

66th meeting

Monday, 24 August 1981, at 3.40 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. T. T. B. KOH (Singapore)

Recommendations of the Collegium to the General Committee

1. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Collegium recommended (A/CONF.62/BUR.14) that the present text of the draft convention contained in document A/CONF.62/WP.10/Rev.3 and Corr.1 and 3 be revised at the end of the present session. In accordance with the provisions of document A/CONF.62/62,¹ the revision would incorporate the recommendations of the Drafting Committee approved by the informal plenary Conference and the decisions taken by the informal plenary on the sites of the international sea-bed Authority and the international law of the sea Tribunal. In addition, the revision would take into account the results of the consultations and negotiations conducted during the present session which, when presented to the plenary, satisfied the criteria in document A/CONF.62/62.
2. The Collegium recognized that the revised text should now have a higher status than the present text, and it proposed to delete the words "informal text". The revised draft convention would bear the symbol A/CONF.62/L.78 and would be the official draft convention on the law of the sea subject, however, to three conditions.
3. First, the door would be kept open for the continuation of consultations and negotiations on certain outstanding issues. The results of those consultations and negotiations, if they satisfied the criteria in document A/CONF.62/62, would be incorporated in the draft convention by the Collegium without the need for formal amendments.
4. Secondly, the Drafting Committee would complete its work and its further recommendations, approved by the informal plenary, would be incorporated in the text.
5. Thirdly, since the process of consultations and negotiations would continue, the time had not yet arrived for the application of rule 33 of the rules of procedure. At the present stage, delegations would not be permitted to submit amendments. Formal amendments could only be submitted after the termination of all negotiations.
6. The Collegium recommended that the Drafting Committee should hold a final intersessional meeting to complete its work. That meeting would be held from 18 January to 28 February 1982 in New York.
7. The Collegium also recommended that the Conference should hold its final decision-making session in New York from 8 March to 30 April 1982, for the adoption of the convention, and that it should request the Secretary-General of the United Nations to consult the Government of Venezuela in order to arrange for the signature of the final act and the opening of the convention for signature in Caracas in early September 1982.
8. The Collegium would submit to the Conference, before the end of the present session, the proposed programme for the completion of the work of the Conference at its next and final session.
9. Mr. OLSZÓWKA (Poland), speaking on behalf of the group of Eastern European States, referred to his group's proposals concerning the future work of the Conference, which had been circulated in a letter to the President of the Conference dated 20 August 1981 (A/CONF.62/L.77). The group of

Eastern European States agreed with the Group of 77 that the programme of work for the tenth session of the Conference adopted on 28 August 1980 should be strictly implemented. The programme for the final stage of the present session should provide not only for the completion of negotiations on all outstanding issues and the formalization of the draft convention, but also for discussion of questions concerning its adoption.

10. His group could agree to an extension of the present session for a fifth week but only on the understanding that an extension would make it possible to complete the negotiations and formalize the draft convention. It could also agree that the Drafting Committee should be authorized to hold another five-week session, on condition that the Committee would finalize its work at that session.

11. His group continued to support the principle of the adoption of the convention by consensus on the basis of the existing draft; but, if consensus could not be achieved, it was prepared to adopt the convention as a whole by vote if the majority so desired.

12. The final stage of the Conference, which was to be devoted to the adoption of the convention, the signing of the final act and the opening of the convention for signature, should take place at the Caracas session, the date of which would be agreed upon with the Government of Venezuela.

13. His group therefore proposed that the following timetable should be fixed for completing the discussions on outstanding issues in accordance with document A/CONF.62/62, and for considering questions of the formalization of the draft convention, its adoption and the final stage of the Conference. With respect to the programme of work for the remainder of the current session, negotiations on all pending issues should be completed and reports on them presented before the end of the fourth week of the session; and, during the fifth week, the Collegium should consider the results of those negotiations as well as questions regarding the completion of the work of the Drafting Committee, the formalization of the draft convention, its adoption and arrangements for the final session of the Conference.

14. The CHAIRMAN assured the representative of Poland that the Collegium had taken into account the proposals made by the group of Eastern European States in document A/CONF.62/L.77, and that some of the elements in that document had been incorporated in the Collegium's own proposals.

15. When the Collegium submitted to the Conference the draft programme for the completion of its work at the next session, it would draw upon the proposal in that document.

