

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records



**FIRST COMMITTEE, 1914th  
MEETING**

Thursday, 7 December 1972,  
at 10.30 a.m.

**NEW YORK**

**CONTENTS**

**Agenda item 36 (continued):**

Reservation exclusively for peaceful purposes of the sea-bed and the ocean floor, and the subsoil thereof, underlying the high seas beyond the limits of present national jurisdiction and use of their resources in the interests of mankind, and convening of a conference on the law of the sea: report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction . . . . .

Page

1

**Chairman: Mr. Radha Krishna RAMPHUL**  
(Mauritius).

**AGENDA ITEM 36 (continued)**

Reservation exclusively for peaceful purposes of the sea-bed and the ocean floor, and the subsoil thereof, underlying the high seas beyond the limits of present national jurisdiction and use of their resources in the interests of mankind, and convening of a conference on the law of the sea: report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction (A/8721 and Corr.1, A/C.1/L.621, 622, 632/Rev.1, and 634 to 639)

1. The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to vote on the draft resolutions and amendments thereto which have been submitted under item 36 concerning sea-bed matters.

2. As members of the Committee are aware, the Committee has before it the following draft resolutions and amendments: draft resolution A/C.1/L.621, sponsored by five delegations; draft resolution A/C.1/L.622, sponsored by two delegations; draft resolution A/C.1/L.632/Rev.1, sponsored by 31 delegations; amendments to that draft resolution submitted by Kenya in document A/C.1/L.636, by Canada, France and Malta in document A/C.1/L.637, by Peru in document A/C.1/L.638; draft resolution A/C.1/L.634, sponsored by 48 Powers; amendments to that draft resolution submitted by Malta in document A/C.1/L.635.

3. With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/L.621, the representative of Brazil, in his statement at the 1913th meeting of the Committee, speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution, indicated that they would not press their draft resolution to the vote; therefore, this draft resolution will not be voted upon.

4. With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/L.622, the representative of Peru, at the 1911th meeting, stated that the submission of draft resolution A/C.1/L.634 made it

unnecessary for a vote to be taken on draft resolution A/C.1/L.622. Accordingly, this draft resolution will not be voted upon.

5. To sum up, the Committee will vote on two draft resolutions, namely, A/C.1/L.632/Rev.1 and 634 and the amendments thereto. I have consulted the delegation of Singapore and, with its co-operation and that of the other sponsors, I shall be putting to the vote draft resolution A/C.1/L.634 and the amendments thereto first, if the Committee is agreeable to that.

6. Mr. PARDO (Malta): I wonder whether you could defer for a while the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/L.634 because there are certain consultations going on and there may be a revision of the amendments presented by my delegation.

7. The CHAIRMAN: The delegation of Malta is seeking to defer the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/L.634—for a short while only I hope—in view of the possibility of a revision of the amendments.

8. To continue, in connexion with these two drafts, I wish to draw the Committee's attention to the financial implications, and I will ask the Secretary of the Committee to read out the report of the Secretariat.

9. Mr. CHACKO (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to inform the Committee that the statement by the Secretary-General on the financial implications of draft resolution A/C.1/L.634 is contained in document A/C.1/L.639.

10. The Secretary-General has also noted the various requests that have been made to him for a statement on the financial implications concerning the study proposed in draft resolution A/C.1/L.632/Rev.1 and in the relevant amendments to the original draft and to the revised text in documents A/C.1/L.636, 637 and 638.

11. The members of the Committee will understand that the time available for examination of newly submitted or revised texts covering complex and technical matters has been limited. Thus the Secretary-General regrets not to be in a position to reply on the points raised in detail or with the precision that may be desired.

12. The effect of the revised draft resolution and of the amendments thereto is to have the Secretary-General carry out the study on the basis of the information available to him. This information is largely of a general—indeed speculative—nature. Apart from living resources, which would be covered under two of the amendments, the only

figures with any degree of precision available to him are those concerning existing off-shore production of minerals, in particular hydrocarbons. To the extent that living resources would be covered, the Secretary-General would be obliged to seek the assistance of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

13. The Secretary-General has noted that the various formulations of the proposed study have been the subject of some controversy among members of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction and he has accordingly taken special care in the following observations to address himself solely to the practical aspects of carrying out the tasks which would be entrusted to him.

