United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
THIRTEENTH SESSION
Official Records

SIXTH COMMITTEE 593rd MEETING

Tuesday, 2 December 1958, at 10.55 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Tribute to the memory of Professor S. B. Krylov, former judge of the International Court of Justice. .	221
Agenda item 59: Question of convening a second United Nations conference on the law of the sea (continued)	
General debate (continued)	221

Chairman: Mr. Jorge CASTAÑEDA (Mexico).

Tribute to the memory of Professor S. B. Krylov, former judge of the International Court of Justice

1. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee of the death of Professor Krylov, which had occurred on 24 November. Professor Krylov, a former judge of the International Court of Justice, had frequently taken part in the work of the United Nations, and had quite recently attended the deliberations of the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea. The Chairman asked the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to convey the Sixth Committee's condolences to his Government and to the deceased's family.

2. Mr. AMADO (Brazil) associated himself with the condolences expressed by the Chairman. He had often had occasion to collaborate with Professor Krylov, both in the International Law Commission and at the Geneva Conference, and would like to pay tribute to his great ability and his personal qualities.

3. The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee to observe one minute's silence in memory of Professor Krylov.

The Committee observed one minute's silence.

4. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thanked the members of the Committee. In Professor Krylov the Soviet Union had lost an eminent international jurist whose memory would be cherished by all those who had known him.

AGENDA ITEM 59

Question of convening a second United Nations conference on the law of the sea (A/3831, A/C.6/L.435, A/C.6/L.438, A/C.6/L.440, A/C.6/L.441) (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)

5. Sir Claude COREA (Ceylon) said that at the time when the Geneva Conference had adopted its resolution of 27 April 1958,[1] those attending the Conference had been almost unanimous in believing that if the Conference had been able to continue for a few days more, it would also have been able to settle the question of the breadth of the territorial sea and that of the fishery limits. For practical reasons it had unfortunately not been possible to continue the Conference, which had therefore had to close after adopting the resolution in question.

6. He recognized that the terms of the resolution did not bring out clearly the feeling of the Conference that another conference should be convened with a view to settling outstanding questions; but that had in fact been the wish of the Conference. The reason why a different text had not been adopted was that the Conference had felt that it was not its place to convene another conference, and that such a decision should be left to the General Assembly. The fact remained that the Committee would be perfectly justified in taking the wishes of the Conference into consideration.

7. However that might be, his delegation felt that a second conference would be only the logical consequence of the first. When the General Assembly had decided in its resolution 1105 (XI) to convene a conference on the law of the sea, it had considered, in line with the opinion of the International Law Commission, that what was necessary was to bring together not only jurists, but also persons qualified to examine the problem taking into account its technical, biological, economic and political aspects. A conference of such persons, who would be in possession of all the relevant information on the matters connected with the problems to be settled, and who would be inspired by the same spirit of understanding and co-operation as that shown at the first Conference, would have much more chance of successfully completing the work of the Geneva Conference than the Sixth Committee.

8. It would hardly be wise to renounce the fruits of previous efforts, to embark on a different course and to work on an entirely new basis in an atmosphere completely different from the one in which the deliberations of the first Conference had taken place. The considerations which had led the General Assembly to decide unanimously that none of its Main Committees was the organ best suited to examine the law of the sea still applied. The results achieved by the first Conference had exceeded the hopes of many countries. The pessimism shown at the beginning of the work had soon given way to a confidence which had increased with the increasing co-operation between the participants. The advocates of the three-mile limit had finally abandoned a position which they had originally declared to be inflexible. Rather than assign the task of seeking agreement on outstanding questions to a purely legal organ, it would be much wiser to entrust that delicate task to a conference of the same composition as before.

9. The General Assembly could take up those questions at any time. It should not examine them without first giving a body which had shown what it could achieve the opportunity of finding acceptable solutions.

1/ United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, Official Records, Volume II: Plenary Meetings (United Nations publication, Sales No.: 58.V.4, Vol.II), annexes, document A/CONF.13/L.56, resolution VIII.

It should only take over the work itself if the new attempt failed.

10. With regard to the seven-Power amendments (A/C.6/L.440), he pointed out that if, as was stated in the first amendment, it was necessary to undertake considerable preparatory work, it was not clear why it was proposed to put the question before the General Assembly which was to meet in September 1959, rather than before a conference which would be held in August 1959, in other words, only a few weeks before. His own delegation was sure that the only preparatory work required was diplomatic talks, which could easily be held between the end of the current session and August 1959.

