United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
TWENTY-SIXTH SESSION
Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE, 1853rd MEETING

Wednesday, 15 December 1971, at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Chairman: Mr. Milko TARABANOV (Bulgaria).

AGENDA ITEM 35 *(continued)*

Reservation exclusively for peaceful purposes of the sea-bed and the ocean floor, and the subsoil thereof, underlying the high seas beyond the limits of present national jurisdiction and use of their resources in the interests of mankind, and convening of a conference on the law of the sea: report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction (A/8421, A/C.1/L.586/Rev.1, 598 and Add.1, 599)

1. Mr. JAYAKUMAR (Singapore): My statement this morning will be very brief. When we commenced our discussions on this agenda item you, Mr. Chairman, with your customary wisdom, appealed to representatives to endeavour to confine their remarks to procedural aspects of future preparatory work of the sea-bed Committee. My delegation, which is a member of the sea-bed Committee, will comply with your recommendation and will accordingly address itself only to certain aspects of the future work of the session.

2. First, we have to consider how many more sessions of the Committee should be held, and the duration and the dates of these sessions. On these questions the delegation of Singapore is of the view that there should be two more sessions, each of which should be of no more than four weeks' duration and that both should be held so as not to clash with the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly. We are aware that some delegations would prefer just one more session of a much longer duration, on the assumption that the Committee would then be able to complete all its work in one such extended session. My delegation, however, has discovered from experience, as many other delegations must have, that it is a fallacy to believe that more work is accomplished or greater results achieved in one longer session. In an extended session there is a tendency to take matters at a somewhat leisurely pace in the first few weeks, since there is the over-all impression that, the session being a long one, there is no need to accelerate the pace of work right from the beginning. This leisurely pace in turn encourages the session to lapse into lengthy but rather unproductive debates on relatively minor matters.

3. My delegation would therefore prefer short sessions, and in this connexion we feel that a four-week duration would be ideal. A session of this duration, while not too short to prevent effective discussions and recommendations, would also inject that sense of urgency in the participants, which, it is hoped, may lead us to maximize the beneficial use of the time allotted for the session.

4. It should also be remembered that as far as the duration and the timing of the sessions are concerned two considerations are important. First, there should be a reasonable interval between the two sessions, for instance, a period of three months. Second, neither session should be held too close to the commencement of the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly. In this way one could ensure that the reports of the two sessions would be available for the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly well before it began.

5. My delegation is therefore in agreement with the suggestion that the dates of the two sessions could be March and August 1972, provided, however, that the second session is completed before the end of August.

6. Concerning the venue of the sessions, my delegation has examined the proposal contained in draft resolution A/C.1/L.586/Rev.1, sponsored by Algeria and others, that there should be two sessions in 1972, both of which should be held in Geneva. The delegation of Singapore, as well as some other delegations, particularly those from the developing countries, has serious difficulties with this proposal that Geneva should be the venue. My delegation is of the view that the venue should be New York and not Geneva.

7. Permit me to explain the reasons for our preference of New York as the venue. First, several developing countries such as mine do not have missions or offices at Geneva. Attendance at a session at Geneva therefore produces immense practical problems such as lack of secretarial, typing, telex and other facilities. If the session is held in New York, where there are permanent missions or other offices having such facilities, those problems can be avoided.

8. Secondly, my delegation wishes to point out that the absence of offices at Geneva not only affects representatives who are members of the sea-bed Committee but also makes it difficult for States not members of the Committee

who wish to observe sessions of the sea-bed Committee. I understand that about 45 States Members of the United Nations are not members of the sea-bed Committee. My delegation feels that as far as possible we should endeavour to arrange our sessions so that those States can observe the work of the sea-bed Committee. Those non-members of the sea-bed Committee who do not have offices in Geneva would be able to observe the proceedings of our meetings only if they were held in New York.

9. Thirdly, developing countries such as mine, which do not find it possible to send large delegations to sessions of the sea-bed Committee, have one other problem. For instance, where a two-man delegation is to be sent to a session at Geneva, obvious problems arise if the session decides to set up three or more sub-committees or groups which meet simultaneously. However, if the sessions were to be held in New York the assistance of other members of missions here in New York could be secured to ensure effective participation in all aspects of the sessions.