14. First, as regards sources of information, a comprehensive study of the extent of the international area that would result from each of the various proposals on limits of national jurisdiction presented so far to the sea-bed Committee would have to rely mainly on the publication entitled "International Boundary Study: Series A—Limits in the Seas, No. 46" by the Geographer of the United States Department of State. The Secretary-General would wish to draw attention to the reservations and caveats set forth by the author of this study in the introduction thereto.

15. Secondly, in regard to the economic significance of the area in terms of resources, as has been noted above and on other occasions, reliable information on the extent and location of sea-bed mineral resources is still very limited. Much of what is available has been presented in two reports to the Economic and Social Council<sup>1</sup> and in two reports by the Secretary-General submitted to the sea-bed Committee in documents A/AC.138/36<sup>2</sup> and A/AC.138/73 [A/8721 and Corr.1, annex II, sect. 2]. Those documents themselves specify the sources used.

16. Thirdly, information for establishing the economic implications as requested for the international community and particularly for developing, land-locked, shelf-locked and coastal States can be obtained from various sources, but the Secretary-General would have to rely primarily on the data which would be supplied by the States concerned and might have to be requested from those States.

17. Fourthly, subject to the limitations noted, the Secretary-General would of course carry out the study envisaged in the draft resolution as revised and in the various amendments thereto. However, in view of the number of specific parameters included in the various requests presented in the draft resolution and in the amendments, and owing to the complexity of the far-reaching problems involved in this type of study, the Secretary-General has not, in the limited time available to him, been in a position to assess with precision the feasibility of the various types of studies requested. The Secretary-General would like to point out that a study based solely on geological data is in fact to a large extent in progress in compliance with resolution 1641 (LI) of the Economic and Social Council.

The Secretary-General would like to inform the Committee that, should the Assembly adopt any or some of the draft proposals before the Committee, provision would have to be made for high-level consultants to assist the Secretariat in its tasks. However, provision has already been made in the regular budget for consultant assistance in the preparation of the study requested by the Economic and Social Council. The cost of consultant assistance for the types of study envisaged would run from a minimum of \$50,000 to a maximum of \$200,000 depending on the combination of elements decided upon by the General Assembly.

18. By the same token, the study envisaged in draft resolution A/C.1/L.632/Rev.1 could be ready on time if the information to be requested from Governments were made available immediately and if sufficient resources were provided. Any more complex studies would probably require additional time.

19. In the opinion of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs it is necessary to restate that the resulting studies could only be of a highly conjectural nature, since the scientific and economic data on which they would be based are not yet sufficient for an in-depth professional analysis of the problems involved.

20. The CHAIRMAN: The situation is now as follows. The Committee has agreed to vote first on draft resolution A/C.1/L.634 and the amendments thereto. However, the delegation of Malta has asked for time to submit a revision of the amendments. Some six delegations are inscribed to explain their vote before the vote, but I shall first call on the representative of Mexico and then on the representative of Canada.

21. Mr. CASTAÑEDA (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to make an observation on the comments of the representative of the Secretary-General regarding the financial implications. I am referring to operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/L.634 and specifically to the five-week session scheduled for New York, which according to the draft resolution should start early in March. The Secretary of the Committee explained that it had been foreseen that this session would be held not early in March but on 26 February and that if it were held on that date it would have no financial implications.

22. Furthermore, the date indicated in the draft resolution, the beginning of March, was established in accordance with a number of considerations which are still valid. Once the date was fixed for the beginning of March, a number of countries made specific arrangements concerning various other conferences, therefore a change at this time could affect plans already made, with certain complications and inconveniences.

23. To be more specific, some of the members of the group of Latin American States had decided to meet about 10 days before the meeting of the Committee, and had therefore arranged to meet 10 days before 5 March, which is the first Monday of that month.

24. In turn, another group of Latin American States has to meet one week before the meeting to which I have just referred, which brings us to about 17 days before the

<sup>1</sup> Documents E/4680 and 4793.

