JNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY



Distr.

LIMITED

A/CONF.10/GC/SR.8

FIRST DRAFT

2 May 1955

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

(No translation)

INTERNATIONAL TECHNICAL CONFERENCE ON THE CONSERVATION OF THE LIVING RESOURCES OF THE SEA

me - 18 April 1955

INTERNATIONAL TECHNICAL CONFERENCE ON THE CONSERVATION OF THE LIVING RESOURCES OF THE SEA

GENERAL COMMITTEE

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE EIGHTH MEETING
Held on 2 May 1955 at 4.15 p.m.

CONTENTS

Reports of Drafting Sub-Committee II to the General Committee on the consensus of the Conference on Items 10 and 11 of the Agenda A/CONF.10/GC.3 and 4)

UN/SEA-300

Present:

CHAIRMAN:	Mr.	SUNNANAA	(Norway),	Chairman	of	the	Conference
-----------	-----	----------	-----------	----------	----	-----	------------

	a v.	-					(x)		
Mr.	ANDERSON (Australia)	V	ice-Ch	airman	of	the	Conference		
Mr.	CHOPRA (India)		11	11	11	11	11		
Mr.	D'ANCONA (Italy)		u ļ	11 .	11	11	11		
Mr.	FUJINAGA (Japan)		11		11	n	11		
Mr.	ALVAREZ DEL VILLAR (Mexico)		11	11	11	11	11		
Rea	r-Admiral LLOSA (Peru)		11	n	11	. 11	11		
Mr.	DIAZ DE ESPADA (Spain)	.*	11	11	11	11	11 .		
Mr.	BABAIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)	ý.	11	11 -	11	u	11		
Mr.	WALL (United Kingdom)		11	11	11	11	11		
Mr.	HERRINGTON (United States of America)		.	11	11	Ħ	ıı		
Mr.	HAVINGA (Netherlands)		Rappor	rteur o			ing Sub- ittee II		
Mr.	SCHAEFER		Observer for the Inter- American Tropical Tuna Commission						
Mr.	BASTER		Execut	ive Se	cro	tary			

REPORTS OF DRAFTING SUB-COMMITTEE II TO THE GENERAL COMMITTEE ON THE CONSENSUS OF THE CONFERENCE ON ITEMS 10 AND 11 OF THE AGENDA (A/CONF.10/GC.3 and 4)

Mr. HAVINGA (Netherlands), speaking as Rapporteur of Drafting Sub-Committee II, introduced the reports on items 10 and 11 of the agenda. The Sub-Committee had received much help from Mr. Schaefer who had prepared the original drafts. Two documents containing proposals had been submitted, one from Mexico and Cuba and the other from Japan. Those proposals, insofar as they referred to items 10 and 11 of the agenda, had been incorporated in the draft reports. There had been general agreement on the two draft reports with the exception of one item in document A/CONF.10/GC.4 to which the USSR representative had not agreed.

Mr. BABAIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation could not agree to paragraph 1(a) ii) in document A/CONF.10/GC.4 which read: "Indirectly limiting the amount of catch by reduction or limitation of the number

of fishing units". Such a limitation was based on economic rather than biological reasons and it was an illogical and impracticable method which was not in general use. The most practical method was to limit the quantity of fish caught, but not the number of vessels or fishermen. Consequently, he could not agree to the inclusion of that point as one of the Conference's general recommendations. Moreover, it raised economic and legal questions which went beyond the scope of the Conference.

Mr. SCHAEFER, Observer far the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, explained that the majority in the Sub-Committee had included a reference to the limitation of the number of fishing units because it was felt to be a sound biological method and it had been used by a number of countries. The phrase referred to the limitation of the total number of vessels or fishermen, not the limitation of the catch of individual vessels.

After some discussion, the CHAIRMAN emphasized that document A/CONF.10/GC.4 did not contain a list of recommendations but simply a description of all the possible conservation measures. The phrase to which the Soviet Union representative objected referred to a method which was rather difficult to apply and was unlikely to be used internationally. It was, however, used by certain countries in their territorial waters and should therefore be mentioned so that the report would be complete. He hoped, therefore, that the USSR representative might be able to withdraw his objection.

Mr. BABAIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he would have to consider the matter in the light of the discussion and give his reply at the following meeting.

Various amendments were suggested to the two draft reports and it was agreed that the Drafting Sub-Committee should reconsider the texts in the light of the discussion and prepare a redraft. Representatives who had made specific proposals were asked to explain them to the Drafting Sub-Committee.

The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.