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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, Office of Conference and Support Services, room DC2-794, 2 United Nations Plaza.

Any corrections to the records of the meetings of this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.
The meeting was called to order at 4.35 p.m.

1. Mr. GRAHAM (United States of America), referring to press reports stating that the United States was not firmly committed to the indefinite extension of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, stated that his country had not wavered in its position. In confirmation, he distributed to delegations a copy of the statement to that effect which he had made to the press the day before.

The meeting was suspended at 4.40 p.m. and reconvened at 7.05 p.m.

ORGANIZATION OF THE 1995 CONFERENCE (continued)

RULES OF PROCEDURE (continued)

2. Mr. SIERLA (Finland), Chairman of the informal working group on the rules of procedure, said that the working group had agreed to delete the reservations made to the draft rules of procedure (NPT/CONF.1995/PC.III/CRP.2 of 20 September 1994) in connection with the following rules: rule 1 and note 1, rule 5 and note 2, rule 12 and note 3, rule 27 and note 4, rule 28 and note 5, rule 28.2 (b), and note 6, rule 28.3 (a) and note 8, and the appendix to rule 12 and note 10. In addition, a consensus had been reached on a new wording for rule 30, which, inter alia, would delete note 9, and for rule 34. The working group had also agreed to introduce a technical amendment recommended by the Secretariat to revise rule 44 so as to bring it into line with the current status of the Treaty.

3. Finally, although there was agreement on the rates of assessment set out in the schedule contained in the appendix to rule 12, three States parties had requested that a footnote should be added to the list indicating that they had objections with respect to the scale of assessments agreed upon by the General Assembly in decision 47/456 and resolution 49/12 B. In view of the historic importance of the forthcoming Conference, the working group had also agreed that, notwithstanding rule 42, the statements made in connection with the adoption of final decisions should be reflected fully in the records. A new appendix to rule 12, giving the per cent share of the estimated total costs for each of the 154 States which had participated in the session, had been prepared and distributed to delegations.

4. In effect, the only matter which the Conference would have to consider was rule 28.3 (c), relating to the voting procedure for the adoption of decisions in the event a consensus had not been reached. Some progress had been achieved with regard to the matters to be discussed in the informal consultations to be held in New York on 14 and 15 April 1995. An appendix containing the five proposals put forward concerning rule 28.3 would be prepared and submitted to delegations for their consideration.

5. Mr. Jun WANG (China) sought clarification as to whether the text of paragraph 2 of the appendix to rule 12 had been changed, in view of the fact that it had been agreed in Geneva that the English text of the second line of that paragraph should read "... except that the shares designated" instead of "... except that the share of States designated".

...
6. Mrs. HOPPE (Secretary of the Preparatory Committee) said that the representative of China was correct and that the error would be rectified accordingly.

7. Mr. DAVINIC (Provisional Secretary-General of the Conference) pointed out that rule 1 of the draft rules of procedure referred to the 1995 Conference as the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty. For practical reasons, therefore, the Conference secretariat proposed to use that terminology in its subsequent communications with States parties.

8. With regard to the distribution of documentation and the complaints voiced by certain delegations to the effect that the documentation did not reach them on time, he explained that, to date, documentation had been sent to the Missions of the various States in New York on three occasions, and requested delegations to indicate clearly to the secretariat whether they wished to receive the documentation through the Permanent Missions or by some other means.

9. Mr. TAYLHARDAT (Venezuela) said that the title of the Conference, which was concerned with the non-proliferation treaty, should be clearly indicated so as to prevent any possible misunderstanding on the part of the general public.

10. Mr. LAPTSENAK (Belarus) thanked the secretariat for preparing the new schedule of the allocation of costs among the various delegations. It provided a clearer picture of the financial implications which the forthcoming Conference would have for States. His delegation was, however, concerned about the budgetary principle used to allocate the costs of the forthcoming Conference and of the earlier sessions of the Preparatory Committee. It would be more in line with United Nations practice to base the allocation of costs among States parties on their actual participation in the whole process, including the preparatory phase. Many of the States taking part in the current session had only recently become parties to the treaty and begun to contribute to the process; ideally, that fact should be taken into account in the allocation of costs. Belarus had proposed an amendment to the text of the draft rules of procedure but had not insisted upon it in order not to prevent a consensus, but it wished to place on record in the official documentation of the current session its position that the allocation of costs should be based on actual participation in the preparatory process.

FINAL REPORT OF THE PREPARATORY COMMITTEE (continued)

11. The CHAIRMAN announced that agreement had been reached on paragraph 20 of the draft report concerning the chairmanship of the two Committees of the Conference which had fallen vacant. The groups had agreed that Mr. Tadeusz Strulak of Poland would be Chairman of the Drafting Committee and that a representative of the Group of Non-Aligned and Other States would be Chairman of the Credentials Committee on the Verification of Powers. If there were no objections, he would take it that delegations agreed to paragraph 20 as revised.

12. Paragraph 20, as revised, was adopted.
13. **Mr. IBRAHIM** (Indonesia) on behalf of the States members of the Non-Aligned Movement, said that the non-aligned States had adopted a decision to support the composition of the Bureau of the Conference announced by the Chairman in a spirit of compromise and in order to facilitate the work of the Preparatory Committee. It should not be regarded as a precedent.

14. **The CHAIRMAN** said that, if there were no objections, he would take it that the Preparatory Committee adopted the draft final report on its fourth session.

15. **The draft final report was adopted.**

**CLOSURE OF THE SESSION**

16. After an exchange of courtesies, in which **Mr. DONNELLY** (United Kingdom), **Mr. WIRANATAATMADJA** (Indonesia), **Mr. BLUKIS** (Latvia) and **Mr. OWADE** (Kenya), on behalf of the regional groups of States, and **Mr. Jun WANG** (China) participated, the CHAIRMAN declared the fourth session of the Preparatory Committee for the 1995 Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons closed.

   The meeting rose at 7.40 p.m.