<sup>2</sup> Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-sixth Session, Supplement No. 21, annex II, sect. 1.

opening of the conference. If the conference did not begin, as specifically provided for in the draft resolution, early in March but rather on 26 February, the meetings of the Latin American countries would have to be early in February and there would not be time to prepare adequately for them. As these are meetings to deal with questions of substance—and an eventual agreement might speed up the work of the preparatory Committee—I believe that it is important to maintain the date in the draft resolution, that is, early March, in order to allow time for holding those earlier meetings.

25. As I have said, the change to 26 February would alter and prejudice the plans already made. On the other hand, it is my understanding that there would be some somewhat greater financial implications if the conference were to start on 5 March rather than 26 February, but I also understand that those financial implications would be quite modest and that it would be worth while incurring them in view of the disadvantages of changing the date which I have indicated.

26. In the circumstances I should like to ask that the Secretariat make arrangements to schedule the opening of the conference as provided in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, without modification. In the context of the draft resolution, “in early March” means 5 March, which is the first Monday of that month.

27. Mr. BEESLEY (Canada): I only wish for one or two points of clarification on the statement just made by the representative of the Secretary-General concerning the studies requested by draft resolution A/C.1/L.632/Rev.1 and the amendments to it.

28. First, would the representative of the Secretary-General mind reading out to us the caveats that would accompany such a study? I doubt if very many representatives are aware of these particular caveats and it might be helpful first to know the conditions under which such studies would be made.

29. My second question is whether the study requested in the amendment proposed by my delegation and those of Malta and France would require any additional funds at all. My understanding from the Secretariat statement would be that it would not, but the resolutions tended to be lumped together to some extent, and I should like that clarified.

30. My third question is whether the effect of the resolution, as now presented in revised form, can be spelled out in financial terms. I should like to obtain that information and then if it is possible, the approximate additional cost of the other amendments to it, in addition to and separate from the amendment proposed by my delegation and two other delegations.

31. I think if we do not have this information then all we know is that we are voting on various resolutions and amendments, some of which may have serious financial implications and some of which may have none at all. I should be grateful if the Secretary-General could enlighten us on this.

32. Finally, one other question: it would be helpful to know whether the Secretariat has already consulted geolo-

gists on these particular resolutions and amendments and, if so, what has been the professional opinion of those geologists on the feasibility, practicability and practicality of these studies?

33. Mr. MARTINEZ (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): As I do not wish to take up the time of the Committee, I will say very briefly that my delegation fully shares the opinion expressed by the representative of Mexico, on what was said by the Secretariat. As he explained, the Latin American countries, taking into account the provisions of operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/L.634, have made certain arrangements to meet 10 days before the meeting of the Committee. Therefore a change in the date would considerably impair the work of the Latin American countries and as Mr. Castañeda said, would also cause undue haste in the work of the Committee. Once again I should like to confirm my agreement with what was said by the representative of Mexico.

34. Mr. JAYAKUMAR (Singapore): My delegation would like clarification from the Secretariat on the observations made by the Secretariat that the costs of the proposed study—depending I suppose on which amendments to the draft resolution are accepted—would range from \$50,000 minimum to a maximum of \$200,000. I think it would be helpful to the Committee if we had a breakdown of which proposal would incur the maximum of \$200,000 and which proposal would incur the minimum.

35. Mr. GUEVARA ARZE (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I have asked for the floor in order to refer to the statement of the Secretary-General on the administrative and financial implications of draft resolution A/C.1/L.632/Rev.1 and amendments thereto [A/C.1/L.641].

36. Like my colleague from Singapore, I think that this report does not enlighten us as much as we had hoped, and I shall hasten to say that I understand full well the problem confronting the Secretariat when it had to submit this report in such a short time; so I am not passing any judgement on the quality of the statement *per se*.

37. But I think that what we had all expected was a breakdown, first of all, of the cost of the implementation of draft resolution A/C.1/L.632/Rev.1, in other words, the original proposal, as revised, submitted by 31 countries; secondly, the cost of the proposal appearing in document A/C.1/L.636, or the amendments submitted by Canada, France and Malta which appears in document A/C.1/L.637; thirdly, the cost of the amendment which appears in document A/C.1/L.638 which was submitted by Peru; and fourthly, the cost of the amendment which appears in document A/C.1/L.636 submitted by Kenya.

