

**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

UNITED NATIONS
CENTRE FOR DISARMAMENT
DEPARTMENT OF
INTERNATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL
Reference Library
S/PC.I/SR.8
16 February 1977
ORIGINALS ENGLISH

First session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 8th MEETING (CLOSED)

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 10 February 1977, at 3.15 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. WYZNER (Poland)

CONTENTS

Progress report of the Preparatory Committee

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

- (d) Financing (continued)
- (e) Languages and documentation, records, etc.
- (b) Composition of the Bureau (continued)

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.

GE.77-82273

PROGRESS REPORT OF THE PREPARATORY COMMITTEE.

1. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Bureau had prepared a draft report which would be submitted to the Committee on the following day, that the list of assessments for the financing of the Conference drawn up by the Budget Division at the request of Canada and a number of other countries would be circulated immediately, and that a document containing an estimate of the cost of the Conference would be distributed later in the meeting.
2. He then read out a letter from the Special NGO Committee on Disarmament requesting, on behalf of the non-governmental organizations, a return to the practice followed during the meeting of the Preparatory Committee of the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. We would inform the Special Committee of the decision taken by the Preparatory Committee in the matter.
3. As the proposals submitted at the previous meeting by Romania (SBT/PC.I/CRD.8) and Sweden (SBT/PC.I/CRD.9) concerning documents which the United Nations Secretariat could usefully prepare for the Review Conference had not yet appeared in all working languages, he asked participants whether they wished to continue the consideration of that item without having before them some of the language versions of the proposals. He recalled that one of the items which was pending, namely, the geographical distribution of the members of the Bureau of the Conference, was now being discussed informally.
4. Mr. HAMILTON (Sweden) thought that the United Nations Secretariat ought to prepare the documents for the Conference on the basis of all information already available to it and information which could be obtained from the Parties to the Sea-Bed Treaty.
5. Mr. SIMARD (Canada) wondered whether an error had been made in arranging the columns showing assessments for the financing of the Review Conference. In his opinion, the contributions of countries having only signed the Treaty should appear in column (b) and those of countries having signed and ratified it in column (c); it was strange that the percentages in column (c) should be higher than those in column (b).
6. The CHAIRMAN said that a representative of the Budget Division was expected shortly and would be able to provide the explanations necessary concerning that list.
7. Mr. MEYERS (United States of America) said he hoped that the representative of the Budget Division would be able to give some idea of the total cost of the Conference.
8. Mr. FERRETTI (Italy) stressed the increasingly urgent need for a list of the States Parties to the Treaty in order to be able to discuss the question of financing and that of the geographical distribution of the members of the Bureau of the Conference.

9. The CHAIRMAN read out a letter from the representative of the United States of America to which were annexed the lists of the States Parties and signatory States provided by each of the Depository States. As the lists had been drawn up in different languages, they would be distributed to the members of the Committee as soon as they had been translated.

10. Mr. DJOKIĆ (Yugoslavia) informed the Committee that the consultations on the geographical distribution of the members of the Bureau had not yet been concluded. As no documents were available and if there were no specific items to be considered, he proposed that the meeting should be suspended so that those consultations might be resumed forthwith.

11. The CHAIRMAN thought that the meeting might be suspended for about twenty minutes if no member of the Committee objected.

12. Mr. ERDEMBILEG (Mongolia) endorsed the proposal by the Yugoslav representative. He would also like to comment on the documents to be prepared for the Review Conference as well as on the subjects which, according to the Romanian proposal, should be dealt with in them. As regards the effectiveness of the Treaty, he thought that the United Nations Secretariat already had in its possession commentaries by States Parties on the implementation of the Treaty. Recent technological developments were indeed of interest to the States Parties to the Treaty. As for the effect of the Treaty on international efforts to promote the exploitation of the natural resources of the seas and oceans for the purposes of development, he observed that the Conference would consider the operation of the Treaty from a purely military viewpoint. He therefore wondered whether it would be possible to instruct the Secretary-General of the United Nations or the Secretary-General of the Conference to request the States Parties to the Sea-Bed Treaty, when they reported on the operation of the Treaty, to express their views on the effects of the Treaty.