10. Fourthly, several developing countries send as representatives to the sea-bed Committee officials stationed at their permanent mission in New York. These officials, because of the limited size of their mission, must concurrently attend to various other matters relating to United Nations activities in New York. For such missions, then, considerable difficulties are created if those officials based in New York have to be away for even a four-week period. In other words, some developing countries, including Singapore, will be faced with difficulties if the venue of the session is to be Geneva. I use the words "some developing countries" advisedly, because my delegation certainly cannot claim to speak on behalf of all developing countries. It has been suggested to me that some developing countries may indeed prefer Geneva as the venue. My delegation will of course give careful consideration to their views, just as we expect and hope careful consideration will be given to the views of my delegation as I have expressed them.

11. Finally, I understand that the proposal to convene sessions at Geneva and not in New York would also involve considerable additional expenditures for the United Nations. At a time when the financial state of the United Nations is causing us all considerable concern, my delegation feels this Committee should bear this factor in mind also in taking decisions relating to the venue of future sessions of the sea-bed Committee.

12. In view of these considerations my delegation hopes the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.586/Rev.1 will reconsider their proposal concerning the venue with a view to accommodating the difficulties and views of several developing countries such as mine in this regard.

13. The CHAIRMAN *(interpretation from French)*: I call on the representative of Sweden, who wishes to introduce an amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/L.586/Rev.1.

14. Mr. HJERTONSSON (Sweden): Mr. Chairman, allow me first to express to you the deeply felt condolences of the Swedish delegation at the loss of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, Mr. Ivan Bachev.

15. Sweden has for 20 years worked for and supported the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. It therefore goes without saying that we associate ourselves with the many delegations that expressed a strong interest in seeing the People's Republic of China participating in the work of the sea-bed Committee. We are convinced that the sea-bed Committee, which now comprises as many as 86 members, would benefit greatly from China's participation in its work. However, after long and rather extensive consultations, we have come to the conclusion that the entry of China into the sea-bed Committee should provide us with an opportunity of accommodating a few countries that have expressed a sincere desire to participate in the work of the sea-bed Committee.

16. In this context I should like to inform the members of this Committee that the group of Western European and other States at its meeting of 13 December decided unanimously to support the candidature of Finland for a new seat in the sea-bed Committee. I would therefore propose that we add a new operative paragraph to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.586/Rev.1. It would be inserted as a new operative paragraph 3, and would read as follows:

> "*Decides* to add to the membership of the Committee four members to be appointed by the Chairman of the First Committee in consultation with regional groups" *[A/C.1/L.599]*.

17. I sincerely hope this amendment will be acceptable to the sponsors of the draft resolution and will receive favourable consideration from the regional groups.

18. Mr. GONZALEZ SOSA (Mexico) *(interpretation from Spanish)*: Mr. Chairman, distinguished representatives, first of all, may I congratulate you all and the officers of the Committee on the correct way in which you have decided on the organization of the debates of the First Committee. I am convinced that under the Chairman's wise leadership the subject that we are discussing today will be successfully examined, as was the case with previous items.

19. On the other hand, Sir, I would tender to you the condolences of my Government and of the delegation of Mexico on the sad demise of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of Bulgaria. May I ask you, Sir, to transmit our sympathy to your Government and people, as well as to the family of the late Foreign Minister.

20. From the very beginning of the discussion of the item before us, Mexico has contended that we must maintain those legal institutions that were established in 1958 in the Geneva Conventions on the Law of the Sea, and are in keeping with the requirements of our day. On this matter we recognize the need imposed on us by reality itself to review certain now obsolete norms contained in those international instruments, particularly bearing in mind the special economic interest of the developing coastal States to be in a position to make full use of the resources of their adjacent seas, as well as those that can be found in their own territorial waters. These are resources that are increasingly necessary for the survival and development of those countries and, therefore, theirs is a legitimate interest

to prevent exploitation benefiting persons in distant lands, which excludes the population of the coastal States from the benefits deriving from such exploitation.

21. That view was defined by my country through its most authorized spokesman when, on 5 October of this year, the President of Mexico himself stated to the present session of the General Assembly:

> "We recognize the validity of the concern of several sister Latin American countries which claim maritime limits beyond 12 miles, on the grounds of their need to make use for their people of the resources that are becoming increasingly necessary for their subsistence. . . . The time has come properly to define the special interest of coastal States in maintaining the productivity of the resources of the seas adjacent to their coasts and in the logical corollary of their sovereign right to establish exclusive and preferential fishing zones." *[1952nd plenary meeting, para. 18.]*