38. What the Committee, and I too, had hoped for and what I had also hoped for was that the Secretariat would have been able to calculate specifically the cost of each of these studies, which obviously are different, depending on whether the study proposed by the 31 countries is made as requested by them and, secondly, depending on whether the study is made in accordance with the various amendments. I think if the Secretariat has been able to calculate the minimum cost of \$50,000—we do not know to what it

applies—and the maximum cost of \$200,000—and here again we do not know to what it applies—it could give us an idea, if not in figures at least some sort of indication of which of the amendments would increase by x per cent the cost of the original draft and which amendment would increase, by a proportion of 2x or 3x or whatever it might be, the cost of the original proposal. In other words, the point on which I am asking for enlightenment from the Secretariat is the cost of the original study proposed in draft resolution A/C.1/L.632/Rev.1. In case that exact figure cannot be provided, I would request at least the proportion by which the original cost would be raised in the case of each of the amendments.

39. The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.634 have submitted an amendment to their draft which is now being processed by the Secretariat and have asked the Committee to postpone the vote until this afternoon.

40. Also, some clarifications have been requested regarding the statement of the Secretary-General concerning the financial implications of draft resolution A/C.1/L.632/Rev.1. I understand from the Secretariat that it will be ready to give the requested clarifications at the beginning of this afternoon's meeting. It is therefore impossible for me to put either of these draft resolutions to the vote now. On the other hand, I am quite willing to call now on those delegations which may be ready to speak in explanation of vote before the voting on these two draft resolutions. First, however, I call on the representative of Jamaica on a point of clarification.

41. Mr. BONNICK (Jamaica): In the presentation of the estimates on draft resolution A/C.1/L.632/Rev.1, it was indicated that a study was now in progress, based on Economic and Social Council resolution 1641 (LI). Could we ask the Secretariat, in presenting the financial implications, to advise the Committee of the kind of study that is being done under that resolution, the title of the study, when it will be ready for circulation, and what will be the cost of distributing it to the sea-bed Committee?

42. The CHAIRMAN: The Secretariat has taken careful note of the statement of the representative of Jamaica and will have something to say regarding this matter later this afternoon.

43. Mr. KAMARAKE (Sierra Leone): Permit me to express my delegation's endorsement of the reports on the work of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction, so ably presented by Mr. Amerasinghe of Sri Lanka, its Chairman, and by the Rapporteur of that Committee, Mr. Vella at the 1903rd meeting. General Assembly resolution 2750 C (XXV) proposed the holding of a conference on the law of the sea in 1973, and entrusted to the 1971 and 1972 sessions of the General Assembly the task of considering the reports of the sea-bed Committee, with a view to deciding upon a suitable programme for the said conference. The Committee was also to recommend the form, dates and duration of the conference.

44. As regards the venue, my delegation is happy to learn that Chile has offered to become the host country. My

delegation extends its heartfelt appreciation to the Government and people of Chile, and also to the Government of Austria for its generosity in extending a hand of friendship to the Committee for 1975 if the need should arise.

45. My delegation wholeheartedly welcomes the idea of holding a conference on the law of the sea as already suggested. That is why my delegation will support and vote for draft resolution A/C.1/L.634, which requests the Committee to hold two further sessions in 1973 with a view to completing its preparatory work for the substantive conference to be convened in 1974 in Santiago, Chile.

46. It is our belief that the preparatory period would create ample opportunity for Member States and their experts to conduct further consultations and discussions in an effort to make the conference a real success.

47. We believe that two of the subjects to which the conference should address itself are a comparative study and negotiation of the various claims already made by States in relation to national jurisdiction and implementation of the concept of common heritage. After consideration of those two subjects, the conference could then go on to take a decision on the international régime which should be the authority to administer the international seas and the sea-bed.