11. The second amendment proposed by the seven-Powers would require the General Assembly to study the procedure to reach agreement on the questions which had not been settled at the Geneva Conference, including the consideration of the substance of those questions, if so decided. It would be most unfortunate if the Assembly did not have enough time to study those problems once the question of procedure had been settled. And if, having succeeded in making the proposed study, the Assembly did not reach unanimous agreement, the world would then have to abandon any hope of finding the solution. It would be much wiser in every respect to refer the important problems in question to a conference.

12. The question of the date on which the second conference should take place was of secondary importance. His delegation would like the conference to be held in August 1959, but it was willing, for the sake of achieving unanimous agreement, to support any proposal for another date, even if it should be in 1960.

13. Mr. PECHOTA (Czechoslovakia) stressed that the question under review was of great importance to his country, which, while land-locked, possessed a merchant fleet. His delegation, jointly with others, had proposed at the eleventh session of the General Assembly that the question of the free access to the sea of land-locked countries should be studied (A/3520, para. 14 (iv)); and it had taken an active part in the deliberations of the Preliminary Conference of Land-locked States, held immediately before the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, and in the work of the Fifth Committee of the latter Conference.

14. The sea was the common heritage of all mankind: in any decisions relating to the rules of the sea, land-locked countries should enjoy the same rights as others, as was borne out by the recent work of the Geneva Conference. While admitting that most members of the international community had shown a great deal of understanding for the position of land-locked countries and that the results of the Conference might on the whole be regarded as satisfactory, his delegation regretted that certain objective and subjective considerations had prevented the incorporation of all the principles set forth by the Preliminary Conference of Land-locked States in the conventions adopted by the Conference.

15. Unlike some delegations, his delegation did not consider that the failure of the Conference to settle the question of the breadth of the territorial sea and that of fishery limits was due to lack of time. It was convinced that the chief reason lay in the fact that some of the participants had not been prepared to recognize the realities of current international life or the legitimate economic and security requirements of other States, particularly those which had only recently attained independence. But while the Conference had not been successful in that respect, it had nevertheless been able to achieve some satisfactory results.

16. In the first place, it had clearly emerged from its deliberations that the alleged three-mile limit, which some maritime Powers had sought to impose on other States, was non-existent. In the second place, the Conference had made clear the close links existing between the question of the breadth of the territorial sea and that of the protection of the sovereign rights and interests of coastal States, and hence the need to recognize the validity of the unilateral acts by which those States defined the limits of their territorial waters. Lastly, the Conference had recognized that no uniform breadth could be fixed for all States, and that the question of the breadth of the territorial sea could be settled without any violation of international law, by determining the limits within which that breadth could be fixed.

17. With regard to the resolution adopted by the Conference on 27 April 1958, the General Assembly's chief task was to determine, in the light of all the relevant considerations, whether in the circumstances a satisfactory settlement of the question of the breadth of the territorial sea could be expected. It should be remembered that the Geneva Conference had proposed the convening of the second conference "at an appropriate time". Consequently, no attempt could be made to reach agreement unless there was general willingness to recognize the right of all States, large and small, to the protection of their legitimate interests and unless there was a desire to promote conditions favourable to the economic and social development of States and to mutual co-operation on a basis of absolute equality and of respect for the principles of peaceful coexistence. It was only in such conditions that there could be any prospect of an acceptable compromise and that a second conference could be convened with any real chance of success.

18. The statements of some representatives showed that proposals for the recognition of a territorial sea of three to six miles could not be regarded as a compromise that might serve as a basis for agreement. Some delegations had had intimated that they were not even prepared to contemplate the possibility of a compromise which would take into account the existing practice of States, and that they were seeking to impose a three- to six-mile limit on States claiming sovereignty over a greater breadth of territorial sea in the interests of their security and economic development. Some Powers did not even shrink from using force or threats, in flagrant breach of the United Nations Charter and the fundamental principles of international law. In that connexion, his delegation wished to express its sympathy for the Icelandic people, which, despite the measures of force used against it, was struggling to protect its coastal interests.