22. The problem to which I have referred is only one—although perhaps the most important—of all those that emerge when, in a body whose procedure leaves much to be desired, we try to carry out a preliminary revision of the different institutions governing the law of the sea and, in the light of the progress achieved, we are forced to doubt the possibility that the third conference on the law of the sea planned for 1973 can successfully complete the proposed agenda. Furthermore, my delegation would like to thank the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/586/Rev.1 for having taken the initiative which, if approved by the Assembly, would renew the mandate of the enlarged sea-bed Committee to continue the preparatory work for the forthcoming conference on the law of the sea. That draft resolution will be supported by Mexico, although we still have certain doubts regarding the contents of operative paragraph 1, since we feel that the words "encouraging progress" do not entirely reflect the situation prevailing in the Committee. As the representative of Malta pointed out *[1851st meeting]*, there has been a certain loss of time, which has been made evident by the very meagre progress achieved.

23. Furthermore, with regard to operative paragraph 3, the Mexican delegation does not consider it logical or appropriate for the two 1972 sessions of the Committee to be held in Geneva, due to the high cost to the Organization of such sessions. We therefore believe that the Committee should consider the possibility of holding, as we would prefer, both sessions—or, as others want, at least one of those sessions—in New York.

24. My delegation also feels that the Secretariat's estimate of the financial implications of holding the sessions in Geneva is somewhat exaggerated. We believe it should be better adjusted to reality and therefore made considerably lower.

25. Referring to the mandate of the sea-bed Committee, we understand that the question of the régime of the sea-bed being examined in Sub-Committee I should be given all the attention it deserves, so long as it is not to the detriment of the work of Sub-Committee II, which has been entrusted with the task of preparing a list of subjects on which the work of codification and progressive development is to be done. We believe that that list, together with the provisional agenda of the General Assembly, should be considered as only a flexible guideline for the debates which must permit an open and frank dialogue on the very varied subjects to be examined.

26. Experience has shown us the advantages of negotiating acceptable texts on the most important subjects through informal consultations among the delegations representing the most extreme positions, even though we recognize that at certain times those who have taken a middle-of-the-road position may turn out to be determinant factors in finding the conciliatory formula that can solve the stalemate. My delegation is therefore in favour of holding such consultations whenever the situation warrants.

27. May I recall, in very general terms, the basic aspects of the position of Mexico on the question of the future régime for the sea-bed. When the General Assembly first took up the subject, the Mexican delegation stressed the fact that whatever régime might be decided upon for the international submarine zone, it should in no way affect the interests of the developing countries. The principles approved by the General Assembly laid the groundwork for the fulfilment of that wish of the Mexican delegation. Our first task in the immediate future is to create legal institutions and international organs that will ensure strict respect for the principle that the zone is to enjoy the legal status of the common heritage of mankind. As we stated in Lima, so we reaffirm the principle here: that the zone of the sea-bed and the subsoil thereof beyond the limits of national jurisdiction, and the resources of that zone, do indeed constitute the common heritage of mankind, and that its use must be governed by a régime that will ensure that the peoples of all nations shall benefit from the exploitation of its resources, giving special attention to the needs and requirements of the developing countries. We also wish to repeat that when the provisions are laid down for the administering of the zone, adequate measures must be adopted to ensure the healthy development of the world economy and to reduce to the minimum the unfavourable economic effect which the fluctuation in the price of raw materials might have on the economy of the developing countries.

28. We contend that a system of merely granting licences for the exploitation and exploration of the international submarine zone would be incompatible with the principle that the zone is the common heritage of mankind. The legitimate beneficiary of the resources of the zone, that is, mankind as a whole, should not be relegated to the role of a mere spectator without enjoying direct participation in both the exploration and the exploitation of the resources which belong to all mankind. For these reasons, the countries of Latin America prepared a working paper, which has already been submitted to the sea-bed Committee *[A/8421, annex I, sect. 8]*, whose fundamental feature is that it provides for the establishment of an international body for the sea-bed whose final objective would be to exploit the sea-bed directly.

29. With respect to the problem of the delimitation of the breadth of the territorial sea—and we understand by the "territorial sea" the zone adjacent to the coast over which

the coastal State exercises full sovereignty—we contend that it is important that that limit be set through conventions, but such a delimitation must never serve as a pretext for fishing piracy or piracy of any nature beyond the territorial sea; on the contrary, that delimination must constitute part of a new system to ensure respect for the special interests of the coastal State, including the exercise of the legitimate economic rights of the coastal State over its resources.