48. Turning now to draft resolution A/C.1/L.632/Rev.1, my delegation does not understand the point of controversy over that draft resolution. To my delegation's understanding, that draft resolution is simple and straightforward. I say "simple and straightforward" because, as my delegation sees it, all that draft resolution requests, at least for now, is information on an issue which, in our understanding, is the actual basis of the conference on the law of the sea itself.

49. The phrase "for now" has been used by my delegation because we do not wish to impute any motive or motives for the submission of this draft resolution. My delegation is judging it merely on the elements it contains as a draft resolution. To impute is to prejudge, and prejudgement can be most misleading.

50. My delegation does not see how the word "undermine" could have been brought in at this juncture. How can a study by the United Nations, the family of nations, undermine the authority of those States that have already made various claims on specific areas of the sea as their territorial limits?

51. My delegation is particularly pleased with the additional operative paragraph 4, which reads:

*"Declares that nothing in the present resolution or in the study shall prejudice the position of any State concerning limits, the nature of the régime and machinery or any other matter to be discussed at the forthcoming United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea."*

This operative paragraph should dispel any fear or reservation entertained by those delegations that have cast doubt on the purpose and sincerity of the sponsors.

52. In 1970 my country proclaimed an extension of its territorial waters to 200 nautical miles. In so doing, Sierra Leone took into consideration the safeguarding of innocent passage for international commerce and scientific research intended for the peaceful exploitation of the sea-bed.

53. My Foreign Minister, in his annual speech to the General Assembly during its twenty-seventh session, had this to say on the question of the sea-bed:

"Our sea resources in many cases represent the potential economic means we have left for our economic development. Ocean technology now enables considerable exploitation, which can take place as far as the 200 nautical-mile limit. My Government agrees with those who insist that adjacent marine resources should be used for the benefit of coastal and neighbouring land-locked States,"—like our friends, for example, in Zambia—"and that far-away nations should not come to deplete such marine stocks any more." [2060th plenary meeting, para. 189.]

This is why Sierra Leone, being a coastal State, attaches great importance to the conference for reasons of national security and, as I said a few minutes ago, for the conservation of its marine resources for economic development. This is why my delegation supports draft resolution A/C.1/L.632/Rev.1 and will vote in favour of it.

54. The CHAIRMAN: I understand that the representative of Thailand wishes to submit a further amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/L.634 and I now call on him for that purpose.

55. Mr. PANYARACHUN (Thailand): As may be recalled, at the 1908th meeting my delegation introduced draft resolution A/C.1/L.634 on the question of the convening of the conference on the law of the sea, on behalf of some 40 Powers. In the past few days, in view of the fact that a few amendments have been proposed in connexion with the draft that my delegation introduced, on the basis of consultations that we have held with the originators of the amendments as well as the sponsors of the draft resolution, and in a spirit of compromise and accommodation, the sponsors have asked me to speak today, not to submit an amendment but to introduce a revised version of that draft resolution. The revision concerns only one paragraph.

56. The sponsors have agreed, in consultation with the delegation that submitted the amendment originally, to add one more paragraph to the preamble of draft resolution A/C.1/L.634. This will become the last preambular paragraph. It will read as follows:

"Expressing the expectation that the conference may be concluded in 1974 and, if necessary, as may be decided by the conference with the approval of the General Assembly, at a subsequent session or subsequent sessions no later than 1975."

57. This additional paragraph does not concern itself with the substance of the matter; it is merely an expression of expectation or hope. I must confess, however, that because of the very large number of sponsors that we have for draft resolution A/C.1/L.634 we have not been able to contact

every sponsor in this room; but the very large majority of the delegations with which we have been in touch have expressed their agreement to this addition. Therefore, on behalf of the sponsors, we hope that this addition will prove to be generally acceptable to all here so as to prepare the way for the approval of the draft resolution as a whole by acclamation.

58. While I am speaking on draft resolution A/C.1/L.634, there is one other matter that I should like to emphasize. It is in connexion with the matter that was raised a few minutes ago by the representative of Mexico and relates to operative paragraph 2 concerning the convening of the session of the Committee in New York for five weeks beginning in early March. After consultations among the sponsors, we should like to say that the wording should remain as it appears in operative paragraph 2, that is, that the session should be convened beginning in early March, and not before then.