16. Mr. SPÁČIL (Czechoslovakia) said that his country was particularly interested in the work of the Conference both because it sought an improvement in its situation as a land-locked country without access to the sea, and because it was concerned that disputes between States should be resolved in accordance with international law.

17. The Conference was now within sight of its goal after long and arduous work. The convention it had drafted was not ideal, but represented a compromise, since an international convention on the scale of the one now being elaborated could not merely reflect the interests of one party in the negotiations; it had to contain guarantees against abuses by individual parties. Hence the complexity of the negotiations on the composition of the Council of the Authority, on voting, on financing and on other matters.

¹Official Records of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, vol. X (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.79.V.4).

18. However, the principles of sovereign equality and mutual advantage, and the United States delegation's own endorsement of the individual parts of the draft, had now all been repudiated in the new approach adopted by the United States.

19. The Chairman of the United States delegation had made a statement to the effect that the United States role in the decision-making system of the sea-bed Authority should reflect and protect its political and economic interests, and should approximate the economic stake it would have as a major consumer and producer of mineral resources and as the major contributor to the Authority and the Enterprise.

20. The Czechoslovak delegation could not accept that attitude, which was contrary to interests of States participating in the Conference. All countries believed, of course, that the United States, a great Power which had special responsibilities under the Charter of the United Nations for maintaining peace and security and which possessed a vast technical potential, should be a party to the convention; and his delegation hoped that the attitude of the majority of the participants in the Conference, who condemned the United States position, would induce the United States to reconsider the situation and join with other delegations in completing the task of codifying the convention.

21. The group of Eastern European States believed that the outstanding issues could easily be settled before the end of the present session; and it could agree to an extension of the session by one week on condition that the purpose of the extension would be to complete all outstanding work. A definite time-table should be established to enable the Conference to complete its work at the present session and adopt the convention or at least formalize the informal text. The subsequent fate of the formalized text would be governed entirely by the rules of procedure.

22. His delegation was concerned at the new proposals of the Collegium and urged delegations to give further consideration to the proposals made by the group of Eastern European States in document A/CONF.62/L.77. If those proposals were unacceptable, his delegation might have to reserve its position.

23. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the position of the Czechoslovakian delegation, which wished the informal text to become an official text of the Conference, was in essence the same as that of the Collegium. The implication of the Collegium's proposal was that the revised draft convention would no longer be an informal text, but the official draft convention of the Conference.

24. Mr. RAJ JHA (Nepal) observed that during the first part of the tenth session his delegation, on behalf of 12 sponsors, had appealed to the Second Committee to consider a revised proposal for the establishment of a common heritage fund (C.2/Informal meeting/45/Rev.1).

25. That revised proposal had aroused great interest at the informal meeting of the Second Committee and had been supported by a number of delegations. However, during the current session no meeting of the Second Committee had been held; and his delegation, considering that the proposal was still outstanding, was determined to ensure that it was not forgotten when the future programme of work was decided upon at the next plenary.

26. Mr. MWANANG'ONZE (Zambia) considered that all outstanding issues should be settled before the text was formalized.

27. Mr. TSHIKALA KAKWAKA (Zaire) welcomed the progress which had been made, but recognized the difficulties involved in formalizing the text before all outstanding issues were settled. He supported the concept of formalization, provided that the door was left open for the solution of outstanding problems.

28. The Collegium's recommendations on the question of outstanding issues did in fact take account of the conclusions

which the President of the Conference had expressed in the informal plenary meeting and which had been developed in the subsequent debate in the First Committee. In that connection, the Zairian delegation's concerns regarding the important question of production limitation had been communicated to the First Committee. He saw no obstacle to that question being included among the outstanding issues. The developing countries and, in particular, the least developed among them, looked forward to a satisfactory solution to the problem of production limitation.

29. His delegation was willing to consider extending the current session for a fifth week, if that would make it possible to resolve all outstanding issues.

30. He noted that the recommendations of the Collegium had stressed the link which existed between the formalization of the informal text, which was to become the official draft convention, and the settlement of outstanding issues.

31. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya) supported in principle the recommendations of the Collegium as read out by the Chairman, but asked for a clarification on one point.

32. It was his understanding that the Collegium, in paragraph 2 of its recommendations was proposing that, once document A/CONF.62/WP.10/Rev.3 and Corr.1 and 3 had been revised, it should be given a higher status, that the word "informal" should accordingly be deleted and that the symbol of the document should be changed to A/CONF.62/L.78. It was also his understanding that the Collegium was recommending that consultations should continue on outstanding issues.