30. The interests and the legitimate right of the coastal States to rely for their subsistence and development on areas of special economic jurisdiction, which some have termed "patrimonial sea" and which goes beyond the territorial sea, is a concept to which no objection can be raised. The unity of the developing countries and of some industrialized countries shown in the question of the special economic jurisdictions narrows down considerably the still existing differences of view regarding the nature and scope of such rights.

31. We believe that the institution of the territorial sea as defined in the Geneva Convention of 1958[1] meets the needs of the coastal States to have a zone adjacent to their territories over which they can exercise full sovereignty as they do over their own territory, with the exception of the right of innocent passage.

32. The delegation of Mexico wishes to reiterate the principle that the General Assembly has already accepted, namely, that the problems of the ocean space are strictly linked with one another and, as such, must be examined as a whole. We trust that that examination will be carried out through open dialogue where, without circumlocutions, the different conflicting interests will be exposed so that dynamic institutions can be created that will meet the present needs.

33. With regard to the continental shelf, we feel that no measures should be adopted that will deprive States of those rights that have already been laid down in the Geneva Convention of 1958.[2] Article 1 of that international Convention, in the delimitation of national jurisdiction, sets forth the criteria of "200 metres or, beyond that limit, to where the depth of the superjacent waters admits of the exploitation of the natural resources of the said areas". The latter criterion, that is, the possibility of exploitation, is interpreted by us to mean that it is not the possibility of exploitation of the coastal State that is to be taken into account in the determination of its jurisdiction, but the possibility flowing from the technical progress achieved by the most advanced nations.

34. We believe that a more precise method than the present one must be devised to determine the extent of the rights of the coastal State over its continental shelf, and we are quite ready to weigh a combination of criteria which will use as the determining factor in national jurisdiction the very existence of the continental shelf or a specific distance, leaving to the coastal State the choice of the system which is most favourable in accordance with the geological conformation of the continental shelf.

35. May I, finally, draw the attention of the First Committee to parallel work that is being carried out in Sub-Committee III of the Committee whose report we are studying.

36. The Intergovernmental Working Group on Marine Pollution met in November last in Ottawa and adopted, for submission to the Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, a number of principles to prevent and control marine pollution. My delegation therefore supports the Canadian proposal that the Preparatory Committee for that Conference should transmit to the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction, for its information, the report submitted by the intergovernmental group that met in Ottawa, in order to ensure coordination of the work of the two committees on this subject which dovetail in many ways. That second intergovernmental meeting of experts on marine pollution also worked on draft articles on the prohibition of dumping waste matter in the sea; in this field co-ordination by the General Assembly becomes even more imperative. Both in the Preparatory Committee of the Stockholm Conference and in the Intergovernmental Working Group of Ottawa, a controversy arose over whether the forthcoming conference on the law of the sea has the right to monopolize the task of codifying and developing the law of the sea with the exception of the mandate that already exists for the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization or whether the Stockholm Conference can in fact contribute to the development of that law by taking the first steps in the work that has been entrusted to Sub-Committee III on matters of contamination.

37. To conclude, I should like to reiterate the words spoken by the President of Mexico in the course of the general debate at the present session, in which he stated:

> "The oceans that separate us geographically should unite us juridically. We should, therefore, strive to formulate a systematic, uniform and equitable code in this field." *[1952nd plenary meeting, para. 16]*.

38. In one word, we feel that the up-dating of the law of the sea should be intended not only to govern and order relations among States but to protect the developing countries. Mexico will bend every effort to succeed in the difficult task of ensuring that the new law of the sea will be a law that will protect the economically weak nations.

39. With regard to the Swedish amendment that has just been submitted *[A/.1/L.599]*, may I point out that my delegation will examine it very carefully, but we have serious reservations on the appropriateness of changing the number of members of the Committee before—and I stress that—before the agreement of the regional groups has been given.

40. Mr. GUEVARA ARZE (Bolivia) *(interpretation from Spanish)*: Mr. Chairman, the fact that I am speaking for the first time in this Committee leads me to offer you the congratulations of the delegation of Bolivia on your election to preside over the work of this Committee. Those of us who have worked with you elsewhere have learnt to value your wisdom and your consideration, and there can

1 Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 516 (1964), No. 7477).

2 Convention on the Continental Shelf (*ibid.*, vol. 499 (1964), No. 7302).

be no doubt that the success of the work of this Committee will to a large extent be due to your endeavours and those of your team of officers.