59. Having said that, I do hope that the additional paragraph that I have just read out will not pose any difficulty for any delegation here and that perhaps it may not even be necessary to have the draft resolution as amended in front of us when it is put to the vote. In view of the lateness of the hour, I should like to propose that the First Committee proceed at this meeting to approve the revised draft resolution containing the amendment which I read out.

60. The CHAIRMAN: As the Committee is aware, the representative of Thailand, speaking on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.634, has proposed an amendment to add a last paragraph to the preamble, which he read out.

61. I should like to ask the representative of Malta at this stage whether the amendment implies any change in the position of Malta.

62. Mr. PARDO (Malta): We are deeply grateful to the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.634 for having considered our suggestions and for having accommodated their purpose to the extent compatible with the maintenance of the delicate balance in the draft resolution to which so many speakers have previously referred.

63. In a spirit of understanding and goodwill, we shall not therefore press the amendments contained in document A/C.1/L.635 to a vote.

64. Mr. KEDADI (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): We have just heard the representative of Thailand introduce with great skill an additional paragraph, which will be the last paragraph, of the preamble. We have also just heard the representative of Malta, who was good enough to withdraw the amendments contained in document A/C.1/L.635. We believe that the situation is becoming more and more clear, and I believe that I am expressing the view of the African delegations when I say that we support that paragraph because it is in perfect accord with operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution.

65. It would now seem, therefore, that the text of draft resolution A/C.1/L.634 as revised, which has been the

subject of much negotiation and many concessions on the part of regional groups, reflects precisely the opinion of the whole Committee and could finally be adopted unanimously without a vote.

66. The CHAIRMAN: I believe that perhaps it would be best to hear explanations of vote before the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/L.634 as revised, and then to put it to the vote at this meeting.

67. Since there is no objection, I shall call on those members who wish to explain their vote before the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/L.634 as revised.

68. Mr. CASTAÑEDA (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to explain the vote of my delegation, but at the same time I shall clarify our position as one of the sponsors of the draft resolution.

69. I am referring to operative paragraph 4, where the text states that the second session of the conference will be held in Santiago, Chile, in April/May 1974. I should like to express the hope that that fixing of the date would be interpreted somewhat flexibly, because each year in the month of May there is also a session of the International Law Commission. As the Committee knows, a number of members of the International Law Commission participate actively in the work on the law of the sea and probably will attend the conference as well. Many other members of the Committee are legal counsellors to their States and they will certainly also have important tasks to discharge in the conference.

70. It would therefore be desirable, as we have done in the past whenever there has been a large conference of this nature, to exert every effort to see that the conference in question and the International Law Commission do not meet at the same time.

71. That could possibly be done by advancing the date of the session of the International Law Commission or by advancing or delaying that of the conference. I should therefore prefer to have operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/L.634 read "in the Spring of 1974", or "between March and June 1974", instead of "in April/May 1974". That would make it easier for the Secretariat to fix the exact dates, taking into account the factors that I have mentioned.

72. I do not think there is any need to change the text formally, but I should like to have this more flexible interpretation on record. Perhaps next year we shall be in a better position to fix a more specific date for the beginning of the conference.

73. Mr. STEVENSON (United States of America): My delegation has already made its views clear on the scheduling and the preparations for the conference on the law of the sea [1908th meeting]. Accordingly, I should like to limit my remarks at this time to two points in connexion with our affirmative vote on the draft resolution.

74. First, we are pleased that the details of the draft resolution have been resolved in a manner that has permitted such widespread support from all groups. This

augurs very well indeed for the future of our deliberations and represents a clear determination on the part of all concerned to resolve our substantive problems together at a timely and successful conference on the law of the sea.

75. Secondly, we continue to believe that the precise work schedule for 1974, as contained in the draft resolution, is not adequate.

76. However, we have been reassured by statements from the sponsors to the effect that the decision regarding eight weeks of work is not necessarily a complete schedule for 1974, and that this could be expanded in an appropriate way by the General Assembly at its twenty-eighth session. A number of sponsors have, in fact, referred to specific ways of expanding the schedule. It is our view that such an expansion will be necessary.