19. With regard to the possibility of achieving agreement by means of a conference, he pointed out that his delegation had maintained at the Geneva Conference that it was neither possible nor necessary to fix a uniform breadth. 2/ In each case, the breadth should

2/ Ibid., Volume III: First Committee (United Nations publication, Sales No.: 58.V.4, Vol.III), 19th meeting, para.17.

depend on a number of factors, the most important of which were geographical conditions, navigational needs, and the security and economic and fiscal interests of the coastal States. It was for each State to fix the limits of its territorial waters, taking into account its own interests and those of international navigation. To try to adopt a uniform rule which would be observed by a minority of States only would be to court failure and to delay the solution of the problem again, repeating the experience of The Hague Conference of 1930. The Committee should be guided by the practice of States, as described, for example, in the synoptical table prepared by the Secretariat for the Geneva Conference (see A/C.6/L.438). That table, supplemented by recent information, showed that about forty-three States had a territorial sea more than three miles in breadth, and that twenty-six States had a territorial sea of more than six miles. If it was remembered that several of the States applying a three- to six-mile limit had expressed their consent to an extension of territorial waters up to twelve miles, it would be seen that there was a real basis of agreement, reflected in article 3 of the International Law Commission's draft (A/3159, para.33) and in the specific proposals submitted to the Geneva Conference by a number of States, particularly in the Soviet Union's proposal3/ and in that of India and Mexico.4/ As the Mexican representative to the Conference had said on 18 April 1958,5/ the attitude of States to those proposals must be regarded as a touchstone of their readiness to accept a democratic and just regulation of the question of the breadth of the territorial waters in the interests of the entire international community.

20. Some representatives, both at the Geneva Conference and in the Sixth Committee, had argued that an extension of the territorial sea would restrict the freedom of the seas and of navigation. It had even been asserted that it would be in the interests of land-locked States that territorial waters should be as narrow as possible. Such statements were erroneous. The Geneva Conference had borne out that the existing limitations arising out of the sovereignty of coastal States over their territorial waters did not prejudice commercial navigation and affected solely the passage of warships and fishing vessels. Experience showed that the presence of foreign warships in the proximity of the coasts of a State or of fishing vessels in the waters bordering that State gave rise to incidents—such as those involving Iceland and the United Kingdom—which could not be justified on the basis of the principle of the freedom of the seas. As the Jordanian representative had pointed out at the Geneva Conference,6/ the large maritime Powers sought to safeguard the freedom of the seas in order to use it to their advantage, while the small countries were chiefly concerned with the defence of their seaboard.

21. For the land-locked countries it was a matter of indifference whether their neighbours imposed a three- or a twelve-mile limit on their territorial waters; what they desired was the assurance that the countries through which they had access to the sea should be in a position to maintain their territorial and economic integrity, so that the area might enjoy sufficient stability.

22. The question of the breadth of the territorial sea would be satisfactorily settled only if the agreement reached included the great majority of countries, for one group of States could clearly not impose any specific solution on another. His delegation considered that it would be premature to decide during the current session that a second conference on the law of the sea should be convened in 1959. No new developments had occurred, and there was no reason to assume that the situation would change during the coming months. His delegation could therefore not support the joint draft resolution (A/C.6/L.435), and would vote in favour of the seven-Power amendments (A/C.6/L.440).

23. Mr. NINCIC (Yugoslavia) considered that the representatives who had restored the procedural question on the agenda of the Committee to the larger context from which it could not properly be separated had been right to do so.

24. The records of the Geneva Conference testified to the effects which the development of international law could have on the growth of peaceful relations and co-operation between peoples. If the unanimous tribute paid to the Conference for the results it had achieved was naturally tinged with regret at the fact that the vital problem of the breadth of the territorial sea and of fishery limits had not been finally settled, that relative failure should not lead to any under-estimation of the importance of the four Conventions adopted, or indeed of the substantial measure of agreement reached on the problem of the territorial sea.

25. That agreement reflected the evolution of customary international law on the subject, an evolution which itself resulted from a gradual process of adaptation of legal ideas to the technical, economic and political realities of the present day, and which had affected both the legal status of the territorial seas and the respective importance of the various interests determining the régime of the territorial seas; in that connexion, economic interests, in particular fishing rights, had acquired growing importance. Thus the three-mile rule no longer met present-day requirements, and a growing number of States were extending their jurisdiction beyond that limit, either openly, for geographical, geological, economic or other reasons of their own, or by making exceptions in certain spheres to the principle of the three-mile limit while continuing to support it. In so doing they had been obliged to act unilaterally, and those acts had given rise to a new customary international law fully respecting the fundamental principle of freedom of the seas but more in conformity with modern needs.