41. At the same time I must express to you, and through you to the Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the sad condolences of my Government on the sudden and tragic death of the Minister For Foreign Affairs of your country.

42. Due to a number of reasons, Bolivia, which was elected a member of the expanded Committee on the sea-bed at the last session of the General Assembly, was unable to be present at the meetings in March and was only able to do so at the end of the August session in Geneva. I am pointing out this fact in order to excuse some references that I shall make in a few moments to some subjects which may have been considered and to which we will have to advert again in the course of next year's sessions of that Committee.

43. Now I intend to deal with the following points: first, procedural questions that should be decided upon at the present session; secondly, comments on the Secretariat study on land-locked States; thirdly, brief comments on the report of the Committee on the sea-bed; fourthly, provisional comments subject to later confirmation on the position of Bolivia regarding the scope of the conference, the features of the international régime and the structure of the machinery; and fifthly, reiteration of previous comments from the standpoint of the land-locked States on General Assembly resolutions 2749 (XXV) and 2750 (XXV) on the law of the sea.

44. The procedural questions seem to be three, and perhaps it may not be necessary for the Assembly to pronounce itself on all of them now: the dates and venue of the forthcoming sessions of the sea-bed Committee, the change in its name and a further increase in its membership.

45. With regard to the venue and dates, my delegation's view is very specific. We wish the first session to take place in New York starting in the middle of March or the beginning of April 1972, and the second in Geneva between July and August 1972. On this matter I would like specifically to address myself to the representatives of the countries of Africa, whose views differ from mine in this respect.

46. Many of the African States are, like Bolivia, also members of the Economic and Social Council. The Council is due to meet in New York in May 1972. My delegation, as do some African delegations, suffers from too small a staff, and this means that with very few staff members we have to deal with matters in many different committees and in different places. If the first session of the Committee is held in New York in March or April 1972 and the Council meets the next month, it will obviously be much easier for the smaller delegations to prepare themselves for, and be present at, both sessions, and, since the second part of the forthcoming session of the Economic and Social Council is to be held in Geneva, again it is possible to take advantage of that coincidence to be present at both sessions. I trust that these arguments will be borne in mind when a decision is arrived at.

47. The appropriateness of changing the name of the Committee seems obvious. Starting from the very mandate included in paragraph 2 of resolution 2750 C (XXV), the Committee now no longer deals exclusively with the peaceful uses of the sea-bed and the ocean floor beyond the limits of national jurisdiction. At its sessions this year and, all the more so, in the forthcoming sessions next year, it has devoted and will devote a considerable part of its attention to preparing the indispensable work to ensure success at the forthcoming plenipotentiary meeting on the law of the sea. Therefore it would be logical to call it "Preparatory Committee for the Conference on the Law of the Sea".

48. Although it is true that that change of name would put everything in its right place, my delegation does not insist that the decision be arrived at at the present session of the General Assembly. What is important is the result of the work of the Committee rather than the name of the Committee itself.

49. With regard to the membership, it is true that approximately two thirds of the Members of the United Nations are at present members of the expanded Committee, yet my delegation would not object to increasing that number once again, if such a decision is useful in meeting the justified interests of a number of as yet non-member States.

50. I shall now refer to the Secretariat survey on the question of free access to the sea of land-locked States and the special problems regarding exploration and exploitation of the resources of the sea-bed and the ocean floor and the subsoil thereof *[A/C.138/37 and Corr.1 and 2]*.

51. First of all, I should like to thank the Secretary-General and the Secretariat for drafting such a valuable study. It will be extremely helpful both to the Committee and the General Assembly when these bodies examine thoroughly the problem of land-locked States in all its different and complex aspects. This survey is a new, and I trust not the last, contribution of the Secretariat to the lot of the land-locked countries. The first was the memorandum prepared in 1958[3] which opened up horizons as yet unknown and gave directives which, although not adequately followed in the Geneva Conference in 1958, and perhaps for that very reason, are still nevertheless valid.

52. Before speaking on the content of the study itself, I must nevertheless make an appeal to the Secretariat after a very brief explanation of justification.

