

of production and improvement of the articles on the participation of land-locked and geographically disadvantaged States.

23. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Chairman of the Second Committee had stated that, subject to its so deciding, there was no reason why the Second Committee should not hold additional meetings. The Chairman of the First Committee had indicated that it has felt that, for the time being, the most appropriate method of work seemed to consist in continuing consultations on the question of production policies.

24. Mr. BENCHEIKH (Algeria) said that, although his delegation did not have any major objections to the programme of work proposed by the President of the Conference, it seemed that nothing was planned for the week of 17 to 24 April, except to try to bring the negotiations within the Conference to a conclusion. Since it did not seem that a great deal of progress could be achieved in the next 10 days, there was no justification for extending the Conference until 24 April for that reason alone. The condition whereby a possible extension of the Conference until that date might be envisaged was that the current session was truly the last session to be devoted to the holding of negotiations. Possibly enough progress could be achieved from 10 to 13 April to justify extending the Conference, in which case his delegation would agree that the Committee should consider that question. However, that matter should be taken up only when it was certain that the current session of the Conference would be the last.

25. With regard to the delimitation issue, his delegation felt that there was nothing to be gained by postponing the discussion of that issue; quite the contrary, the Conference would benefit a great deal if the problem was solved as soon as possible. Clearly, the Conference needed to achieve success, especially in such a delicate matter where failure or a partial solution could not be accepted.

26. Moreover, many other problems, in addition to those being discussed at the current session, were awaiting a solution, because large regional or interest groups had opposed the solutions contained in the third revision of the draft convention on the law of the sea. Moreover, since meetings were sometimes planned but subsequently not held, the competent organs of the Conference, for example the Second Committee, should try to find a solution to that problem or, failing that, at

least try to ask those in charge to explain the reasons for the delay in the negotiations. In that connexion, the views expressed by the representative of the German Democratic Republic were very much to the point.

27. Mr. CALERO RODRIGUES (Brazil) said that his delegation accepted the reasons the President of the Conference had given for holding a meeting of the Committee on 13 April, and he understood the practical reasons to which the representative of Australia had referred. However, the possibility of moving up the Committee's meeting to 9 or 10 April should be considered, since that would allow time for other arrangements.

28. As to the possibility of enabling the Second Committee to hold additional meetings, after listening to the Chairman of that Committee, his delegation felt that the proposed schedule of meetings would not prevent the Second Committee from meeting more frequently, if necessary.

29. The CHAIRMAN said that he would consult members of the General Committee about the possibility of holding its next meeting somewhat sooner.

30. Mr. MWANANG'ONZE (Zambia) pointed out, in connexion with the programme of work for the next two weeks, that the Second Committee still had questions pending. However, the schedule of meetings provided that the Second Committee should hold only one meeting in the next two weeks. That seemed insufficient in view of the fact that the Second Committee was very far from having completed its negotiations. In his delegation's opinion, it would be necessary to hold additional substantive negotiations on the exclusive economic zone and the continental shelf. Accordingly, it was to be hoped that those very important topics could be considered at some of the proposed meetings.

31. The CHAIRMAN reiterated that, if necessary, the Second Committee could hold additional meetings and said that, if he heard no objections, he would take it that the General Committee endorsed the proposed programme of work and decided to recommend that the plenary Conference should adopt it.

*It was so decided.*

*The meeting rose at 10.50 a.m.*

## 61st meeting

Friday, 10 April 1981, at 3.30 p.m.

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

### Date of adjournment or suspension of the session

1. The CHAIRMAN said that the Collegium and the Chairmen of the regional groups had agreed that the tenth session should be extended to 24 April 1981, on the understanding that all substantive work would end by 16 April and that the last week would be devoted to meetings of the Drafting Committee and its constituent bodies.

2. Mr. KOZYREV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) inquired whether the plenary Conference would meet during the last week of the session to consider the work done by the Drafting Committee, and whether any meetings of the Committees or working groups would be held during that week.

3. The CHAIRMAN said that according to the recommendation of the collegium and the Chairmen of the regional groups, the only meetings to be held during the last week would be those of the Drafting Committee and its constituent

bodies. The work done by the Drafting Committee would be considered by the plenary Conference at a later date.

4. Mr. UL-HAQUE (Pakistan), speaking as Chairman of the Group of 77, inquired whether the date of 24 April referred to the suspension or adjournment of the current session.

5. The CHAIRMAN said that the question of whether the session would be adjourned or suspended depended on the decision to be taken by the General Committee on agenda item 3.

6. Mr. UL-HAQUE (Pakistan), speaking as Chairman of the Group of 77, said the Group had agreed to the proposed arrangement on the understanding that the session would be suspended, not adjourned.

7. The CHAIRMAN said that if he heard no objection he would take it that the General Committee wished to recommend to the plenary Conference the arrangement agreed upon by the collegium and the Chairmen of the regional groups.