13. The CHAIRMAN said that the representative of the Budget Division had arrived and that the Committee would revert later to the Yugoslav proposal to suspend the meeting.

BUSINESS PERTAINING TO THE SEA-BED TREATY REVIEW CONFERENCE (agenda item 1)
(SBT/PC.I/CRD.1)

(d) FINANCING (continued)

14. Mr. ZAHLES (Deputy Chief, Budget Division), introducing the list of assessments for the financing of the Review Conference, explained that the problem for the Budget Division had been to determine the assessments of the countries which were likely to participate in the financing of the Conference, without having a list of the participants in the Conference. It had tried to determine those percentages starting with the lowest contributor and ending with the highest contributor.

15. Its first assumption had been that all signatory States, whether or not they had ratified the Treaty, would participate in the financing without discrimination; the corresponding percentages were shown in column (b) of the list of assessments. Its second assumption had been that only the countries which had ratified the Treaty would finance the Conference; the relevant percentages were indicated in column (c). For instance, a country whose contribution to the United Nations budget was 0.02 per cent, which had signed the Sea-Bed Treaty and which would take part in the Review Conference, ought to contribute to the financing of the Conference to the extent of 0.025 per cent.

16. Referring to a point already raised by the representative of Canada, he said that the figures in column (b) related to countries which were either signatories of the Treaty or Parties to it. For example, the countries whose contribution to the United Nations budget was 0.30 per cent, which were parties to the Treaty or which had signed but not yet ratified it, ought to contribute to the financing of the Review Conference at the rate of 0.35 per cent. As soon as Budget Division had received information concerning the number of preparatory meetings and the number of countries which would take part in the Conference, it would review the percentages shown in the list under consideration and prepare a second list. However, he did not think that those percentages would vary to any great extent.

17. The CHAIRMAN recalled the question raised by the representative of the United States concerning the cost of the Conference.

18. Mr. ZAHLES (Deputy Chief, Budget Division) said that for the moment he could give only approximate figures. The cost of the Preparatory Committee's session, including the salaries of the staff servicing the meeting and the cost of documentation was expected to amount to \$64,300 at the exchange rate of 2.44 Swiss francs to one dollar. That figure would therefore have to be reassessed in the light of the current rate of the dollar. The cost of the Conference itself was estimated at \$129,000. The secretariat costs would be \$2,500 for the Preparatory Committee and approximately \$10,000 for the Conference itself. The appointment of a Secretary-General of the Conference would entail additional expenditure of \$39,000 or \$40,000, including the assistance provided by the secretariat. To those amounts should be added miscellaneous expenditure, concerning which the Budget Division had only very little information (communications, documentation, possible printing of the report). The total amount would therefore be approximately \$250,000, which would be divided among the countries according to the percentages indicated in the list of assessments.

19. Mr. FERRETTI (Italy) thanked the Deputy Chief of the Budget Division for his list of assessments, but thought that it was merely of an indicative nature. Taking the example of countries which contributed to the United Nations budget at the rate of 0.02 per cent, 0.30 per cent or 3.30 per cent - the case of Italy - and 25 per cent - the case of the United States - their assessments for purposes of financing the Conference would, according to the list, be 0.025 per cent, 0.35 per cent, 3.89 per cent

and 29.45 per cent respectively, which would mean increases of 25 per cent, 18 per cent, 21 per cent and 19 per cent respectively. The increase therefore varied between 18 per cent and 25 per cent. He also drew attention to a typing error at the beginning of column (c): 0.25 should read 0.025.

