of the Treaty and hence strengthen the non-proliferation regime. That would ultimately promote the noble cause of disarmament and a world free from nuclear weapons and all weapons of mass destruction. His delegation welcomed the atmosphere of flexibility, responsibility and cooperation which had reigned throughout the Conference.

60. **Mr. Albuquerque** (Portugal), speaking on behalf of the European Union and the associated countries Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Turkey, welcomed the successful outcome of the Conference. The flexibility shown by all States parties had confirmed the shared commitment to the Treaty as a cornerstone of the global non-proliferation regime and the foundation for the pursuit of nuclear disarmament based on the

decisions and resolution of the 1995 Review Conference.

61. The European Union strongly supported the Conference's renewed urgent call to those States that had not yet adhered to the Treaty, to do so without delay. It remained committed to the Resolution on the Middle East adopted by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference and to its implementation. It therefore welcomed the progress towards that end and the agreement by the Conference on a balanced outcome concerning various elements of that issue.

62. The Conference had reviewed the situation regarding compliance, an issue to which the European Union also attached particular importance. Moreover the Conference had agreed on practical steps designed to lead to the progressive implementation of article VI of the Treaty and paragraph 4 (c) of the 1995 decision on Principles and Objectives. The European Union was encouraged by the agreements reached on those measures and hoped that the momentum generated by the Conference would be sustained.

63. **Mr. Aboulgheit** (Egypt) expressed the hope that the success achieved by the Conference would help to promote the non-proliferation regime as a whole, speed up nuclear disarmament and achieve universality of the Treaty. By achieving consensus on all matters before them, the 187 States parties to the NPT had reaffirmed the importance of Israel's adherence to the Treaty and the placement by that country of all its nuclear facilities under full-scope IAEA safeguards. That was an important and essential step towards achieving the universality of the Treaty in the Middle East. The States parties to the Treaty had reaffirmed the continued validity of the Resolution on the Middle East and had stressed the need to follow up progress made in its implementation and in achieving its objectives. Moreover, they had underscored the need to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

64. **Mr. Haniff** (Malaysia) said that the outcome of the Review Conference had not matched his delegation's earlier expectations of stronger commitments to nuclear disarmament, especially from the nuclear-weapon States. The lack of political will on the part of nuclear-weapon States had been reflected by their failure to even acknowledge the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons, which had a direct impact on the activities, policies and obligations

of Member States in the area of nuclear disarmament, particularly with regard to article VI. Instead of making a strong pronouncement on the Court's advisory opinion, the Conference had been prevailed upon to merely recall that opinion in the "forward-looking" document and to note it in the "review document". Regrettably, the nuclear-weapon States did not view the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals as a matter of urgency. Some of them continued to oppose the proposal to begin negotiations on a nuclear weapons convention or a framework convention.

65. The Resolution on the Middle East was an integral part of the package of decisions and resolutions adopted at the 1995 NPT Review and Extension Conference, yet the region was far from being a zone free from nuclear weapons as called for in that Resolution. In that regard, his delegation was concerned that Israel was the only State in the Middle East that had not acceded to the Treaty or placed its nuclear facilities and material under full-scope IAEA safeguards. It was also concerned about the new concept of "strategic" stability, which was definitely incompatible with nuclear disarmament, since it appeared to imply the retention of nuclear weapons.

66. Referring to the Nuclear Suppliers Group, he said that a group of over 30 countries could not and should not dictate terms to the other 150 States parties to the NPT. The activities of the Nuclear Suppliers Group were undemocratic and contrary to existing international norms. The Group's activities did not adequately distinguish between non-nuclear-weapon States parties to the NPT which had full-scope safeguards arrangements with IAEA and States not parties to the Treaty. He therefore hoped that any further strengthening of the international nuclear non-proliferation safeguards system, particularly in the context of dual-use items, would be pursued with greater transparency. It was also regrettable that the Secretary-General's proposal to convene a major conference to identify ways of eliminating nuclear dangers had not been widely supported, since the issue of nuclear disarmament was of paramount importance to the survival of humanity.

67. **Mr. Tucknott** (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the Western Group, said that the States parties to the NPT had demonstrated their collective desire to reach an outcome which confirmed the relevance of the Treaty 30 years after its entry into force. The final report of the Conference contained a balanced review

and set a realistic and achievable agenda to take forward the work to which the entire international community was committed, namely, the achievement of a world free from nuclear weapons.