33. On both these points, his delegation could agree. However, the Collegium had also stated that the time had not yet arrived for the application of rule 33 of the rules of procedure. His delegation could agree to rule 33 being put in abeyance with respect to matters on which the Conference was still trying to reach a solution; but was rule 33 still to be inapplicable with respect to parts of the draft on which there now appeared to be agreement? If it was, what was the purpose of altering the status and the symbol of the text?

34. The CHAIRMAN said that the proposal of the Collegium differed from what had originally been conceived.

35. Earlier it had been thought that the act of giving the text a formal status would take place only after negotiations on all outstanding issues had been completed, and that any further changes would then be made by way of amendments.

36. It was now proposed to alter the character and status of the text, so that it would become an official text of the Conference; and that important legal step was to be symbolized by converting the document from a working paper to a formal proposal. The changes were not merely cosmetic, without legal meaning. The Collegium was asking the General Committee to recommend that the text be elevated from the status of an informal document to that of an official draft convention on the law of the sea.

37. At the same time, it was proposed that the door would not be closed to consultations on outstanding issues; and, if the results of those consultations and negotiations satisfied the criteria in document A/CONF.62/62, they would be incorporated in the draft convention by the Collegium without the need for formal amendments. If the door was kept open for negotiations, it would not be logical at the same time to invite delegations to submit amendments to the draft. That stage would be reached only when all the negotiations had been completed; and thereafter formal amendments could be submitted.

38. The proposal of the Collegium was that the Conference should now take a very definite step in the collective march towards the conclusion of a convention. He hoped that his elucidation would show that the Collegium's recommendations were internally consistent.

39. Mr. KOZYREV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had listened carefully to the Chairman's statement and had well understood its contents.

40. From the Collegium's recommendations it emerged, on the one hand, that the draft convention was ceasing to be an informal text and was to be regarded as the "official" draft convention. On the other hand, the recommendations contained certain reservations which in fact detracted from the legal importance of that instrument. In the first place, it was stated that the door would be kept open for the continuation of consultations and negotiations on certain outstanding issues; and, secondly, it was stipulated that the submission of amendments in accordance with rule 33 of the rules of procedure was inadmissible and that amendments could be submitted only after the termination of all negotiations in the future. Thus, the Collegium's recommendations proceeded from the assumption that negotiations on outstanding issues would not be completed at the present session; and the text was being formalized in a rather strange manner—in fact, it was not being genuinely formalized, although it was stated that the revised text was to become the official draft convention.

41. The Soviet delegation could not agree with that approach to the solution of the problem of the formalization of the draft convention, unless it was clearly put to the plenary Conference that the Collegium or the President of the Conference was submitting a formal proposal regarding the formalization of the draft convention. The Soviet delegation believed that the draft convention should at the present session be genuinely formalized, as the delegation of Czechoslovakia had suggested. For that purpose, it was essential above all to complete negotiations on all three outstanding issues. His delegation would not object to an extension of the session for a fifth week in order to complete the negotiations and genuinely formalize the draft.

42. Those who were opposed to the completion of negotiations, and to a genuine formalization of the text, advanced a number of different arguments in support of their position. It was alleged *inter alia* that the text could not be formalized because the negotiations on outstanding issues had not been completed. But negotiations on those issues had already been in progress for a long time, and the Conference was fully entitled to establish a time-limit for completing them. Otherwise, the negotiations could not be completed at the present session at all since, as everyone knew, efforts were being made in certain quarters to hold up the work of the Conference and even to disrupt it. Delegations which used the above-mentioned argument were merely playing into the hands of those who were trying to hold up or disrupt the Conference.

43. Another argument advanced was that a genuine formalization of the draft convention at the present session by taking a vote would violate the principle of consensus, since the United States of America would vote against it.

44. In the Soviet delegation's opinion, that argument was baseless. From the very beginning of the Conference the Soviet delegation had unfailingly supported the principles of consensus and the "package deal", and it was still adhering to that line. On the other hand, it agreed with the Group of 77 that consensus was not an end in itself but a means of achieving an objective—namely, a means of elaborating and adopting a comprehensive convention on the law of the sea.

45. The main reason for applying the principles of consensus and the "package deal" at the present Conference had been that all problems of the law of the sea were closely related to one another and needed "to be considered as a whole", as stated in the appendix to the rules of procedure of the Conference. It had always been understood at the Conference that the application of the principles of consensus and the "package deal" meant that all participants in the negotiations would regard the convention as a single and indivisible package of compromise solutions and would, throughout the negotiations,

display goodwill and readiness to reach compromises which took into account the interests of all participants.