*It was so decided.*

### Organization of work

8. The CHAIRMAN said that by 13 April 1981 the Secretariat would have issued a work programme for the remainder of the session. He suggested that joint consultations on delimitation between the two interest groups should be held on 13 and 15 April. On 14 April, the two interest groups could be given conference facilities to meet separately. He suggested also that the consultations on the Preparatory Commission and the question of participation should continue on 13 and 14 April. The plenary Conference could meet on 15 and 16 April to receive reports from the Chairmen of the Committees and he himself, as Chairman of the informal plenary Conference, could present the report on the processing of the work of the Drafting Committee and possibly on the question of participation in the convention. He hoped that before the next week the Chairmen of the two interest groups would have met and worked out a compromise and be able to report on that to the plenary Conference. At least one additional informal plenary meeting would have to be held to process the recommendations of the Drafting Committee on pending items. If the Drafting Committee wished to meet during the coming week, conference facilities would be provided. The only programme of work for the week of 20-24 April would be the activities of the Drafting Committee and its constituent groups.

9. Mr. MWANANG'ONZE (Zambia) said that consultations on production limitation should be included in the programme of work so that the group of African States, the Group of 77 and any other interested parties could meet officially to discuss that topic.

10. The CHAIRMAN requested an outline of the programme of work of the First Committee.

11. Mr. ENGO (United Republic of Cameroon), speaking as Chairman of the First Committee, said that he could not provide the information until he had consulted with his Committee. Any delegations would be welcome to make inquiries at his office after those consultations had been held.

12. The CHAIRMAN assured the Chairman of the First Committee that conference facilities would be provided upon his request.

13. Mr. MUKUNA KABONGO (Zaire) expressed support for the remarks of the representative of Zambia. His delegation too would like consultations to be held on production limitation.

14. Mr. YANKOV (Bulgaria) expressed agreement with the Chairman's proposals. He inquired whether the meetings at which the plenary Conference was to receive the reports of the informal plenary meetings and those of the Chairmen of the Committees and the meetings at which it would discuss organizational matters would be formal. If so, the meeting at which the plenary Conference was to consider the remaining items relating to the Drafting Committee should, like the ones before it, be informal. He suggested that the plenary Conference might not need to meet on 16 April, since the report of the Third Committee and possibly of other Committees could be presented in a few sentences. He therefore suggested that on 14 April there could be two informal meetings of the plenary Conference on the remaining items relating to the Drafting Committee; on 15 April the plenary Conference could meet in the morning to consider the reports of the Chairmen of the Committees, and in the afternoon, to discuss the organization of work.

15. The CHAIRMAN, referring to the comments of the representative of Bulgaria, said that when the plenary Conference processed the recommendations of the Drafting Committee, it would be meeting informally. When it met to receive the reports of the Chairmen of the Committees and possibly of the informal plenary, it would do so formally so that the proceedings would be recorded. He felt that not all Chairmen of Committees would be able to submit their reports by 15 April.

However, he wished to urge all the Chairmen to make their reports at the same meeting.

16. Mr. CHARRY SAMPER (Colombia) suggested that the joint consultation on delimitation should be held on the afternoon of 15 April, so that the interest groups could meet separately in the morning of that day.

17. Mr. ENGO (United Republic of Cameroon), speaking as Chairman of the First Committee, said his Committee was still working out a programme of work for the following week and could not present its report until 16 April.

18. The CHAIRMAN said that as the Chairman of the First Committee was still conducting consultations which might well continue until 15 April, the General Committee might give him the extra day to complete and submit his report.

19. Mr. UL-HAQUE (Pakistan), speaking as Chairman of the Group of 77, said the Group had prepared a resolution on the development of national marine science and technology which it had submitted to the secretariat for processing. He requested that the Group should be given an opportunity to introduce that resolution at the meeting of the plenary Conference.

20. The CHAIRMAN expressed the hope that the Chairman of the Group of 77 would consult with delegations belonging to other interest groups so as to ensure the passage of the resolution by the plenary Conference.

### Organization of the future work of the Conference

21. The CHAIRMAN said that although the Drafting Committee had worked hard and effectively in 1981, it would need to hold an intersessional meeting to complete its work. He had told the Chairmen of the regional groups that the Chairman of the Drafting Committee had informed him that that Committee would need five to six weeks to complete its work. He suggested that, in order to minimize the cost to participating countries, especially developing countries, the intersessional meeting of the Drafting Committee should be held at the same venue as the Conference itself, and should immediately precede the commencement of the Conference. The Chairman of the group of African States had informed him that his group considered that the current session should be suspended, not adjourned, and should be resumed late in July 1981 for six weeks. The resumed session, which should be the final session of the Conference, could be held in New York or Geneva, depending on the availability of conference services. The Chairman of the group of Asian States had expressed similar views on behalf of his group. The Chairman of the group of Eastern European and other States had said that his group agreed that the current session should be suspended and resumed in late July for six weeks, and that the resumed session should be the final session of the Conference. However, that group would prefer the resumed session to be held in Geneva. The Chairman of the group of Latin American States had said that his group agreed that the resumed session should be held in July and August. That group had, however, been divided with regard to the venue of the resumed session. Eight delegations had been in favour of holding it in New York and four had been in favour of holding it in Geneva.