77. In light of these assurances the United States is able to support the draft resolution as revised by the sponsors in accordance with the statement of the representative of Thailand.

78. We are indeed encouraged by the wide extent of agreement in this Committee on an expanded and accelerated work programme for the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction in 1973. We believe that the final phase of our preparatory work should begin not in March 1973 but much sooner than that, as Governments, alone or in consultation with each other, endeavour to find ways to harmonize the interests of their own countries with those of other countries and the international community in general. Let us arrive in March having identified our interest more clearly and determined to shape a new and comprehensive treaty on the law of the sea that protects and accommodates all of the major interests involved.

79. Mr. AMERASINGHE (Sri Lanka): My delegation would like to associate itself with and endorse the observations made by the representative of Mexico with regard to operative paragraph 4 and the dates given there for the first substantive session of the Conference—April/May 1974. We agree that that should not be too rigidly interpreted and that it should be made somewhat flexible. We would ourselves wish the element of flexibility to be specifically introduced by a change in the wording to "in April 1974" or, as the representative of Mexico suggested, the alternative of "between March and June", but as long as it is understood that April/May 1974 is to be interpreted flexibly and not absolutely rigidly we would allow this present wording to remain on the basis of the understanding regarding its interpretation.

80. Mr. CAROKIS (Greece): My delegation takes this opportunity to say that we are looking forward to a warm, and, we hope, unanimous reception by the Committee of draft resolution A/C.1/L.634, as revised, of which we are sponsors.

81. As is well known, this draft before us is the result of a successful compromise reached between different approaches on the question of the conference and our sincere thanks are extended to those sponsors of the draft who have worked so hard in this direction.



82. We are looking forward to the convening of the conference in New York in 1973 to deal essentially with the preliminary organizational work, and in Santiago, Chile, in 1974 to begin the substantive work. So far as the length of the 1974 meeting is concerned, we would associate ourselves with the remarks made earlier by the representatives of the United Kingdom at the 1913th meeting and the United States. Indeed, the importance of the coming conference cannot be over-estimated, not only from the point of view of the law of the sea itself, but also looked at in the wider context of human life and endeavour.

83. The omens for the success of the conference are good. Already considerable progress has been achieved, thanks to the dedicated leadership of Mr. Amerasinghe. This progress was particularly evidenced in summer this year in Geneva in, amongst others, the drawing up and approval of the list of items and the enunciation of principles governing the sea-bed régime. It is important, nevertheless, to keep in mind that the progress made should be kept under review in order that, if necessary, measures be taken to facilitate the completion of the substantive work of the conference. Needless to say, the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction is faced with an onerous task in 1973. We therefore agree that it should hold two sessions, one in New York and the other in Geneva. We think that some 13 weeks should prove adequate for it to accomplish its task.

84. The CHAIRMAN: According to the rules of procedure, it is not normal for a sponsor of a draft resolution to explain its vote before the vote. However, as the draft with which we are at the moment seized has been amended perhaps we may be a little generous in applying the rules.

85. Mr. RANGANATHAN (India): My delegation appreciates this indulgence shown.

86. My delegation is delighted that we are about to adopt, by acclamation I hope along with the representative of Greece, this draft resolution before us. My delegation had the great privilege of being associated with the evolution of this paper from its very inception.

87. A matter of particular satisfaction to my delegation is that this draft resolution would decide definitively about Santiago, Chile, as the venue for the Conference in 1974. Indeed, when the representative of Chile made this offer in Geneva my delegation welcomed it since it was an endorsement of the principle that the conference could be held in a developing country. At the same session my delegation also pointed out that if any other developing country offered venues for the holding of subsequent sessions these offers, too, could be considered at the appropriate time without, of course, any prejudice to the very generous offer made by the Government of Austria.

88. To conclude, my delegation is particularly gratified that we are about to adopt a draft resolution laying down a definite schedule for the conference.

89. Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): The Soviet delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/L.634 with the

amendments which was orally introduced on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution, by the representative of Thailand.