46. Those principles were therefore violated by any delegation which refused to consider the draft convention as a single and indivisible package of compromise solutions, or which tried to scrap one part of the package and thus to undermine and destroy the whole draft, or which refused to take into consideration the interests of others but tried only to dictate its own conditions.

47. In addition, the Soviet delegation believed that a real—i.e. a genuine and not fictitious—formalization of the draft convention, including formalization by taking a vote, would not close the door to the adoption of the convention by consensus.

48. It was in fact doubtful whether many States would wish to introduce official amendments to the official text, to request a vote on them and thus threaten to undermine the draft convention. The only countries likely to adopt that course were the countries which were even now deliberately attempting to destroy the existing compromise draft convention. It appeared that the countries that would take that position were very few in number, since the vast majority of participants in the Conference were opposed to any undermining of the foundations of the existing draft convention and would not support amendments thereto.

49. The delegation of the United States of America had repeatedly stated that its objective at the present session was to ascertain the attitude of other participants in the Conference to the existing draft convention and to inform the new United States Administration of their attitude. Formalization of the draft would help the United States delegation to carry out its task more successfully. By deciding to formalize the text, the Conference would demonstrate once again that the vast majority of the participants were strongly opposed to the United States' attempt to have radical changes made in the draft convention, solely for its own benefit and to the detriment of the interests of others. Perhaps such a clear answer would be heard in the White House and would help the United States Government to understand the real situation at the Conference and to take a constructive position on it.

50. On closer examination, all the arguments advanced against a genuine formalization of the draft convention proved to be unfounded. Conditions were now ripe for the completion of the Conference's work and the adoption of a convention on the law of the sea; the Conference could and must complete its task. The present session should be concluded with the genuine formalization of the draft convention, which would create all necessary conditions for the adoption of the convention. That was what most of the participants in the Conference wanted, as was clear from the position of the Group of 77 as expressed at the 152nd plenary meeting, and also from the position of the group of Eastern European States as expressed in the letter addressed to the President of the Conference on 20 August (A/CONF.62/L.77).

51. The programme of work for the remaining part of the session should reflect those wishes of the majority of the participants in the Conference. The group of Eastern European States had therefore suggested that the programme should clearly state that negotiations on all pending issues must be completed before the end of the fourth week and that, during the fifth week, if an additional week was required, the Collegium and the plenary could consider the results of the above-mentioned negotiations as well as questions concerning the genuine formalization of the draft convention and its adoption. Unfortunately, those proposals had not been reflected in the Chairman's draft programme of work for the fourth week.

52. His delegation hoped that the Chairman and the Collegium would take into account those wishes of the majority of the participants, and would take steps to ensure that at the present session the Conference fulfilled the task assigned to it.

53. The CHAIRMAN said that he would put the recommendations of the Collegium to the General Committee paragraph by paragraph.

54. Mr. ARIAS SCHREIBER (Peru) said he thought that the recommendations of the Collegium constituted a real step forward which would reaffirm the Conference's aim of endorsing the informal text of the draft convention and would serve as a catalyst for the conclusion of the negotiations.

55. The decision to formalize the text should be accompanied by the establishment of a time-limit during the next session for completion of the negotiations on outstanding issues and for the application of the rules of procedure. Everyone agreed that the next session would be the last session of the Conference, and that the establishment of such a time-limit was necessary to dispel the fears expressed by the group of Eastern European States that the Conference would not conclude its work. If there was no agreement on that point in the General Committee, the recommendations of the Collegium nevertheless enjoyed sufficient support and should be considered in the plenary session so that a decision could be taken.

56. Nepal's claim that there was wide support in the Second Committee for its proposal regarding the common heritage fund was not entirely true, since only the sponsors had voted for it.

57. The CHAIRMAN said that he appreciated the suggestion for the establishment of a time-limit for the completion of negotiations and the application of rule 33.

58. Mr. GOERNER (German Democratic Republic) said that his delegation had contributed to the implementation of the decisions adopted by the Conference at the ninth session and during the first half of the tenth session to the effect that negotiations on the few outstanding issues should be completed so that the draft convention could be adopted. At Geneva, however, one delegation had not been prepared to collaborate and had thus delayed the work; that delegation must be considered responsible if the work were not completed by the end of the tenth session.

