

**Preparatory Committee for the Review Conference
of the Parties to the Treaty on the Prohibition of
the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other
Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea-Bed and
the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof**

Distr.
RESTRICTED
SBT/PC.I/SR.2
9 February 1977
ENGLISH
Original: FRENCH

PREPARATORY COMMITTEE OF THE REVIEW CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES
TO THE TREATY ON THE PROHIBITION OF THE EMPLACEMENT OF NUCLEAR
WEAPONS AND OTHER WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION ON THE SEA-BED
AND THE OCEAN FLOOR AND IN THE SUBSOIL THEREOF

First Session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 2ND MEETING (CLOSED)

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Monday, 7 February 1977, at 3.10 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. WYZNER (Poland)

CONTENTS

Business pertaining to the Sea-Bed Treaty Review Conference
(agenda item 1)

- (d) Financing
- (c) Participation (including attendance of observers and arrangements
for them to speak or present papers, by NGO's etc.)
- (a) Rules of procedure

This record is subject to correction.

Participants wishing to make corrections should submit them in writing to the
Official Records Editing Section, room E.4108, Palais des Nations, Geneva, within
one week of receiving the record in their working language.

Corrections to the records of the meetings of the Committee at this session will
be consolidated in a single corrigendum to be issued shortly after the end of the
session.

BUSINESS PERTAINING TO THE SEA-BED TREATY REVIEW CONFERENCE (agenda item 1)

(a) FINANCING

1. Mr. LIKHATCHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that the preparation of the Sea-Bed Treaty Review Conference raised specific questions which the Preparatory Committee was required to consider. The first concerned financing. Consideration of that question would be facilitated if the secretariat could provide the Committee with an estimate of expenses for the organization of the Conference. The length of the Conference was a determining factor in that regard.
2. The Committee would also have to define procedures. In view of the nature of the Sea-Bed Treaty, and as the participants in the Sea-Bed Treaty Review Conference would be more numerous than the participants in the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, it would be desirable to adopt a simpler structure for the Sea-Bed Treaty Review Conference.
3. The CHAIRMAN said that the secretariat would take note of the request that it should prepare an estimate of expenses for the organization of the Conference. With regard to the length of the Conference, he recalled that it had been decided informally in New York that the Conference should be held from 20 June to 1 July 1977. If there were no comments, he would take it that the Committee approved those dates.
4. It was so decided.
5. Mr. JAY (Canada) acknowledged that the total cost of holding the Conference was an important aspect of the problem of financing, and that the number of participants would be a determining factor. However, he recalled that, during the informal discussions which had been held in New York, it had been considered desirable that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) should not meet concurrently with the Sea-Bed Treaty Review Conference. He was now submitting to the Committee a formal proposal to that effect.
6. He also announced that a number of delegations, including that of Canada, would soon be submitting a proposal regarding participation in the expenses of the Conference. Canada considered that the financing arrangements which had been adopted for the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, and which had obliged it - as well as other countries - to contribute excessive amounts, were unacceptable. The only equitable solution would be to fix the contribution of all participants on the basis of the United Nations scale of assessments, but taking into account the fact that the States participating in the Review Conference would be fewer in number than the States Members of the United Nations.
7. The CHAIRMAN suggested that members of the Preparatory Committee who also participated in the work of the CCD might be consulted with regard to the possible overlapping of the CCD and the Review Conference.
8. Mr. van der KLAUW (Netherlands) thought that it was for the CCD to decide whether or not it would meet simultaneously with the Review Conference.
9. The CHAIRMAN explained that there was no question of imposing a decision on the CCD. The intention was merely to request it not to meet at the same time as the Review Conference.