26. As early as 1930, at The Hague Conference, it had been apparent that the three-mile rule was far from being generally accepted, and that circumstances were more and more militating against the adoption of a uniform limit. That trend had continued, and had led the International Law Commission to recognize in its draft that international practice in that respect was not uniform, although international law did not permit the extension of the territorial sea beyond twelve miles. At the Geneva Conference, it had also become apparent that the States which still supported the three-mile rule were in the minority. The Conference had failed by one vote to adopt a proposal to recognize the right of States to set the limit of their territorial seas at between three and twelve miles. However, no final agreement had been reached, in particular because

3/ Ibid., annexes, document A/CONF.13/C.1/L.80.
4/ Ibid., annexes, document A/CONF.13/C.1/L.79.
5/ Ibid., 53rd meeting, para.17.
6/ Ibid., 9th meeting, para.9.

some States had continued to invoke their so-called "historic" fishing rights. Thus there were obviously still important differences of opinion, based on tradition, acquired interests and various other factors.

27. The problem having thus been stated, the procedural question before the Committee had to be settled and a decision taken on whether a new effort should be made to fill the gap in the work of the Geneva Conference; and if so, in what way and at what time. As to the first question, the discussion in the Committee had sufficiently brought out the need for continuing efforts to reach a general agreement. The possibility of such an agreement had likewise been demonstrated at the Geneva Conference. As to the procedure to be followed, valid reasons could be set forth either for calling a second conference or for referring the matter to the General Assembly for its consideration. His own delegation was prepared to defer to the majority view on that point. The question of the date had been keenly debated. While all representatives agreed that a solution to the problem should be found as soon as possible, there must also be reasonable prospects of success. But the difficulties encountered at Geneva apparently still existed; no new formula had been proposed and there was no sign of any narrowing of the gap between views. Moreover, certain regrettable incidents had still further underlined the existing differences of opinion. The conditions necessary for agreement could therefore be brought about only by means of considerable preparatory work. As dangerous as it would be to temporize, the consequences of failure would be at least as serious.

28. After careful consideration, therefore, his delegation was prepared to support the seven-Power amendments (A/C.6/L.440), which, if the conditions necessary for agreement came into being in the next few months, would have the same effect as the joint draft resolution (A/C.6/L.435), but which, if they did not, would avoid the dangers of an insufficiently prepared conference because of the more flexible formula they put forward.

Mr. Stabell (Norway), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

29. Mr. AMADO (Brazil) pointed out that there was no legal rule on the breadth of the territorial sea that all States were likely to accept at the present time. On that issue, Brazil's position was dictated, not by any direct interest or urgent need, but by the desire to make what contribution it could to the maintenance of harmony and good order in international relations.

30. His delegation had been impressed by the arguments put forward by delegations which feared that another conference held in the near future would end in failure; but it also found much reason in the arguments put forward by countries like Iceland, Norway, Denmark, Canada, Australia, the United Kingdom and France. One of the most striking features of the Geneva Conference had been the differences of opinion which had emerged between such friendly and closely-linked countries as Canada and the United States and Canada and the United Kingdom. If those countries now believed in the possibility of an early agreement, it was obviously because they had conferred and managed to find common ground; their differences had, in fact, been as serious as those which existed between the South American States and countries like the United States, the United Kingdom and France.

31. On the other hand, the views regarding the proposed conference expressed by countries like Mexico, Peru or Chile, which were vitally concerned in the issue, gave grounds for serious reflection. For those countries, the course they had to follow was clear, since the interests of their peoples were at stake. For on that vital issue, economics dictated policy; and economics had its own peculiar logic. For a country like Brazil, with its extensive ocean coastline, a wide territorial sea needing surveillance would at present be a rather troublesome acquisition. On the other hand, populations like that of Peru depended for their food supply and their very existence on fisheries situated off their coasts, where fish abounded thanks to the Humboldt current. It could not be denied, however, that the nationals of certain countries had strong reasons for fishing far from their own coasts and near those of other countries, and they had a right to do so; nor on the other hand could it be denied that with their modern equipment they were making inroads that caused alarm to coastal countries like Iceland. Hence the complaints of a country which, nevertheless, had no wish to harm the United Kingdom's interests.