68. **Mr. Kvok** (Russian Federation) said there was no doubt that the Conference had demonstrated once again the need to strengthen the non-proliferation regime and strategic stability, the cornerstone of which was the ABM Treaty of 1972 and all its revisions. Without that Treaty, it was impossible to make any progress towards nuclear disarmament. In his delegation's view, strategic stability was primarily meant to strengthen international security, which would make it possible to achieve more substantial reductions in nuclear and conventional weapons in the future. While the final document of the Conference was not ideal, it was a product of common sense and good will. The Russian Federation would continue to conduct a consistent policy to strengthen the NPT and try to make it universal.

69. **Mr. Brunet** (France) said that the results of the Conference showed the continuing commitment of the international community to non-proliferation, nuclear disarmament and the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. His delegation would continue to work towards that end on the basis of the review of the 1995 decisions and forward-looking results of the Conference.

70. **Mr. Hoang Chi Trung** (Viet Nam) welcomed the success achieved by the Review Conference and hoped that it would provide the impetus for efforts aimed at achieving the common goal of total nuclear disarmament. The NPT was the cornerstone of the non-proliferation regime and a tool which would enable the States parties to work towards achieving a world free from nuclear weapons. In that regard, nuclear-weapon States should make an unequivocal commitment to eliminating all nuclear weapons within a specified time-frame. Although the measures laid out in the final outcome document were not as complete and comprehensive as most of the non-nuclear-weapon States would have wished, they nevertheless represented considerable progress in the work towards that noble objective. His delegation sincerely hoped that those measures would be observed by all States parties to the Treaty in general, and by the nuclear-weapon States in particular.

71. The President welcomed the positive outcome of the Conference. While the results might not appear to be commensurate with the magnitude of the tasks and challenges facing the international community or the expectations of that community, they must be seen against the background of the prevailing political circumstances.

72. In accordance with Decision 1 on the strengthening of the review process for the Treaty adopted in 1995, the Conference had been successful in looking forward as well as backward. It had managed to evaluate the results of the period since 1995, including the implementation of the obligations of States parties under the Treaty, and to identify areas in which, and the means through which, further progress would be sought in the future, including the strengthening of the implementation of the provisions of the Treaty and the achievement of its universality.

73. Among its major achievements, the Conference had again reaffirmed its conviction that the preservation of the integrity of the Treaty and its strict implementation were essential to international peace and security, and it had recognized the crucial role of the Treaty in nuclear non-proliferation, nuclear disarmament and the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. Thus, agreements had been reached on the review of the operation of the Treaty, and the progress achieved in the implementation of the obligations of all States parties to the Treaty had been duly recognized. At the same time, nuclear-weapon States had been urged to show more resolve in carrying out their undertakings under article VI of the Treaty.

74. The paramount importance of achieving the goal of universality of the Treaty had once again been stressed. In that regard, States not yet parties to the Treaty, namely Cuba, India, Israel and Pakistan had been urged to adhere to it promptly and without delay. The importance of the full compliance of all States parties with all provisions of the Treaty had also been emphasized, while the contribution of nuclear-weapon-free zones to the enhancement of global and regional peace and security and to the strengthening of the nuclear non-proliferation regime had been further stressed. In addition, the importance of legally binding security assurances by the five nuclear-weapon States to the non-nuclear-weapon States parties to the Treaty had been reaffirmed and further efforts in that regard had been urged. An in-depth consideration of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy under IAEA safeguards

had been conducted and agreement had been reached on appropriate recommendations in that respect.

75. More significantly, the Conference had agreed on some practical steps for the systematic and progressive efforts to implement article VI of the Treaty and paragraphs 3 and 4 (c) of the 1995 decision on Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament. The implementation of that programme of action would undoubtedly accelerate prospects of achieving the shared objective of the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

76. The Conference had also focused on regional issues. In particular, the situations in the Middle East and South-East Asia had been the subject of an in-depth consideration and appropriate recommendations. Finally, the Conference had emphasized the need to keep the issue of improving the effectiveness of the strengthened review process for the Treaty under constant review and a decision aimed at further improving the effectiveness of the review process had been adopted.

77. In conclusion, he reiterated that the final outcome of the Review Conference, which was the product of a delicate and hard-won compromise between divergent and sometimes conflicting positions, was the best attainable under the prevailing conditions.

78. He declared the Conference closed.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.