10. Mr. van der KLAUW (Netherlands) considered that the Committee could ask the CCD only to consider the possibility of not meeting at the same time.
 11. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee decided to request the CCD to consider the possibility of not meeting concurrently with the Sea-Bed Treaty Review Conference.
 12. It was so decided.
- (c) PARTICIPATION (INCLUDING ATTENDANCE OF OBSERVERS AND ARRANGEMENTS FOR THEM TO SPEAK OR PRESENT PAPERS, BY NGO'S, ETC.)
13. The CHAIRMAN invited the participants to consider rule 44 of the draft rules of procedure for the Review Conference on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT/CONF/2).
 14. Mr. FERRETTI (Italy) thought that, with a number of minor amendments, the text of rule 44 might be adopted for the Sea-Bed Treaty Review Conference. He felt that the provisions concerning participation by the various categories of country (countries which had ratified the Treaty, countries which had signed but not yet ratified the Treaty, countries interested in the Treaty), and by the specialized agencies and other organizations, should be retained. The only amendments needed related to participation in the work of any committees which might be set up, and that question could be settled at a later stage. In any event, he considered that provision should be made for as wide a participation as possible.
 15. Mr. TUDOR (Romania) felt that the wording of rule 44 was likely to satisfy both States Parties to the Treaty and those who were considering acceding to it. It would also be appropriate to make provision for the participation of the United Nations, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), specialized agencies and regional intergovernmental organizations. The Preparatory Committee would decide on the final wording of the article when a number of other problems had been settled; but, even at the present stage, it was desirable to provide for as wide a participation as possible, in order to encourage accessions.
 16. Mr. van der KLAUW (Netherlands) felt that paragraphs 1, 2 and 5 of rule 44 should be retained in their present form. Amendments would be required only to paragraphs 3 and 4, which related specifically to the Review Conference on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. For instance, the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) might be allowed to participate in the Sea-Bed Treaty Review Conference with observer status.
 17. Mr. GAYNOR (Ireland) believed that rule 44 should be retained in its present form, subject to certain adaptations which, as the Netherlands representative had suggested, would enable organizations such as UNEP to participate.
 18. Mr. DJOKIC (Yugoslavia) felt that, with certain minor amendments, rule 44 met the requirements of the Sea-Bed Treaty Review Conference. Yugoslavia would support all proposals in favour of the broadest possible participation in the Conference.
 19. The CHAIRMAN noted that the members of the Preparatory Committee seemed to be in agreement that in general rule 44 should be retained. He invited them to consider the text paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraph 1: Signatories

20. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no comments and subject to any decisions which might be taken concerning the organization of the Conference, he would take it that the Preparatory Committee adopted paragraph 1 on first reading.

21. It was so decided.

Paragraph 2: Observers

22. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, in accordance with the numbering of the articles of the Sea-Bed Treaty, the number "IX" in the first line of the paragraph should be replaced by "X".

23. Mr. TUDOR (Romania) proposed that the words "of the Plenary and of the Main Committees" in the fifth line should be deleted, since the structure of the Conference had not been defined.

24. Mr. van der KLAAUW (Netherlands) pointed out that those words also appeared in paragraph 1. He thought that, as long as the structure of the Conference had not been defined, it would be preferable not to make any changes in the text.

25. Mr. TUDOR (Romania) withdrew his proposal.

26. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) said that he assumed that the footnote on page 11 of the draft rules of procedure for the Review Conference on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons would also form part of the rules of procedure for the Sea-Bed Treaty Review Conference.

27. The CHAIRMAN confirmed that that would be so. If there were no comments, and subject to any decisions which might be taken concerning the organization of the Conference, he would take it that the Preparatory Committee adopted paragraph 2 on first reading.

28. It was so decided.

Paragraph 3: The United Nations and the International Atomic Energy Agency

Paragraph 4: Specialized Agencies and Regional Intergovernmental Organizations

29. Mr. MEYERS (United States of America) thought that it might be possible to meet the point made by the representative of the Netherlands, at the beginning of the consideration of rule 44, by mentioning in paragraph 4 the Director-General of the International Atomic Energy Agency who for special reasons, had been mentioned in paragraph 3 in the draft rules of procedure for the Review Conference on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

30. Replying to a question by Mr. JAY (Canada), the CHAIRMAN said that the Secretary-General of the Conference would be appointed at the appropriate time. If the proposal by the representative of the United States of America was accepted, IAEA would have to be mentioned in a suitable place in paragraph 4, separately from the specialized agencies.