20. Mr. ZAHLES (Deputy Chief, Budget Division) noted the correction to be made to column (c) of the document under consideration. Replying to the comments of the Italian representative, he said that the number of States participating in the Conference would be less than the number of Member States of the United Nations. The percentages in the list showed what that smaller number of States would pay if they participated in the financing of the Review Conference at the same rate as they contributed to the United Nations budget. The percentages depended on the number of contributors.

21. Mr. FERRETTI (Italy) was not convinced by the explanations given by Mr. Zahles. The percentages in column (b) were between 18 per cent to 25 per cent higher than those in column (a). He failed to see why the increase should not be uniform and considered that the figures given merely had an indicative value.

22. Mr. GRISHCHENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) asked whether account had been taken in the calculations of Switzerland's participation in the financing of the Conference.

23. Mr. ZAHLES (Deputy Chief, Budget Division) said that the figures were indicative. An exact calculation of the percentage increase would require the figures shown in column (a) to be stated in the maximum feasible number of decimal places. The final figures would contain a larger number of decimal places. With regard to Switzerland's participation in the financing, if its assessment was the same as in the bodies of which it was a member, the percentage would be 0.96 per cent, a figure which appeared in the list that had been drawn up.

24. Mr. van der KLAUW (Netherlands) requested further information on the remuneration of the Secretary-General of the Conference. As the Secretary-General and the members of his secretariat would probably be United Nations officials, he wondered how expenditure in respect of their salaries and travel costs could amount to \$40,000.

25. Mr. ZAHLES (Deputy Chief, Budget Division) said that, according to information communicated to the Budget Division, the Secretary-General's salary would correspond to that of a United Nations official at the D-1 level, appointed for seven months. To his normal salary would be added a subsistence allowance and travel costs. If the Secretary-General was recruited within the United Nations system and his salary was chargeable to the Conference budget, then the orders of magnitude indicated by the Budget Division were correct. The Budget Division could provide more precise figures only if it was given more precise information.

26. Mr. van der KLAUW (Netherlands) wondered if the Secretary-General was recruited within the United Nations system and therefore paid out of the contributions of Member States, whether it would be necessary for the Conference to reimburse the United Nations the amount of the Secretary-General's remuneration and whether that would not be tantamount to having the Member States participating in the Conference make a double contribution.
27. Mr. TUDOR (Romania), referring to operative paragraph 2 of General Assembly resolution 3484 E (XXX), asked whether the assistance mentioned in that paragraph was reimbursable or free, and what services it would include.
28. Mr. ZAHLES (Deputy Chief, Budget Division) said, in reply to the Netherlands representative, that if the Secretary-General of the Conference was recruited from among the staff of the United Nations, the difference between his remuneration plus his expenses, and the salary which he would have received at the United Nations if the Conference had not been held might be charged to the budget of the Conference. However, if the Secretary-General of the Conference was not a staff member of the United Nations, his salary would be charged entirely to the budget of the Conference. In addition, if the Secretary-General of the Conference was a staff member of the United Nations and had to be replaced, the cost of his replacement should be charged to the budget of the Conference. It was impossible to make an exact calculation without knowing what decision would be taken.
29. In reply to the question by the Romanian representative, he observed that the Sea-Bed Treaty Review Conference was not among those for which funds had been appropriated in the United Nations budget. The same was true of the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. It could therefore not be assumed that the services made available would be automatically charged to the United Nations budget. Indeed, the countries participating in the Conference would not necessarily be those which contributed to the budget of the United Nations. The financing would also depend on certain decisions to be taken subsequently in connexion with the Conference.
30. Mr. GRISHCHENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said he was not opposed to the idea that the Secretary-General of the Conference should receive the salary of an official at the D-1 level. However, as the Conference was to last two weeks and as invitations would be sent one month in advance, he thought that the services of the Secretary-General of the Conference would be required at the most for only two months. He asked why the Budget Division had used the figure of seven months in its calculations.
31. He also failed to understand why it would be necessary to bring interpreters and other staff from New York, as their travel costs in themselves already represented a considerable sum. It would be better to use the staff of the United Nations Office at Geneva or to recruit other staff locally. He also wondered how the cost of the Conference as a whole could amount to \$250,000.