90. At the same time, we should like to make two remarks in this regard. First, the Soviet delegation did not see any need to include in the preamble a new paragraph which attempts to prejudge all the stages or phases for holding the conference on the law of the sea, including the time for concluding its work. In our view, at this stage this is premature, particularly bearing in mind the fact that, in accordance with operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/L.634, it is provided that at its twenty-eighth session the General Assembly will review the progress of the preparatory work of the sea-bed Committee and, if necessary, take measures to facilitate completion of the substantive work for the Conference and any other action it may deem appropriate. For these reasons it would seem to us that this addition is unnecessary.

91. My second point is that we would like to draw attention to the extremely substantial financial implications of adopting draft resolution A/C.1/L.634, both for 1973 and 1974. Our understanding of these estimates is that they are extremely provisional and we want the Fifth Committee to pay particular attention to these estimates so that, as far as possible, it will cut them substantially. Of course, there is no need to say that any other estimates which might lead to a further increase of what is already a large sum would be entirely unacceptable.

92. Mr. NJENGA (Kenya): As a sponsor, I do not wish to explain my vote. I merely want to make a clarification in connexion with operative paragraph 4 on the venue of the conference. As far as my delegation is concerned, under that paragraph, we have taken a definite decision only with regard to Santiago, Chile for 1974. As I stated yesterday, should there be a need for further sessions of the conference after 1974, the offer made by the Government of Austria would be considered along with such other invitations as may have been received by then. Therefore, this is not the proper time to discuss venues for future conferences and we are not taking any decision in the matter by adopting this resolution.

93. Mr. BEESLEY (Canada): As a sponsor, who has also been associated with the negotiation of this resolution from the outset of these discussions, I am not able to speak in explanation of vote but want to comment briefly on three points raised. First, I can speak on behalf of my own delegation, and also that of Australia and Norway, to say that we all accept the compromise preamble which we think is an excellent example of the spirit of conciliation that has prevailed throughout the negotiation of this draft resolution. I should like to express the hope, on behalf of my own delegation, that this same spirit of conciliation will be shown throughout our future work. I am not speaking at this point on behalf of the delegation of Sweden, which may wish to speak for itself.

94. With regard to the comments made by the representative of the United States, we are very sympathetic to the approach expressed by him and we are hopeful that if and when it becomes necessary to alter any decisions, we can do so once again in a way that reflects the general view.

95. With respect to the point made by the representative of the Soviet Union, I think he has given us all a very timely reminder that we should give careful attention to the costs involved in all our resolutions on the law of the sea. Certainly, if any further clarification can be provided, we would welcome it, although we would expect that the Secretariat has really gone into these questions as thoroughly as possible and that, therefore, we must accept these rather heavy financial commitments because of the nature of the task we are undertaking, which is a major one, and of crucial importance to all of us who sit here as representatives of Governments.

96. Finally, I would hope that it would not be necessary to vote on this resolution, that it could be accepted without a vote and, for that reason, I do not find it necessary to comment on the concluding observations of the representative of Kenya who has pointed out that perhaps some decisions still remain to be made at a later date.

97. Mr. GUEVARA ARZE (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I wish to make a very brief comment concerning draft resolution A/C.1/L.634. On behalf of my delegation, I should like to state that we will vote in favour of this resolution with the most recent changes introduced today. As the Committee will have noted, a certain group of countries, because of their interests, have acted together in

dealing with certain problems. I am not speaking on behalf of this group of countries but I believe that, as far as my delegation is concerned, it is in the interests of this group of countries as well to vote in favour of this resolution either by acclamation or by any procedure that may be deemed most convenient.

98. I should like to make one comment only about venue. My Government's criterion was different from the choice finally made for 1974 but, in accordance with the spirit of conciliation which exists in the Committee, my delegation will not make any comments, will accept the view of the majority, and do so very willingly.

99. The CHAIRMAN: As the Committee is aware, the delegation of Malta has made a statement explaining that it will not press to the vote the amendments contained in document A/C.1/L.635 to draft resolution A/C.1/L.634. May I take it that the Committee is prepared to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/L.634, as orally revised by the representative of Thailand, without a formal vote? As I hear no objection, I shall declare that draft resolution A/C.1/L.634, as orally revised, is adopted unanimously.

*It was so decided.*

*The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.*