

UNITED NATIONS
DEPARTMENT FOR DISARMAMENT AFFAIRS
REFERENCE LIBRARY

Preparatory Committee for the Second
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/CONF.II/PC/SR.3
4 May 1983
Original: ENGLISH

PREPARATORY COMMITTEE FOR THE SECOND 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

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 3RD MEETING (CLOSED)

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 3 May 1983, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. THIELICKE (German Democratic Republic)

CONTENTS

Organization of the Preparatory Committee (continued)

Organization of the Review Conference

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 Official Records Editing Section, room E.6108, Palais des Nations, Geneva.

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 10.50 a.m.

ORGANIZATION OF THE PREPARATORY COMMITTEE (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN said that, following the agreement at the previous meeting that the members of the Bureau should prepare a draft programme of work for the Preparatory Committee, the following text had been drawn up and circulated:

"1. Organization of the Preparatory Committee

- (a) Composition of the Bureau
- (b) Participation of non-members
- (c) Methods of work

2. Organization of the Review Conference

- (a) Date and duration
- (b) Agenda
- (c) Composition of the Bureau
- (d) Rules of procedure
- (e) Background documentation
- (f) Final document(s)

3. Follow-up to the conclusions of the First Review Conference concerning Articles V and VII of the Treaty.

4. Report to the Review Conference."

If he heard no comments regarding that suggested programme of work, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt it.

2. It was so decided.

(a) Composition of the Bureau

3. The CHAIRMAN recalled that, at the previous meeting, it had been decided that the Bureau would be composed of representatives of the German Democratic Republic, Norway and Yugoslavia and that, pending the settlement of the question of the chairmanship, those members would take turns in acting as Chairman of the Committee. That question was still pending, but every effort would be made to resolve it as soon as possible.

(b) Participation of non-members

4. The CHAIRMAN said that three States signatories to the Treaty, namely Greece, Madagascar and Senegal, had asked to participate in the work of the Preparatory Committee. While there was no precedent in the work of the Preparatory Committee for the First Review Conference, it was clear from a number of indications, particularly rule 43 (1) of the rules of procedure of that Conference (SBT/CONF/2) that it had been considered desirable that the participation of signatories should be encouraged.

5. The Bureau had thus decided to recommend that the Preparatory Committee should invite the three signatory States concerned to participate in its discussions without taking part in the adoption of decisions. If there were no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to accept that recommendation.

6. It was so decided.

(c) Methods of work

7. The CHAIRMAN said that the report of the Preparatory Committee for the First Review Conference stated that the Committee had decided to reach its decisions by consensus (SBT/CONF/3, para.7). If he heard no objections, he would take it that the current Preparatory Committee wished to adopt a similar procedure.

8. It was so decided.

ORGANIZATION OF THE REVIEW CONFERENCE (item 2)

(a) Date and duration

9. The CHAIRMAN said that, during informal consultations held by the States Parties to the Treaty in the course of the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly, it had been agreed that the Review Conference should be held at Geneva from 12 to 23 September 1983. It was necessary, however, for the Preparatory Committee to formalize that agreement.

10. If he heard no objections, therefore, he would take it that the Committee wished to decide that the Review Conference was to be held at Geneva from 12 to 23 September 1983.

11. It was so decided.

(b) Agenda

12. The CHAIRMAN said that the agenda of the First Review Conference (SBT/CONF/1) had been circulated. The Bureau suggested that the Preparatory Committee should recommend the same provisional agenda to the Second Review Conference.

13. It was so decided.

(c) Composition of the Bureau

14. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to paragraphs 10 and 11 of the report of the Preparatory Committee for the First Review Conference (SBT/CONF/3). He suggested that the current Preparatory Committee might wish to adopt the same arrangements.

15. Mr. GARCIA MOLINA (Argentina) said that his delegation considered that the composition of the Bureau for the Second Review Conference should be given further consideration. There were many new signatory States from Latin America, a region which, at the First Review Conference, had been allotted only one post of Vice-President. In his view, the number of Vice-Presidents should be increased from 16 to 17 and the Latin American region should be allotted a second post.

16. Mr. SARAN (India) said that it would be useful if the Preparatory Committee could be given details of the number of additional signatory States since 1977, broken down in terms of regions.

17. The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretariat was, in fact, preparing a paper on the new accessions since the First Review Conference. However, it would not include the dates of ratification of such accessions and it might thus be necessary to ask the Secretariat to prepare a second paper.

18. In the circumstances, he suggested that the Committee should take note of the points raised by the representatives of Argentina and India and, for the moment, leave the matter in suspense.

19. It was so decided.

(d) Rules of procedure

20. The CHAIRMAN said that the rules of procedure for the First Review Conference (SBT/CONF/2) had been circulated. In the event that there were no comments, he would take it that the Committee wished to recommend the same rules of procedure for the Second Review Conference apart, of course, from rule 5, relating to the composition of the Bureau.