32. Lastly, with regard to the calculation of the assessments, he observed that, in the case of a country whose contribution to the United Nations represented 0.02 per cent of the budget, its contribution to the financing of the conference should be 0.023 per cent and not 0.025 per cent. For a country which, for purposes of the United Nations budget, was assessed at 3.3 per cent, its share in the financing of the Conference should be 3.93 per cent, and not 3.89 per cent as indicated in the list drawn up by the Budget Division. That showed that the figures furnished had to be checked.

33. Mr. DI BERNARDO (Italy) thought that the calculations of the Budget Division were based on incorrect assumptions. He did not see why the Secretary-General of the Conference should be recruited for seven months if the Conference was to last only 10 days.

34. Mr. SCHNEEBERGER (Switzerland) asked when the list of countries Parties to the Treaty would be available. Indeed, if other States were in the same situation as Switzerland, it would be possible to have a clearer idea of the question of participation in the financing of the Conference. Switzerland was prepared to contribute to its financing in accordance with the scale of assessments established by the United Nations for States not members of the Organization which participated in a conference. In order to facilitate the drafting of the final proposal, it would perhaps be necessary to specify the United Nations resolution used as a basis.

35. Mr. JAY (Canada) wondered to what extent the Sea-Bed Treaty Review Conference, which was a small conference, needed a Secretary-General. Perhaps the three depositary countries could send out the invitations and might be persuaded to provide the services for the Conference. Furthermore, none of the three columns of figures furnished by the Budget Division seemed to relate directly to the Canadian proposal, which sought to define the financial obligations of the Parties to the Treaty and those of countries which were merely signatories of the Treaty. It would be necessary to indicate what the financial contribution of the signatories of the Treaty would be if that contribution was prorated in accordance with their respective rates of assessment under the United Nations scale and what the contribution of States Parties to the Treaty would be if made in accordance with that scale of assessments. The figures furnished by the Division budget would therefore have to be revised.

36. Mr. DAVIS (Australia) said that he found the estimated cost of the forthcoming Conference extremely high compared with the cost of the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. It seemed that, although the former would require 75 per cent less services than the latter its cost would be only 50 per cent lower.

37. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) observed that the estimates could not be complete because it was not known how many countries would be Parties to the Treaty at the time of the Conference or how many countries would participate in the Conference as observers. The present estimates, for which thanks were due to the Budget Division, gave an idea of the implications of the Canadian proposal.

38. Mr. ZAHLES (Deputy Chief, Budget Division) said, with regard to the question why the Secretary-General had to be appointed for a period of seven months whereas the Conference would last only 10 days, that the period of seven months had been indicated to the Budget Division, which had simply made the necessary calculations without determining their basis. Furthermore, its calculations could be precise only if it was given precise data. The question of the Secretary-General's grade was not for the Budget Division to decide. Referring to the comparison made with the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, he pointed out that the situation as regards that Conference had been different: some countries had accepted specific percentages of contributions, others had agreed to contributions based on their United Nations assessment scale, and yet others had agreed to meet the balance of the costs. The remuneration of staff required for the Conference had been calculated by taking account of an inflation rate higher than that prevailing at Geneva. If such staff was recruited at Geneva, the level of salaries would be different. Lastly, if the Budget Division was given more precise information, it would be able to present more detailed and more precise estimates at the following meeting.

39. Mr. SCHLAICH (Federal Republic of Germany) thanked the Secretariat for its assistance to the Preparatory Committee for the Sea-Bed Treaty Review Conference. With regard to the work entailed by the preparation of that Conference, he wondered whether it could not be done by the Disarmament Affairs Division. He also wondered whether it would not be possible for one of the officials of that Division to assume the functions of Secretary-General of the Conference.