32. After studying the question in all its aspects, he had arrived at the conclusion, as long ago as 1952, that it was impossible to establish a rule of universal application for the delimitation of territorial seas. The International Law Commission had referred back to his work on the subject and had confirmed the truth of that conclusion. When jurists as eminent as the members of the International Law Commission failed to distil a rule from international practice, it was because such a rule did not exist; that was the reason for article 3, paragraph 1, of the draft articles concerning the law of the sea (A/3159, para.33), of which he was the author.

33. The disagreement arose because in point of fact what was needed was not to find a rule of law but to reconcile interests. Such a reconciliation would be possible only if a clear distinction was made between the question of fisheries and that of the territorial sea. As he had said before, States whose people engaged in fishing and lived by the produce of the sea would never renounce their traditional and historic privileges. Such a sacrifice could not be demanded, at least without some compensation. On the other hand, it had to be realized that that practice harmed certain States and that the modern fishing industry was decimating certain species of fish essential to coastal countries.

34. The only solution hitherto had been the conclusion of regional agreements. The situation would have been better if industrial progress had been uniform in all countries; but unfortunately that was not the case. Fishing fleets owned by large companies and possessing all the latest technical equipment were ranging the seas—as they were entitled to do—and intensively exploiting the natural resources of the seas to such an extent that the freedom to fish was threatening entire species with extinction. Meanwhile, countries not so well equipped were suffering as a result of that threat and the needs of their people were not being satisfied. Special formulas would be needed to reconcile such conflicting interests: an exceptional situation called for exceptional measures. Statesmen should stop seeking a single, ideal solution and declaring a particular rule to be paramount. They should negotiate and take into account national institutions which could not be sacrificed. The United States, for instance, could not

renounce certain privileges which were necessary to its complex industry. However, anyone who looked facts in the face and was not blinded by emotions realized that at Geneva the United States had made a notable attempt at conciliation. The United Kingdom had also taken a step forward. For their part, Brazil's neighbours, like Peru, Chile and Ecuador, knew that Brazil would always take their side on vital issues which directly affected the women and children of those countries.

35. Canada and the United States, which at the outset had adopted opposing points of view, were now agreed on the desirability of another conference. There was, therefore, every indication that they were prepared for mutual concessions; but those concessions were as yet undefined and it would be interesting to know how matters now stood.

36. Because it wished to see the conflicting interests reconciled, the Brazilian delegation would vote for the seven-Power amendments (A/C.6/L.440), which, it believed, should in no way postpone the solution of the problem.

37. Mr. AGOLLI (Albania) said that in his opinion the Geneva Conference had been very useful. Unfortunately, however, it had not been able to settle the question of the breadth of the territorial sea and the related question of the exclusive fishing rights of the coastal States, and those were questions which it would be desirable to settle by means of an agreement between all States. In that connexion, not only the interests of the coastal States and of international navigation but also the requirements of international law must be taken into account.

38. Two different viewpoints had emerged in the Committee and were reflected, respectively, in the joint draft resolution and in the seven-Power amendments. His delegation supported the idea of convening a second conference on the law of the sea but did not exclude any other procedure.

39. The Committee was divided on the date for the conference, which was an important question, as the time factor often played a major role. The co-sponsors of the draft resolution requested that the conference be convoked as soon as possible, but they did not take into account the fact that lack of adequate preparatory work might prejudice the outcome of the conference. The co-sponsors of the amendments rightly believed that it was necessary to choose the right moment for convening the conference.