31. Mr. FERRETTI (Italy) considered that IAEA should be mentioned at the beginning of paragraph 4, since it was the United Nations agency competent in nuclear questions.

32. The CHAIRMAN asked the members of the committee where they thought it would be appropriate to mention UNEP.

33. Mr. van der KLAUW (Netherlands) said that he was not insisting that UNEP should be mentioned expressly in rule 44. He had simply referred to it as one agency among others which ought to have the opportunity of participating in the Conference.

34. The CHAIRMAN said that if the proposal by the United States representative was accepted, paragraph 3 would read as follows:

"3. The United Nations

The Secretary-General of the United Nations, or his representative, shall be entitled ...".

In the absence of any objections, he would take it that paragraph 3, as amended, was adopted on first reading.

35. It was so decided.

36. Mr. van der KLAUW (Netherlands) considered that the reference to the Agency for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America should be deleted from paragraph 4. A simpler and more general term, such as "Regional intergovernmental organizations", could be used.

37. Mr. JAY (Canada) proposed that an even more general term - namely, "and any other United Nations or regional organization" - should be inserted after the reference to IAEA.

38. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) considered that the word "regional" could simply be deleted from the existing text of paragraph 4.

39. Mr. JAY (Canada) said that he did not wish to exclude regional organizations. It would be for the Conference to decide whether a particular regional organization would participate in its work.

40. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) pointed out that any regional intergovernmental organization was necessarily an intergovernmental organization.

41. Mr. TUDOR (Romania) proposed that, in order to include UNEP, the words "or any other organization" be added after the words "any specialized agency". The text would then read: "The International Atomic Energy Agency, regional intergovernmental organizations and any specialized agency or any other organization of the United Nations may apply ...".

42. Turning to another subject, he said that his delegation considered that it would be useful for the Sea-Bed Treaty Review Conference to be kept informed of the proceedings and decisions of the Conference on the Law of the Sea. The information could be provided through the Secretary-General of the United Nations or through a representative of the Bureau of the Conference on the Law of the Sea.

43. Mr. GRISHCHENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) considered that the Romanian proposal to insert the words "or any other organization" in paragraph 4 was unacceptable. The representation of such organizations was in fact already provided for in paragraph 3, since it was for the Secretary-General of the United Nations to represent them. If the Committee wished to emphasize the role of IAEA, his delegation could accept the United States proposal. It should be noted,

however, that IAEA had no power and that its only role could be to provide information. Moreover, if the reference to the Agency for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America was to be deleted, it seemed hardly logical to mention the International Atomic Energy Agency. It would perhaps be sufficient to say: "Any specialized agency of the United Nations and any regional intergovernmental organization may apply ...".

44. Mr. FERRETTI (Italy) pointed out that the International Atomic Energy Agency was neither a specialized agency of the United Nations nor a United Nations organization. It might perhaps be wrong to place too much emphasis on IAEA; but it could certainly not be excluded.

45. The CHAIRMAN considered that the beginning of paragraph 4 could read: "The International Atomic Energy Agency, any specialized agency of the United Nations and regional intergovernmental organizations may apply ...".

46. Mr. van der KLAUW (Netherlands) said that he wanted to be sure that the wording adopted would allow UNEP to attend the Conference as an observer. He wondered whether UNEP should not be mentioned by name.

47. Mr. BJÖRNERSTEDT (Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations) reminded members that the usual formula was: "The specialized agencies of the United Nations and the International Atomic Energy Agency", since IAEA had been established more recently than the specialized agencies. The formulation "The International Atomic Energy Agency and the specialized agencies" would place special emphasis on IAEA. The United Nations Environment Programme formed part of the United Nations system. Whether it was to be mentioned or not was a matter of emphasis; and that depended on the importance which the Conference attached to the presence of UNEP.

48. The CHAIRMAN observed that, if UNEP was to be mentioned by name, it should be mentioned in paragraph 3. The beginning of paragraph 4 might read: "The specialized agencies of the United Nations, the International Atomic Energy Agency and regional intergovernmental organizations may apply ...". In the absence of any objection, he would take it that the Committee approved that wording.