40. Mr. BJÖRNERSTEDT (Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations) thought that, if the question was to be viewed in its proper perspective, it was necessary to go back to the Fifth Committee's consideration of the proposal of the Secretary-General of the United Nations (approved by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions - ACABQ) concerning the financing of the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. In that proposal, it had been envisaged that the United Nations would subsidize much of the work of the Preparatory Committee and that of the Conference itself, by assuming staff costs and requesting the Parties and signatories to the Treaty to finance only the additional expenses connected with the travel costs of staff from Headquarters to Geneva. When the proposal had been examined in the Fifth Committee, several States Members had pointed out that, as the Review Conference was of concern only to the Parties to the Treaty, it was not logical for the United Nations to bear those costs. The financing arrangement had therefore been recalculated in such a way that the costs were shared entirely among the Parties to the Treaty. The Secretariat had used that precedent as a basis to establish the principles of financing which were now before the

Preparatory Committee for the Sea-Bed Treaty Review Conference and according to which the Secretary-General of the forthcoming Review Conference would be responsible only to the States Parties to the Treaty and therefore paid by them. There was, however, a difference, which was due to the size and duration of the forthcoming Conference. That difference would make it possible to appoint a Secretary-General at the D-1 level instead of having, as in the case of the Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference, a secretary of the Preparatory Committee at the D-2 level and a Secretary-General of the Conference appointed at the Under-Secretary-General level. However, that difference would in point of fact be reflected by a reduction in expenses by a few percentage points and not, as some delegations thought, by three-quarters; indeed, experience and the calculations of the Budget Division showed that staff expenses could perhaps be reduced by half, but in no case to 25 per cent in relation to the figures of the Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference.

41. Furthermore, he emphasized that provision had been made to appoint a Secretary-General for a period of seven months because, in the light of experience, that period seemed to be the essential minimum for the good conduct of the Conference; in the event that the volume of work was not as great as estimated, that official would obviously not be paid by the States Parties to the Treaty for doing nothing, but would be given other assignments financed from other budgets.

42. Mr. KROYER (Iceland) thanked the two representatives of the Secretariat for their explanations. He would, however, welcome information on one point: in view of the fact that the representative of the Budget Division had said on several occasions that it was not for the Division to prejudge the decision with regard to the appointment of the Secretary-General of the forthcoming Review Conference, who could be recruited within or outside the United Nations system, he would therefore like to know who would take that decision in the final analysis. Would it be the Preparatory Committee or the Secretary-General of the United Nations?

43. The CHAIRMAN recalled that it had been decided to request the Secretary-General of the United Nations to propose a candidate, in consultation with the members of the Preparatory Committee. Therefore, the latter would have its say in the selection of the person who seemed to be the most suitable for that post.

44. Mr. DJOKIĆ (Yugoslavia) said he hoped that the Committee, before discussing points of detail, would take a decision on the most important question, which was that of determining how the Conference would be financed, namely, what method of financing should be applied.

45. Mr. ZAHLES (Deputy, Chief, Budget Division) said he wished to add a few words of explanation to what had been said by the representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations. The total cost of the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons had been estimated at \$645,000, and the eventual reduction of that figure to \$514,000 had been achieved not by some miraculous procedure but because the Conference, under the guidance of its Secretary-General, had

made an effort to function as economically as possible, by limiting its work to what had been really necessary and by employing only the minimum number of staff required to ensure the sound conduct of the Conference.

46. The CHAIRMAN said it would be well if, as the representative of Yugoslavia had just suggested, the Committee were to take a decision on the method of sharing the costs of the Conference and gave the Secretariat instructions on its preparation, which would have a direct bearing on the total cost of the Conference. He pointed out that the eight-Power proposal (SBT/PC.I/CRD.3) had already won very wide approval.

47. Mr. Van Der KLAUW (Netherlands) announced that he had just received instructions from his Government to support that proposal.