21. Mr. GARCIA MOLINA (Argentina) said he wished to draw the Preparatory Committee's attention to rule 35 concerning the Drafting Committee. His delegation did not think it advisable that the Drafting Committee should be composed solely of representatives of States which were represented on the General Committee. It would be more appropriate to adopt a formula which permitted other delegations to participate also.

22. Mr. LANG (Austria) said it would be helpful if information could be supplied concerning the practice at recent review conferences which might, perhaps, provide a useful precedent.

23. The CHAIRMAN said that, in the case of the Review Conferences on the Bacteriological Weapons Convention and the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the wording of the corresponding rule of the rules of procedure was much the same as that in document SBT/CONF/2 but, in each case, there was a further paragraph specifying that representatives of other delegations could attend meetings of the Drafting Committee when matters of particular concern to them were under consideration.

24. Mr. MIDDLETON (United Kingdom) said everyone with any experience of drafting work would agree that it was essential that the committee in question should be kept as small as possible. Although there would have to be some provision enabling the representatives of other States to attend, it was essential that the primary responsibility for the drafting work should rest with a limited number of delegations. He felt sure that the Bureau and the Secretariat would be able to find a suitable formula.

25. Mr. NUNEZ-MOSQUERA (Cuba) said that his delegation thought it unfortunate that a number of matters should be left in suspense. It was surely possible to work out a solution satisfactory to the delegation of Argentina in the light of the precedents that the Chairman had quoted.

26. Mr. SARAN (India) said that, while his delegation had no objection in principle to modifying rule 35, it would like to see a draft amendment on the subject submitted in writing.

27. The CHAIRMAN said it would seem that the Committee would have to wait until one or more amended versions were available in writing before reaching a decision concerning rule 35.

28. He suggested that if there were no objections to the other rules in document SBT/CONF/2, they could be adopted immediately as the rules of procedure for the Second Review Conference, pending decisions concerning rules 5 and 35.

29. It was so decided.

(c) Background documentation

30. The CHAIRMAN said that, for the First Review Conference, the Secretariat had submitted two papers: an information paper relating to the Sea-Bed Treaty (SBT/CONF/4) and a document concerning information relevant to the Treaty supplied to the Secretary-General by the Parties or other Governments (SBT/CONF/6). Some details of both documents were to be found in paragraph 16 of the report of the previous Preparatory Committee (SBT/CONF/3).

31. Mr. NORBERG (Sweden) said that his delegation thought it important that the background information should be supplied well in advance of the Review Conference itself. In the circumstances, while requesting the Secretariat to provide the information already available, the Committee should also invite the Parties to the Treaty to supplement that information by communicating to the Secretariat as soon as possible any material at their disposal.

32. The CHAIRMAN said that there were two questions to be decided, the first of which related to the information paper concerning the Sea-Bed Treaty (SBT/CONF/4). If he heard no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to request the Secretariat to bring that information paper up to date.

33. It was so decided.

34. The CHAIRMAN said that, with regard to the information to be supplied by Governments, the question was whether the same procedure should be adopted as in the case of document SBT/CONF/6.

35. Mr. LANG (Austria) asked what would be the deadline for the transmission of background material to delegations.

36. The CHAIRMAN said that it was difficult at the current stage to decide on a deadline. The matter could be discussed by the members of the Bureau, who would make suggestions for possible inclusion in the Committee's report.

(f) Final document(s)

37. The CHAIRMAN referred to paragraph 21 of the final report of the previous Preparatory Committee (SBT/CONF/3) and suggested that the Committee should include a similar paragraph in its own report.

38. In response to a question put by Mr. STEELE (Australia), the CHAIRMAN said that the final document of the First Review Conference (SBT/CONF/25) had consisted of three parts, one relating to the organization and work of the Conference, the second containing the final document, and the third containing the summary records of the plenary meetings.

39. Mr. MELESCANU (Romania) said that his delegation had no objection to the formula in paragraph 21 of the final report of the first Preparatory Committee provided that it was in no way held to prejudge the content of the final document of the forthcoming Conference which, it was to be hoped, would accomplish more than the First Review Conference.

40. The CHAIRMAN said that it was, of course, for the Second Review Conference itself to decide on the content of its final document.

41. Mr. MIDDLETON (United Kingdom) said that the adoption of a paragraph similar to paragraph 21 of document SBT/CONF/3 would not prejudge the content of the final document or the outcome of the forthcoming Conference.

42. The CHAIRMAN said that if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to adopt the formulation used in paragraph 21 of document SBT/CONF/3 and to leave it to the Conference itself to decide on the content of its final document.

43. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 11.40 a.m.