40. His delegation could not agree to a conference hurriedly convened. If it were to be successful, the conference would have to be well prepared. At Geneva, major differences of opinion had become apparent, and those differences must be reconciled. The co-sponsors of the draft resolution were the States which at Geneva had upheld the three-mile limit, considering it to be a general and compulsory rule for all maritime States regardless of their individual circumstances. From international practice, however, it was apparent that each State had the right to establish the breadth of its territorial sea in the light of its own peculiar geographic, economic and other conditions. Some States claimed more than twelve miles. At the Geneva Conference only a minority of States had declared their intention to apply the three-mile limit by contrast with the others applying a greater breadth. The three-mile limit was consequently not a generally recognized rule of international law. The Geneva Conference had buried the three-mile myth once and for all, yet some great maritime Powers were attempting to revive it. They wanted territorial waters to be as narrow as possible because they took no account of the vital interests of coastal States, particularly with regard to security and fisheries. Those Powers wished to be able to approach as close as possible to the shores of other countries in order to exploit their fisheries, to obtain military information and, occasionally, to engage in displays of naval force. Their domineering behaviour was prejudicial to the rights and interests of the smaller States. It was for those reasons that there had been such complete disagreement on the question of the breadth of the territorial sea and that the question had not been solved either at The Hague Conference in 1930 or at the Geneva Conference in 1958. His delegation was not pessimistic, but it was compelled to note that the situation had not changed since the latter Conference. The incidents which had occurred in Icelandic territorial waters certainly did not militate in favour of the three-mile limit. His delegation gave unqualified support to the protest of Iceland against the deliberate and repeated violations of Icelandic territorial waters by United Kingdom vessels in violation of the Charter. The problem could not be solved by such methods. The need was for negotiations in which all States, large and small, would take part on an equal footing. His delegation therefore favoured the convening of a further conference, but the time was not ripe for holding it now and the interval proposed in the joint draft resolution was inadequate. But insisting that a conference should be convened as soon as possible, certain Powers were seeking not to serve the general interest, but merely to obtain by pressure a solution favourable to themselves.

41. If a successful conference was desired, very careful preparations would have to be made, and a number of factors would have to be taken into account. Many countries which had cast off the colonial yoke only recently had not had an opportunity to study the matter, and they should be given time for reflection to enable them to solve the problem in accordance with their own national interests. In addition, since the end of the Geneva Conference many countries, particularly the smaller ones, had had neither the time nor the opportunity, for obvious practical reasons, to study the Conventions with a view to ratifying them.

42. The various reasons which he had given explained why his delegation could support the joint draft resolution (A/C.6/L.435) only if the seven-Power amendments (A/C.6/L.440) were adopted.

43. Mr. EVANS (United Kingdom) said that he wished to reply to the statement which had been made at the 592nd meeting by the Icelandic representative concerning an incident involving the United Kingdom trawler Hackness. The Icelandic representative had complained, in particular, of a threat made to an Icelandic patrol vessel by a United Kingdom naval vessel.

44. As the representative of Iceland had admitted, the Committee was the wrong forum in which to discuss that incident but, since the question had been raised, the Committee was entitled to a full statement of the facts according to the information available to the United Kingdom Government. Those facts were the following: the trawler Hackness, which had been

damaged by heavy seas, had been moving south to find calmer weather. It had not been fishing at the time of the incident, and, furthermore, the only charge made against it had been that it had passed within three miles of the coast of Iceland with its gear improperly stowed. From the information at its disposal, the United Kingdom Government was of the opinion that the trawler had kept outside the three-mile limit and, in particular, had been outside that limit when it had first been summoned to stop. The pursuit of the trawler by an Icelandic coastguard vessel had therefore been unlawful from the outset. During that pursuit, the Icelandic coastguard vessel had fired a live projectile to stop the trawler. The pursuit was then suspended by the intervention of the United Kingdom naval vessel Russell. One hour and fifty minutes later, in the midst of discussions on the incident, the trawler had begun to move again and the Icelandic coastguard vessel Thor had signalled to the Russell that international law allowed it to stop the trawler and had threatened to reopen fire. It was in reply to that threat to reopen fire on an unarmed trawler, while discussions were still in progress, that the captain of the Russell had threatened to sink the Icelandic vessel if it reopened fire.

45. His Government appreciated why the Icelandic Government sought to reserve certain fishing grounds for the exclusive use of Icelandic vessels, but that did not mean that the interests of others should be ignored. Other countries besides Iceland had fished in those waters for many years, and their rights to continue to do so were supported by international law. His country had offered on several occasions to negotiate a settlement with the Icelandic Government which would have been most advantageous to the Icelandic fishing industry. It had also offered to submit the legal issues to the International Court of Justice. The Icelandic Government, however, had turned a deaf ear to those offers.

46. His delegation hoped that a second conference on the law of the sea would make it possible to remedy the present situation, which gave rise to such regrettable incidents as the Hackness incident between States which had had a long history of cordial relations. Pending the outcome of that conference, the possibility of such incidents could be removed by the conclusion of an arrangement regulating fisheries around Iceland, either as a result of negotiations or as a consequence of the reference of the dispute to the International Court of Justice.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

Litho. in U. N. 77601-March 1959-2,050