48. Mr. SUKHDEV (India) said that his country was not a Party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and had not, therefore, attended the Review Conference of that Treaty. However, on the basis of the draft rules of procedure which had been very carefully prepared for that Conference, after due reflection, and on the basis of information supplied by the Secretariat on the proposed percentages for sharing the cost of the future Conference, his delegation was of the opinion that, in the case of developing countries, the formula originally proposed in the Schedule appended to rule 12 of the draft rules of procedure for the Review Conference of the Non-Proliferation Treaty should be followed. His delegation was unable, therefore, to support the proposal in document SBT/PC.I/CRD.3 as it stood. The developing countries could not be asked to assume additional expenses which they would be unable to bear, and his delegation feared that the prospect of undue expenditure would deter some of those countries from attending the Review Conference.

49. Mr. COOMSON (Ghana) said he wished to raise a few questions concerning the proposal in document SBT/PC.I/CRD.3. First, he wondered whether the phrase "States Parties to the Treaty participating in the Review Conference" could not be interpreted as an escape clause. He hoped, obviously, that all States Parties to the Treaty would participate in the Conference, but would like to know whether, should one of those States decide, for one reason or another, not to participate, that State would no longer be obliged to bear its share of the cost of the Conference.

50. Secondly, he hoped that a clear explanation would be given of the meaning, from the point of view of its implications for the financing of the Conference, of the end of the first sentence of the text under consideration, beginning with the words "prorated to take into account differences ...".

51. He recalled that, by ratifying the Treaty, States Parties had undertaken to observe its principles and objectives; as the Review Conference was supposed to promote those principles and objectives, States Parties, whether or not they decided to participate in the Conference, should feel obliged to contribute to its financing. His delegation would therefore favour deletion of the words "participating in the Review Conference" and "participating in the Conference" from the first sentence of document SBT/PC.I/CRD.3, and hoped that the sponsors of the proposal would clarify the other points he had just raised.

52. Mr. MEYERS (United States of America), referring to the statement of the representative of India, said if that representative proposed, as a matter of principle, that a developing country should assume only a proportion of the expenses equal to its assessment under the United Nations scale, as indicated in the appendix to the draft rules of procedure (NPT/CONF/2), the United States could also insist, as a matter of principle, that it should pay no more than its assessment under the scale, namely, 25 per cent of total expenses. However, if the representative of India were to approach those problems from a slightly more pragmatic point of view, he would observe that, in the frame of reference of cost outlined by the Secretariat, as estimated expenses relating to the Preparatory Committee and the Review Conference would total \$250,000, the proportion of 0.02 per cent envisaged for a number of developing countries would amount to \$50, which should not present practical difficulties for any country.

53. Turning to the proposal in document SBT/PC.I/CRD.3, he said that, after due reflection and a considerable amount of difficulty, his Government could grudgingly accept the formula if there was a consensus in its favour in the Committee and provided that it was accompanied by a note similar to that to rule 12 of the draft rules of procedure for the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, stating that the arrangement did not constitute a precedent. He hoped, therefore, that the Indian delegation, in a spirit of compromise, would also be able to accept the proposal.

54. Mr. JAY (Canada), referring to the points raised by the representative of Ghana, said that his country - which would, of course, attend the Review Conference - would probably be very reluctant to contribute to the financing of the Conference in the event that, for one reason or another, it did not participate in it. Conversely, however, it was obvious that any voluntary contribution from a non-participant would be welcome.

55. Mr. COOMSON (Ghana) appreciated the validity of the Canadian representative's argument. He would not insist that the words "participating in the Review Conference" and "participating in the Conference" should be deleted, in the hope that nobody would take advantage of the text to refrain from participating in the Conference and that all States Parties to the Treaty would abide by their obligations in that connexion.

56. Mr. JAY (Canada), while recalling that his Government had never balked at providing financial assistance to the developing countries, considered that given the more general context of the particularly delicate and complex question of the contributions of countries to the financing of the United Nations, the proposed solution - bearing in mind the financial problems faced by all Governments - was fairly equitable and did not lay an excessive burden on any country. On the understanding that rule 12 of the draft rules of procedure was to be accompanied by the note requested by the representative of the United States - the presence of which in document NPT/CONF/2 had, moreover, enabled Canada to escape the rather unfair precedent in its regard of the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons - he expressed the hope that members of the Committee would soon be able to reach agreement on the proposal under consideration.