49. It was so decided.

Paragraph 3

50. Mr. HERDER (German Democratic Republic) felt that there was no need to mention UNEP in paragraph 3 since it had apparently been decided that the beginning of the paragraph should read: "The Secretary-General of the United Nations, or his representative ...", and that wording would cover any representative whom the Secretary-General might instruct to attend the Conference.

51. Mr. DAVIS (Australia) proposed the following wording: "The Secretary-General of the United Nations, or his representative or representatives, shall be entitled ...", which would show that there might be more than one representative of the Secretary-General.

52. Mr. van der KLAUW (Netherlands) pointed out that if UNEP were mentioned in paragraph 3, its representative would have more rights than the IAEA representative because he would be able to attend closed meetings whereas the representative of IAEA would not.

53. Mr. GAYNOR (Ireland) considered that the words "representative or" in the Australian proposal were unnecessary, since the plural "or his representatives" incorporated the singular.
54. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) said he was prepared to accept either expression.
55. The CHAIRMAN said that, in the absence of any objection, he would take it that the Committee approved the wording proposed by Australia.
56. It was so decided.
57. Mr. TUDOR (Romania) reminded members that his delegation had expressed the wish that the Sea-Bed Treaty Review Conference should be kept informed of the work of the Conference on the Law of the Sea.
58. Mr. MEYERS (United States of America) considered that the questions discussed respectively by the Law of the Sea Conference and the Sea-Bed Treaty Review Conference were entirely separate. Furthermore, delegations were able to keep themselves informed of the work of the Law of the Sea Conference.
59. Mr. OGISO (Japan) said that the Secretary-General of the United Nations would be represented at both conferences. Information could thus be obtained through his representatives.
60. Mr. TUDOR (Romania) pointed out that the Treaty to be reviewed was the result of concerns relating both to the law of the sea and to nuclear disarmament. Moreover, it was stated in the first preambular paragraph that mankind had a common interest in the progress of the exploration and use of the sea-bed and the ocean floor for peaceful purposes. He failed to understand how it could be argued that there was no connexion between the work of the two conferences. The idea of receiving information from the representatives of the Secretary-General was interesting. Another possibility might be to invite a member of the Bureau of the Conference on the Law of the Sea to furnish information to participants in the Sea-Bed Treaty Review Conference.

Paragraph 5

61. Mr. GRISHCHENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) drew attention to the fact that in paragraph 5 of rule 44, the question of participation was not dealt with in the same way as in the previous paragraphs. In paragraph 2 it was stated that any State which had neither signed nor ratified the Treaty could apply for observer status in order to attend the Conference. A similar provision was found in paragraph 4. The same idea should also be included in paragraph 5.
62. Mr. HAMILTON (Sweden) considered that the provisions governing the participation of a non-governmental organization constituted a minimum. Anybody could attend public meetings. Representatives of non-governmental organizations could not, however, attend closed meetings.
63. Mr. van der KLAUW (Netherlands) accepted the wording of paragraph 5 because anybody could attend public meetings. The only important idea in paragraph 5, therefore, was that representatives of non-governmental organizations could, at their request, receive the documents of the Conference.
64. The CHAIRMAN reminded members that in any case the paragraph was to be adopted only provisionally. In the absence of any objection, he would consider that the Committee approved the wording of paragraph 5.
65. It was so decided.

66. The CHAIRMAN requested the secretariat to reproduce the text of the paragraphs adopted so that the Committee could reconsider them after the structure of the Conference had been determined. He said that the Canadian proposal concerning participation in the expenses of the Conference would be circulated as soon as possible.

(a) RULES OF PROCEDURE

67. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should go through the draft rules of procedure for the Sea-Bed Treaty Review Conference again from the beginning, on the basis of document NPT/CONF/2 - namely, the draft rules of procedure for the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

CHAPTER I

Rules 1 and 2

68. Draft rules 1 and 2 were adopted on first reading.

Article 3

69. Mr. FERRETTI (Italy) felt that, in view of the small number of countries that would be participating in the Conference, the Credentials Committee might be composed of six members instead of nine (for example, a Chairman, one Vice-Chairman and four members).