59. There was still a real chance of completing negotiations on the three outstanding issues of the preparatory commission, participation in the convention and delimitation criteria. If the majority of States and especially the Group of 77 considered that more time was necessary, his delegation would support that approach; but there must be guarantees that the next session would be the final one and that the draft convention would be adopted. His delegation would oppose any attempts to reopen negotiations on issues already settled. The draft as it stood was a delicately-balanced compromise. Changes in the text would break up the whole package and endanger the work done. Every effort should be made to expedite the entry into force of the convention.

60. Mr. ŠPÁČIL (Czechoslovakia), speaking on a point of order, asked what was now the status of the document of the group of Eastern European States containing proposals for the Conference's programme of further work (A/CONF.62/L.77). Those proposals had not been discussed in the Committee. He requested the Chairman to inform the plenary Conference of those proposals, in addition to the recommendations made by the Collegium.

61. Mr. KOZYREV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) agreed with the representative of Czechoslovakia. He also wished to repeat his earlier proposal that the Chairman should put to the plenary session for discussion and decision the question whether the convention was to be formalized or not.

62. The CHAIRMAN said that if the General Committee agreed to adopt the recommendations of the Collegium, they would be submitted to the plenary Conference. It would therefore have before it, as one of the proposals of the General Committee, the proposal to change the status of the draft con-

vention from that of an informal text to that of the official draft convention.

63. Mr. ZHELIAZKOV (Bulgaria) said that the proposals of the group of Eastern European States were in keeping with the earlier decision of the Conference to complete negotiations during the present part of the session. He thought it would be logical to ask the Conference whether it wished to abide by its earlier decision regarding formalization, and then to put to the vote the recommendation of the Collegium, which was a revision of the earlier decision.

64. The CHAIRMAN said that, of all participants in the Conference, it was the members of the Collegium who were most anxious to finish the work; but it was not easy for chairmen of committees to ask their committees to display political will. Work was still pending in the Drafting Committee, and five of the six co-ordinators had said that, even if the session were extended by an extra week, the work could not be completed. The members of the Collegium were human beings and could not force unwilling parties to agree to complete the negotiations at the tenth session, although they were using all their persuasive powers for that purpose.

65. He asked whether the group of Eastern European States wished to press the General Committee to accept the proposals in document A/CONF.62/L.77. The Collegium had taken useful ideas from that document but considered that it had served its purpose in leading to reasonable proposals.

66. Mr. ENGO (United Republic of Cameroon), Chairman of the First Committee, observed that in the Conference there was a general will to complete negotiations, while a number of delegations wished the Conference to formalize the text of the draft convention as it stood. The Collegium's recommendations represented the best that could be expected of the Conference at the present stage, but it was for the General Committee to take a decision on them. He appealed to members of the Committee to view with understanding the difficulties facing the Conference. The world must be made aware of the Conference's determination to complete its work despite the hesitations of certain participants. The general resolve was to terminate the work of the Conference next year at a session which would be a decision-making session. The problems should be viewed realistically; and he asked the group of Eastern European States, which had contributed so much to the Conference, not to allow it to be said outside the Conference that there was disagreement as to whether the work would be finished at the next session. Since it was impossible to conclude all the work at the tenth session, he suggested that the recommendations of the Collegium should be adopted as the best solution.

67. Mr. ZEGERS (Chile) said that during the eight years of the Conference and the preceding preparatory stages decisions of procedure had been taken on the initiative of the President or the Preparatory Committee. The fact that the Collegium was now making such proposals was in keeping with normal procedure. Its proposals corresponded to what the regional groups—including the group of Latin American States—had requested; and they reflected what was probably the only procedure by which the Conference could arrive at an official draft convention. It was not possible at the present stage to proceed to a vote or to permit the submission of amendments, because some issues had been insufficiently negotiated and others were outstanding. The Conference had always worked according to the principle of consensus. He expressed support for the appeal made by the Chairman of the First Committee.

68. Mr. ŠPÁČIL (Czechoslovakia) expressed his appreciation of the work of the Collegium and said that the present moment was crucial for the Conference and for the draft convention. The group of Eastern European States had in document A/CONF.62/L.77 suggested a way out of the various difficulties facing the Conference; and it deplored the fact that its proposals had not been discussed. It was now being asked to

accept the Collegium's recommendations in preference to its own proposals. In the circumstances, he asked for a short suspension of the meeting in order to enable the members of his group to hold consultations.