53. At the last session of the sea-bed Committee, my delegation, when dealing with the same subject, made a statement which was summarized and published in English and other languages in the summary records. Reading through the English version of this summary showed us that it was less than comprehensible. This obviously was a problem of translation or interpretation which at times distorted not only the language but sometimes the very concepts of the speaker, and therefore confronted the

3 United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, *Official Records*, vol. I: *Preparatory Documents* (United Nations publication, Sales No. 58.V.4, vol. I), document A/CONF.13/29 and Add.1.

numerous delegations whose working language is English with texts that had no logical correlation and at times even lacked common sense. I fully understand the difficulties inherent in making an English summary of a Spanish statement and then having to retranslate that summary into the original language. The consequences are at times lamentable, not only for the speaker himself but rather because of the confusion about his ideas in the minds of the other delegations.

54. In the specific case of the survey to which I am referring, some of these confusions appear in paragraphs 14, 15 and 24. For example, in paragraph 14 it states that: "there had been fragmentary and insufficient concern over relationships between the sea and land-locked countries". Since this refers to what my delegation said last year I must correct this matter and say that the "insufficient concern" referred to the relationship that exists between the land-locked countries and the sea, in the present state of the law of the sea, which is obviously very different from what was said in the summary.

55. Paragraph 15 mentions "pipelines and pumping stations". I presume that this must refer to oil pipelines and valves for the purpose of increasing or decreasing the oil pressure being poured. Finally, because of the initial wording of paragraph 24, one would infer that the benefits of the international zone should be "shared on a similar basis" by all the developing countries, whether or not they have a coastline. If my memory does not fail me, what some delegations said—and the Bolivian delegation is certainly included among them—was exactly the opposite.

56. I must apologize for these corrections, which may seem to be of little importance to some, but whose consequences are quite significant. Obviously the original text of the Secretariat's study was drafted in English, taking into account summaries made in English, and the results of this can be clearly seen in the Spanish text of the document.

57. The second part of the survey, which summarizes the bilateral and multilateral treaties dealing with the question of free access to the sea and the consideration of this subject by United Nations organs as of 1958, is worthy of the greatest praise since it gives us an over-all view not only of everything that has been achieved but also of what still remains to be done.

58. My delegation has certain reservations regarding the third part of the survey, but except for a general concept which I shall mention, I shall not go into these reservations now as they will probably be formulated at some later meeting of the sea-bed Committee. The general concept is that perhaps the phrase "in the light of the events which have occurred in the meantime", which appears in operative paragraph 1 of resolution 2750 B (XXV), has not been as fully utilized in this document as we might have wished.

59. In fact, as of 1968, apart from important international agreements such as the Geneva Conventions on the Law of the Sea, the Convention on Transit Trade of Land-locked States[4] signed in New York in 1965, the Declaration of Principles Governing the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor, and the Subsoil Thereof, beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction approved by the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth regular session *[resolution 2749 (XXV)]* and a number of bilateral agreements, other events have taken place which have a very appreciable bearing on everything that touches on the law of the sea and, by extension, on the land-locked nations. I refer specifically to the scientific and technological progress achieved and, indirectly although it is equally important, the organic concept of development that has gained ground in the last few years, a concept that has in fact been reflected in the resolution on the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade *[resolution 2626 (XXV)]*.

60. There can be no doubt that in the light of this scientific and technological approach to the Strategy, a number of new and fundamental concepts can be outlined which the Secretariat may have overlooked because of their inescapable political content and because of the controversial features which are inherent in them.

61. Having made these comments, I wish to repeat the appreciation of the delegation of Bolivia for the excellent work submitted by the Secretariat.

62. A few words are called for on the report of the sea-bed Committee *[A/8421]* covering its work for this year. I must of course express the gratitude of my delegation to Ambassador Amerasinghe and to the other members of the Bureau of that Committee, particularly the Rapporteur, for submitting to us a document that is so helpful in guiding our present deliberations.

63. The very features of the report, which deals with subjects still being worked on, make detailed comments on its contents untoward. But the systematic organization of such complex and diverse subjects as well as the inclusion in the annexes of all the drafts and documents to be borne in mind are extremely useful. Among these annexes I would stress the documents submitted by Afghanistan and other countries on the list of subjects and that submitted by Canada on the international régime and machinery, as well as the draft articles of a treaty proposed by the Soviet Union.

64. Provisionally, and therefore subject to later revision, I should like now to make a few comments on the position of Bolivia with respect to the scope of the forthcoming conference on the law of the sea, the limits and other characteristics of the international régime and the structure of the machinery.

65. From the first meeting of the General Committee at the twenty-fourth session of the Assembly, and later in the First Committee, my delegation pronounced itself very clearly and categorically on the scope of the forthcoming conference. We feel its scope should be wide and deal not only with the unsolved subjects pending since 1958 in Geneva, but also with all the subjects that have been termed problems of the ocean space and connected problems, including obviously the problems of the land-locked nations. That is the position we will maintain in the deliberations of the sea-bed Committee.