70. Mr. van der KLAUW (Netherlands) pointed out that, in accordance with the customary procedure, the Credentials Committee should consist of an uneven number of members in case a vote was necessary. Rule 3 might state that it would be composed simply of a Chairman and six members - i.e., seven members in all, who would appoint their own Chairman.

71. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that rule 5 provided that the officers of Committees were to be elected by the Conference. The beginning of rule 3 might read:

"The Conference shall establish a Credentials Committee composed of a Chairman elected in accordance with rule 5 and six members appointed by the Conference...".

72. Mr. TUDOR (Romania) felt that it would be better to make provision for at least one Vice-Chairman in case the Chairman was unavailable. Furthermore, as the number of participants in the Conference was not yet known, it seemed difficult to fix a precise number for the membership of the Credentials Committee. He thought that blank spaces should be left in the appropriate places in rules 3 and 5.

73. Mr. JAY (Canada) thought that it could be assumed that some 60 States would participate in the Conference and that the rules of procedure could be prepared on that basis. Otherwise, the Committee might prevent the Conference from getting off to a good start by leaving too many points of detail to be settled.

74. The CHAIRMAN said that it had always been customary to proceed on the basis of working hypotheses. In any case, the Committee was only preparing draft rules of procedure which the Conference would have to approve. The Conference could always, therefore, decide to reduce the number of members of the Credentials Committee.

75. Mr. MIHAJLOVIC (Yugoslavia) suggested that, in view of the point made by the representative of Romania, the Credentials Committee should consist, for example, of a Chairman, two Vice-Chairmen and four members.

76. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the following wording should be adopted: "The Conference shall establish a Credentials Committee composed of a Chairman and a Vice-Chairman elected in accordance with rule 5, and five members appointed by the Conference...".

77. It was so decided.

78. Draft rule 3, as amended, was adopted on first reading.

Rule 4

79. Draft rule 4 was adopted on first reading.

CHAPTER II

Rule 5

80. Mr. KABARITI (Jordan) wondered whether rule 5 should not also indicate the basis - e.g. equitable geographical distribution - on which the officers would be elected.

81. The CHAIRMAN said that it was, in fact, usual to include such a provision.

82. Mr. van der KLAUW (Netherlands) felt that, in that rule, what was important was not so much to determine the number of officers as to decide whether the Sea-Bed Treaty Review Conference should have the same number of commissions and committees as the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. That question would have to be taken up again during the discussion of the structure and organization of the Conference, but the Preparatory Committee could already express its view on whether the two main committees should be retained and on the need for a drafting committee.

83. Mr. MEYERS (United States of America), recalling that, at the preceding meeting, he had stressed the need to simplify and rationalize the organization of the Conference, proposed, merely as a suggestion, that there should be a president and ten vice-presidents - who should, in fact, be elected on the basis of appropriate geographical distribution, a single committee of the whole and a credentials committee and that other machinery which had been provided for should be eliminated by giving the Conference the authority to establish working groups, such as a drafting group and a group on technological advances.

84. Mr. NIKOLOV (Bulgaria) said that he was also in favour of simplifying the organization of the work of the Conference. In view of the nature of the Sea-Bed Treaty, the structure of the future Conference should be simpler than that decided upon for the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. His delegation associated itself with what the representatives of the Soviet Union and the United States of America had previously stated in that connexion. It could be decided that the Conference would elect a president and vice-presidents - although it would be difficult to indicate the exact number of vice-presidents, who must, of course, be elected on the basis of equitable geographical distribution, the chairman of the credentials committee and the chairman of the

drafting committee. Since the Conference would have to adopt a final act when it had completed its work, an official drafting committee or group, with officers and an adequate number of members, could hardly be dispensed with. With regard to the main committees, his delegation was of the opinion that it was not even necessary to make any provision for them, since all the discussions might take place in the plenary meetings of the Conference.

85. Mr. MEYERS (United States of America) said he thought that drafting problems could be dealt with by special informal consultations and that it was not necessary officially to appoint a committee to draft the final document.