69. Mr. UL-HAQUE (Pakistan), Chairman of the Group of 77, said that he realized that there was a formal proposal before the Conference, submitted by the group of Eastern European States (A/CONF.62/L.77), concerning the completion of negotiations on all outstanding issues and the formalization of the draft convention before the end of the present session.

70. However, the Conference operated on the basis of both formal and informal proposals, and he felt certain that no single group of countries intended to make a proposal and force it to a vote. As for the Group of 77, it had made certain informal proposals that very morning and had submitted them to the President of the Conference; the Collegium had taken those proposals into account in its own recommendations (A/CONF.62/BUR.14).

71. He strongly urged the General Committee to endorse the Collegium's recommendations. By its very composition, the Collegium represented the whole Conference and could not fail to be sensitive to the views of all the groups when it prepared its recommendations. It had done its best to reflect adequately the over-all position of the Conference.

72. The Group of 77 supported the Collegium's recommendations.

73. The CHAIRMAN noted that there was no objection to the Czechoslovak representative's request for a suspension of the meeting.

The meeting was suspended at 5.30 p.m. and resumed at 6 p.m.

74. Mr. OLSZÓWKA (Poland), Chairman of the group of Eastern European States, said that his group still believed that the Conference should implement its decision of 28 August 1980 to complete the negotiations on all outstanding issues and adopt the convention. The position of principle expressed by those countries in document A/CONF.62/L.77, and the proposals therein, had been based precisely on that decision of the Conference.

75. In framing its proposals, the group of Eastern European States had taken duly into account the position of the Group of 77 as expressed at the 152nd meeting of the Conference. However, the statement just made by the Chairman of the Group of 77 showed that that Group was now prepared to accept the Collegium's recommendations (A/CONF.62/BUR.14). Accordingly, the group of Eastern European States, acting in a spirit of goodwill, would not object to the Collegium's recommendations.

76. The CHAIRMAN thanked the Polish representative and the group of Eastern European States for their co-operation. He invited the General Committee to consider the adoption of the Collegium's recommendations.

77. Mr. MWANANG'ONZE (Zambia), said that he could accept the Collegium's recommendations provided that the first sentence of the concluding subparagraph of paragraph 2 was reworded so as to make it clear that the "outstanding issues" in the question included production limitation.

78. Mr. MUDHO (Kenya) pointed out that some of the Collegium's recommendations related to matters yet to be decided. Like the previous speaker, he was concerned at the formulation of the last subparagraph of paragraph 2 and particularly the concluding portion which read: "the time has, therefore, not arrived for the application of rule 33 of the rules of procedure of the Conference".

79. That part of the Collegium's recommendations created difficulties for his delegation, and he was unable at that stage to give his full endorsement to the recommendations. He therefore reserved his delegation's right to express its views on the matters at the plenary meeting of the Conference.

80. The CHAIRMAN explained that it was the intention of the Collegium to present a proposed programme of work for the next session. In reply to the points raised by the representatives of Zambia and Kenya, he explained that when negotiations on the outstanding issues were completed, the time would have arrived for the application of rule 33 of the rules of procedure and it would then be possible to submit formal amendments.

81. If there were no further comments he would take it that, subject to the reservations expressed by the delegations of Zambia and Kenya, the General Committee agreed to propose to the Conference for adoption the recommendations of the Collegium contained in document A/CONF.62/BUR.14.

It was so decided.

Date of the closure of the resumed session

82. The CHAIRMAN said that the Collegium had examined the question of the possible extension of the present session for a fifth week, and had decided not to recommend such an extension but to propose that the resumed tenth session should end on 28 August 1981. All members of the Collegium had agreed that an extension would not alter the results of the session. The Drafting Committee, and the co-ordinators of the six language groups, did not wish to make use of a fifth week at the present stage, since they were exhausted by a very long intersessional meeting followed by the long and arduous meetings during the present resumed session.

83. In the absence of any objection, he would take it that the General Committee agreed to recommend to the Conference that the resumed tenth session should end on 28 August 1981.

It was so decided.

Programme of work for the fourth week of the session

84. The CHAIRMAN introduced to the General Committee the programme of work for the fourth week of the tenth resumed session which had been prepared by the Collegium. In the absence of any objection, he would take it that the General Committee agreed to recommend that programme of work to the Conference.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 6:15 p.m.