4 United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 597 (1967), No. 8641.

66. With regard to the limits of the international zone, I believe it appropriate to recall the circumstances which we stressed last year and which we feel to be specifically applicable to the position of the land-locked developing nations.

67. Our most vital interests seem to be in conflict with the convenience of the developing coastal States and to coincide with the interests of the maritime Powers. But to solve this conflict in a generally satisfactory manner, we must appeal for the widest understanding of the nations of the third world.

68. Any position that might shrink the international zone is prejudicial to us. It is well known that the mineral resources and hydrocarbons of the sea-bed which can be viably exploited with present-day techniques lie in the submerged area of continents, that is to say, on the continental shelf, the continental slope and its basins. If that area is excluded or if that area is significantly diminished, the purpose of benefiting mankind as a whole cannot be achieved as far as the land-locked countries are concerned. Those with the poorest conditions and facilities would be left with the benefits of the exploration and exploitation of the abysses of the deepest part of the oceans.

69. If we bear in mind the great difference between the principles established in the treaties and the practice followed in reality regarding the facilities available to the land-locked countries in the ports of the coastal nations, it is logical that we show an interest in the establishment of an international régime possessing wide powers. In practice, if any benefits were to accrue to us from the exploitation of the sea-bed, it would be through the régime rather than through our own endeavours. Therefore, we would not want the régime to become a type of agency to note requests for concessions and to grant licences for exploration and exploitation.

70. At the same time, we fully understand the position of those developing countries which possess wide coasts and a continental shelf and which are interested in trying to avoid the creation of an international régime that might control the exploration and exploitation of those areas which they consider to be their exclusive property. Perhaps the solution might lie in a mixed system which would take into account both schools of interest.

71. With regard to the structure of the international machinery itself, at this moment I shall merely say that we would want the representation of the land-locked countries in the executive organs to be truly proportional with the number of land-locked nations. They do, after all, amount to between one quarter and one third of the total membership of the United Nations. Among the drafts thus far submitted, the Soviet draft *[ibid., annex I, sect. 3]* appropriately considers this situation and the United States draft[5] also provides for representation, although not at an adequate level.

72. With respect to the last part of my statement which will refer to the texts approved by the General Assembly, which obviously must be the framework and the terms of reference of the work of the sea-bed Committee, I must crave the indulgence of the Chairman and members of the Committee and refer in some detail to the Declaration of Principles and to resolution 2750 (XXV).

73. Since we refer to already approved texts, my words may appear belated, but we are in the process of elaborating a law of the sea, and until that is embodied in treaties and conventions, all observations are valid and might contribute to the success of the undertaking. Furthermore, I would not be adequately defending the interests of my country were I not to state that those resolutions have not given sufficient attention to the realities confronting the land-locked States. Finally, this subject can be more properly discussed in the Assembly than in the sea-bed Committee, since the latter must inevitably be guided by the decisions already approved or that may be approved by the General Assembly.

74. The Declaration of Principles is an important milestone in the elaboration of the law of the sea. The land-locked countries are mentioned in the text in some interpolated phrases in paragraphs 5, 7 and 9. But the only reason for mentioning them is to place them on an equal footing with the coastal States, despite the obvious differences that exist between the two groups of nations.

75. When the Declaration mentions in paragraph 7 "special consideration" to be shown the developing countries in the distribution of benefits, the land-locked States, developed or developing, are placed on an equal footing with the developing coastal States.

76. When mention is made of "equitable participation" in paragraph 9, it is repeated that the land-locked States will be treated on an equal footing with the developing or developed coastal States. That implacable hunger for equal treatment, in fact, contradicts the basic concept of "equitable participation" in the common heritage of mankind, since it is an obvious fact that, in order to overcome unequal conditions, equity must call for unequal treatment, that is to say, treatment that only apparently seems more favourable since it does not prejudice any other State.

77. But that major concern justified by specific situations is, on the other hand, reflected in resolution 2750 A (XXV), which refers to the problem of mineral-producing countries. My delegation supported that text with its vote.

78. As the Committee will see, the General Assembly recognized the existence of potential danger and anticipated measures to forestall it. Those measures are of a special nature since they deal with a special situation. Why then not apply the same criterion to the problems of the land-locked nations, problems whose magnitude and significance for them is proportionately greater than the risk of an alteration in the price of minerals on the world market.