86. Mr. TUDOR (Romania) said that the main issue was to ensure that the Preparatory Committee proposed the kind of structure for the Conference which would enable it to work as effectively as possible in order to carry out the task entrusted to it. Among the objectives set out in the Sea-Bed Treaty, there were two main themes: on the one hand, the role of the Treaty in the strengthening of international peace and security, which involved political, legal and military factors, and, on the other, the advances made in the exploration and the peaceful use of the sea-bed and the ocean floor. In addition to the question of the length of the Conference, the problem at hand was to ensure that the Conference had a structure which would enable all the participants to deal with those two main themes in as thorough a manner as possible. Since the Sea-Bed Treaty Review Conference would last half as long as the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, it seemed doubtful that the structure which had been decided upon for the latter would make it possible to achieve that objective. For the sake of efficiency, the Committee should perhaps not be too hasty in taking decisions on the draft rules of procedure. His delegation considered that the question of the number of officers came under item I (b) of the Committee's agenda and that it was too early to take decisions on the questions of the structure and organization of the future Conference. It therefore proposed that there should be further consultations on that matter.

87. Mr. di BERNARDO (Italy), leaving aside the question of the structure of the Conference, said that he would like to provide some clarifications concerning the drafting committee. Referring to what the representative of the United States had said, he noted that the Conference's main task would be to prepare a final act and that, if the Conference was not to be extended, it was essential for that task to be carried out by a structured body. A body which would include all the participants in the Conference could not conceivably be expected to carry out such drafting work. He therefore considered that it was essential to maintain the drafting Committee.

88. Mr. HAMILTON (Sweden) considered that, in addition to the credentials committee, it might be possible to provide for a single main committee and, possibly, working groups, to handle the drafting work, as had been the case for the consideration of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. He noted that, if a drafting committee was established, its report would first have to be considered by the committee of the whole. That would involve a loss of time which should be avoided in view of the limited duration of the future Conference.

89. Mr. van der KLAUW (Netherlands) endorsed that suggestion. It would also be necessary to know whether it would be possible to hold two meetings at the same time during the Conference. With regard to the drafting of the final act, it should be stressed that that document would include a rather general part, which should not give rise to many difficulties. In addition, specific draft proposals would be submitted by countries or groups of countries and they would have to be approved by the committee of the whole or by the plenary meetings of the Conference. Consequently, the structure of the Conference should not be too rigid; it would seem preferable to establish special working groups to prepare draft proposals and to plan to hold discussions in the committee of the whole or in plenary meetings of the Conference.

90. Mr. GAYNOR (Ireland) agreed with the two preceding speakers that the official structure of the Conference should be reduced to a minimum; he felt that, even in the case of the Review Conference on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, a drafting committee had not been absolutely necessary.

91. Mr. di BERNARDO (Italy) noted that that had been a very special case, since the President of the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons had played an exceptional role in that respect.

92. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the consideration of rule 5 should be suspended while the delegations concerned held active consultations, in co-operation with the members of the Bureau of the Preparatory Committee, concerning that rule and all matters relating to the structure of the future Conference.

93. It was so decided.

Rules 6 and 7

94. Draft rules 6 and 7 were adopted on first reading.

CHAPTER III

Rule 8

95. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, since no one was questioning the need for a main committee, note should be taken of the Committee's agreement on that matter and that the final wording of rule 8 should be left pending until decisions had been taken on questions of composition.

96. It was so decided.

Rule 9

97. Draft rule 9 was adopted on first reading.

CHAPTER IV

Rule 10

98. Draft rule 10 was adopted on first reading.

99. The CHAIRMAN said he thought that it might be useful to remind delegations at the present stage that the Preparatory Committee of the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons had invited the Secretary-General of the United Nations to present a candidate for the post of Secretary-General of the Conference, as stated in the Final Act of that Conference. He suggested that the present Committee should send a similar invitation to the Secretary-General of the United Nations concerning the Sea-Bed Treaty Review Conference, since it would have final responsibility for the appointment of its Secretary-General, who would remain in office during any other sessions of the Conference.