22. Mr. DREHER (Federal Republic of Germany), speaking as Chairman of the group of Western European and other States, said that his group had not had the opportunity to discuss the question of a summer session until the previous day and the views of its members had been divided. One group of delegations had been prepared to express an opinion, while a substantial number of other delegations had wanted more time for consultation. He suggested that the General Committee should defer taking a decision on the future programme of work of the Conference; as in the past, that decision could be taken on the last day of the session.

23. Mr. UL-HAQUE (Pakistan), speaking as Chairman of the Group of 77, said the Group had agreed that a meeting of

the Drafting Committee was necessary before resumption of the tenth session. The meeting should be in the same location as the resumed tenth session and should be long enough to enable the Committee to complete its work. The Group considered that the resumed tenth session should last for six weeks, beginning on 27 July 1981, and that its programme should be the same as that adopted at the resumed ninth session for the current session. That meant that the Conference was expected to complete its work at the tenth session. The group was flexible as to the venue of the resumed session, but would like to request that as was the custom, it be given facilities to meet for three days prior to the resumption.

24. Mr. ZEGERS (Chile) said that he wished to clarify the position of the group of Latin American States, which was in favour of a four- to five-week session with the possible addition of one more week.

25. The CHAIRMAN said that as he heard no objection he would take it that in response to the request from the Chairman of the group of Western European and other States the

Committee agreed to defer further discussion of the item until its next meeting.

*It was so decided.*

#### **Recommendation of the Conference to the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session concerning the future work of the Conference**

26. The CHAIRMAN observed that the item was legally necessary because the General Assembly had not mandated the Conference to hold a resumed session. However, in the light of the request made by the Chairman of the group of Western European and other States, he would take it, if he heard no objection, that the Committee agreed to defer consideration of the item until its next meeting.

*It was so decided.*

*The meeting rose at 4.20 p.m.*

## **62nd meeting**

Tuesday, 14 April 1981, at 3.25 p.m.

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

### **Organization of the future work of the Conference**

1. The CHAIRMAN said that after consultations with the Chairmen of the regional groups, the Chairman of the Group of 77 and the representative of the United States, the Collegium had decided to suggest to the Conference that the Drafting Committee should hold a five-week intersessional meeting from 29 June to 31 July 1981 and that the tenth session should resume for five weeks from 3 August to 4 September 1981; the programme of work should be the same as the one agreed upon at the end of the resumed ninth session. The meeting of the Drafting Committee and the resumed tenth session should be held at the same venue. The Special Representative of the Secretary-General would provide information from the Department of Conference Services regarding available conference facilities in New York and Geneva.

2. Mr. OXMAN (United States of America) said that his Government was certain that its policy review would not be completed before the autumn of 1981 and felt that it would be advantageous if all delegations were to engage in bilateral and multilateral consultations before taking a final position. Accordingly, the United States believed it would be preferable to delay the next session until early in 1982; at that time his Government would be able to state its definitive views. However, it had become clear to his delegation that others wished to have a session of the Conference in August. While his delegation had taken those views into account, it was not prepared to regard the August session as the final one or a session for the formalization of the text. His delegation therefore believed that there should be no more than a three-week session for informal consultations so as to ensure that the United States Government and any other Government wishing to undertake a review would be able to ascertain the views of all before taking a final decision.

3. Mr. UL-HAQUE (Pakistan), speaking as Chairman of the Group of 77, said that while the Group had suggested a six-week session for the summer, it could make a compromise and accept the Chairman's proposal.

4. The CHAIRMAN said that during the consultations, the Collegium had learned that the Group of 77 was in favour of a six-week summer session. That had also been the preference of

the group of Asian States, the group of African States, the group of Latin American States, subject to modification, and the group of Eastern European and other States. The Chairman of the Latin American group had stated that that group had been in favour of a six-week session but was willing to accommodate the views of those who wished a shorter session and could accept a four-week or five-week session, provided that it could be extended, if necessary, to six weeks. The group of Western European and other States had had divided views but in order not to obstruct the wishes of the majority had stated that it was able to accept a consensus that there should be a four-week summer session. Members of the General Committee had just heard the United States position. The suggestion of the Collegium had been an attempt to answer the needs of the Conference and the views of the majority and to accommodate the wishes of the group of Western European and other States and the United States delegation. He therefore appealed to the Chairman of the Group of Western European and other States and the United States delegation to go along with the suggestions of the Collegium.

5. Mr. DREHER (Federal Republic of Germany), speaking as Chairman of the group of Western European and other States, expressed his regret at being unable at the current stage to agree with the suggestion of the Collegium because it went too far in view of the discussions held within the Group. It would therefore have to be left to the individual delegations to state their positions.

6. Mr. OXMAN (United States of America) said that his delegation was not in a position to go along with the proposal of the Collegium.

7. Mr. NAKAGAWA (Japan) said that his delegation supported the proposal by the United States that the session should be for three weeks only and, in any event, no longer than four weeks.

8. Mr. ARIAS SCHREIBER (Peru) said that the delegations of the developing countries had been most patient and understanding and had made every effort to accommodate the wishes of others. However, those efforts at conciliation had their limits and his delegation had no choice but to attempt to obtain the will of the majority, which should not be subject to