57. Mr. SUKHEDEV (India) said he would like a little more time to consider the proposal before giving his final opinion.

58. Mr. OGISO (Japan) endorsed the arrangement proposed in document SBT/PC.I/CRD.3. He thanked the United States delegation for having accepted it and welcomed the fact that the Indian delegation had decided to examine it further.

59. The CHAIRMAN thanked the Deputy Chief of the Budget Division for his useful explanations. He noted, briefly, that the majority of the members of the Committee seemed prepared to consider the text proposed in document SBT/PC.I/CRD.3 as a possible wording for rule 12 of the draft rules of procedure (on the understanding that a note would be added indicating that the financial arrangements provided for did not constitute a precedent), but that some States wished to reflect on the question until the following meeting when, he hoped, the Committee would be able to take a decision.

(e) LANGUAGES AND DOCUMENTATION, RECORDS, etc.

60. The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the members of the Committee to the suggestions of the Geneva Information Service concerning arrangements to be made for the dissemination of information on the Conference.

61. Mr. TUDOR (Romania) asked whether the words "the committees being closed", which appeared between brackets in the English version of the text should be retained or not.

62. The CHAIRMAN said that the words should be deleted.

63. Mr. OGISO (Japan) asked exactly what was meant by the sentence "If necessary, the Information Service will also release to the press all other texts on closed meetings".

64. The CHAIRMAN explained that the sentence meant that the Conference could decide to supply the press with certain information concerning closed meetings if it saw fit to do so, but that it was in no case obliged to provide information on the exact content of those meetings or the decisions taken at them. If the suggestions of the Information Service were approved, they would be noted in the Committee's report.

65. The suggestion of the Geneva Information Service were approved.

(b) COMPOSITION OF THE BUREAU (continued)

66. The CHAIRMAN reminded members that that question and the question of the geographical distribution Bureau posts (articles 5 and 8 of the draft rules of procedure) had not yet been resolved. He appealed to members of the Committee to speed up consultations on the subject so that the Committee could take an early decision.

67. Mr. van der KLAUW (Netherlands) said he wished to discuss further the question of the number of Vice-Presidents. It appeared from the decision the Committee had already taken concerning the structure of the Conference, that the Bureau would consist of five posts (President of the Conference, Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Credentials Committee, Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Drafting Committee), plus a number of Vice-Presidents of the Conference. He considered that the two Vice-Chairmen included in the total of 5 should be deducted from the number of Vice-Presidents yet to be determined. As the Committee had on the whole been of the opinion that the number of Vice-Presidents should be as limited as possible, it might be possible to divide by two the number of Vice-Presidents provided for the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons: that would give a total of 12 or, if the Vice-Chairman of the Credentials Committee and the Vice-Chairman of the Drafting Committee were deducted, a total of 10; that number, which had, moreover, been mentioned in the course of the previous discussion, should be sufficient to enable each regional group to be adequately represented. He wondered whether that proposal could serve as a basis for the consultations still to be conducted on that question.

68. Mr. FERRETTI (Italy) considered that the suggestion was reasonable, as a consensus seemed to have emerged during the discussion in favour of a small number of Vice-Presidents. It had also been decided by consensus, however, that three of the Bureau posts should be reserved for the depository States. He wondered, therefore, whether the figure proposed by the representative of the Netherlands would be sufficient to ensure equitable geographical distribution, because all regional groups (even the least strongly represented, such as the Latin American group) should have at least one seat on the Bureau of the Conference.

69. The CHAIRMAN requested those delegations wishing to engage in consultations on the matter to take account of the suggestions and comments which had just been made and expressed the hope that a solution would be found by the following meeting.

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.