100. It was so decided.

Rule 11

101. Mr. FERRETTI (Italy), referring to the concern already expressed by the delegation of the Soviet Union that the total cost of the Conference should be kept to a minimum, said that he was not sure whether it was really necessary to make sound recordings, since summary records of the meetings would be prepared.

102. Mr. van der KLAUW (Netherlands) pointed out that sound recordings were very useful when there were different points of view on sensitive matters and that it was usual to have such recordings at all international conferences.

103. Mr. FERRETTI (Italy) said that he would support the view of the majority of the members of the Committee.

104. Draft rule 11 was adopted without change on first reading.

Rule 12

105. It was decided that that rule should be left pending until consideration of financial matters was resumed.

CHAPTER V

Rules 13 to 27

106. Draft rules 13 to 27 were adopted on first reading.

CHAPTER VI

Rule 28

107. Mr. FERRETTI (Italy) said that, for a conference which would not last more than ten working days, the period of deferment of 48 hours provided for in rule 28, paragraph 3, was too long. It might be advisable to reduce it to 24 hours.

108. Mr. OGISO (Japan) felt that a period of deferment of 48 hours might hamper the speedy adoption of decisions. It should probably be reduced to 24 hours, but, if it was not, paragraph 3 should contain a provision enabling the President to reduce the period of deferment if he deemed it advisable.

109. Mr. DAVIS (Australia) said he thought that it might be better to delete the idea of compulsory deferment of voting in that paragraph and to indicate that the President had the right to defer the vote for 24 or 48 hours, depending on the period of deferment decided upon by the Committee. The compulsory deferment of voting might have the result of jeopardizing the successful completion of the work of the Conference.
110. Mr. MEYERS (United States of America) pointed out that rule 28 was the result of concessions and compromises. He would prefer that the period of deferment of 48 hours should be retained.
111. Mr. HAMILTON (Sweden) endorsed the Australian proposal. If it was not adopted, the period of deferment should be shortened.
112. Mr. TUDOR (Romania) said that he also endorsed the Australian proposal.
113. Mr. van der KLAAUW (Netherlands) felt that the Australian proposal gave the President a great deal of authority. The words "after consultation with the General Committee" should therefore be added after the word "President".
114. Mr. GAYNOR (Ireland) supported the proposal by the Netherlands.
115. Mr. DAVIS (Australia) endorsed the proposal made by the Netherlands and supported by Ireland and read out the new wording: "... the President, acting in consultation with the General Committee, shall have the right to defer the vote for ...". The period of deferment still had to be determined.
116. Mr. GAYNOR (Ireland) said that he would like the words: "for 48 hours or any other shorter period which they consider appropriate or advisable ..." to be added after the words "the vote".
117. Mr. MEYERS (United States of America) said he wished to know whether the proposed wording included the words "shall defer" or the words "shall have the right to defer".
118. Mr. GAYNOR (Ireland) said that the wording proposed by the representative of Australia included the words "shall have the right to defer".
119. Mr. JAY (Canada) wondered how the provision in question could be applied in practice. The simplest solution would probably be merely to change the period of deferment in question by reducing it from 48 hours to 24 hours.
120. Mr. HOTERDAEME (Belgium) said that it would be wiser not to make any changes in the structure of rule 28, which was perfectly in keeping with the Conference's objective of reaching a consensus. The proposed period of deferment might, however, possibly be reduced to 24 or 36 hours.
121. Mr. KABARTFI (Jordan) proposed that the words "at least" should be added after the words "48 hours".

122. The CHAIRMAN said that the members of the Committee seemed to be coming back to the original wording and wondered whether they might be able to agree to a period of deferment other than one of 48 hours.

123. Mr. JAY (Canada) said that he would prefer the words "at most" rather than the words "at least" to be added after the words "48 hours".

124. Mr. DAVIS (Australia) proposed that the words "except on the last day of the Conference" should be added after the words "for 48 hours" in order to avoid any difficult situations.

125. The CHAIRMAN invited the members of the Committee to think about that question until the next meeting.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.