79. Resolution 2750 C (XXV) calls for some comments too. I shall not add unnecessary words to stress its importance since it does after all contain the mandate of what is expected from the sea-bed Committee, and therefore constitutes a guideline and a frame of reference of the work itself. For that same reason, both what it includes and what it omits are important to the land-locked nations.

5 *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 21,* annex V.

80. However, without comment, I shall merely note that the eighth preambular paragraph repeats the ideas already noted in the Declaration of Principles when it speaks of States with and without coastlines being dealt with equally. But in this case it is a two-fold levelling that is resorted to. Thus, for instance, by that same text, we might equate the United Kingdom or the Philippines with any land-locked State, developed or developing. In addition, all the developing States are placed on an equal footing: those which have no coastline whatever and those which have thousands of kilometres of coast. Thus, equal and identical treatment, as far as the sea is concerned, should be meted out to Bhutan or Afghanistan and to India; to South Africa and to Zambia; to Brazil or Chile and Paraguay or Bolivia. However tightly one may close one's eyes to reality, that forced equalization is not only not fair but makes no sense.

81. Paragraph 2 of resolution 2750 C (XXV) is the most important, since it lists the items to be studied at the conference. However, that listing omits mention of the problems of the land-locked States, but expressly mentions the preferential rights of the coastal States.

82. May I recall some examples of what this situation spells in the three-fold aspects of free access to the sea, disadvantages regarding utilization of the living resources of the sea, and exploitation of the sea-bed. I shall not speak of the specific case of Bolivia but shall refer to another country when speaking of the practical difficulties which belie the written texts when we speak of freedom of access to the sea. In so doing, I shall advert to the letter sent in June of this year by the delegation of Zambia,[6] a document which might be summed up as follows. Maize or corn is a staple used to feed the people of that country. National production was insufficient during 1970 and 1971, and the same is feared for 1972. Therefore, Zambia has had to import corn and, as a land-locked State, it must use foreign ports in order to do so. For political and other reasons, those ports have been partially blocked to imports for Zambia. Service rates have been raised disproportionately. Handling of cargo has been made difficult, and at least one of the countries of transit has insisted that the corn be bought from it at a very swollen price. This costs Zambia tens of millions of dollars.

83. It would seem unnecessary to add that unacceptable political reprisals or impositions incompatible with the sovereignty of a country would have placed that nation before the dilemma of hunger or submission. This is inadmissible in the twentieth century, particularly when we speak here of equitable participation and of the universality of the sea.

84. Other less dramatic examples might be evoked, which refer to the land-locked developing countries. Freedom of transit, which must necessarily be reciprocal without any valid reason for it, is limited to goods or merchandise.

85. Among other places, this limitation appears in article 1 of the New York Convention on Transit Trade of Land-locked States of 1965. But the determination of what might be termed goods or merchandise is not always easy and may give rise to differences between the transit and the land-locked country. The last word, then, is left to the will or whim of the transit country.

86. Arms which may be vital to the defence of a land-locked nation are excluded from freedom of transit by article 11 of that same Convention. Experience has shown us that that exclusion applies even in the case of the land-locked countries being involved in a war with a third State that is not the country of transit. Diplomatic action and distant interests at play would jeopardize the very existence of the land-locked nations.

87. There is another example. Normally speaking, the judicial authorities of a transit nation exercise jurisdiction and competence over goods and persons passing through its territory between the sea and the coastless State. That means that in the case of a conflict between powerful international private interests and the land-locked State regarding the nationalization of its resources, it is the judges of a third country which will decide upon certain aspects of the conflict. But the transit State may, for political or other reasons, decide to refuse passage to persons whom the coastless State wishes to receive. The first of these situations once occurred in Bolivia, but was, fortunately, successfully overcome.

88. But another and perhaps the most important example is the lack of relationship between the written provisions of international instruments on freedom of transit and the very physical means of transport and communications to implement such provisions. Words, albeit wide, ample and solemn, do not suffice to transport goods and persons between the sea and the land-locked nations, or vice versa. What are needed are railroads, roads, pipelines, airports, means of communication. To construct, build and maintain that entire infrastructure of transport, without which freedom of transit is illusory, is the exclusive right, without appeal, of the transit State. In some cases it is also its exclusive right to indicate which of the existing facilities can be used by the land-locked nation and which are barred to it.

89. To place some States at the mercy of others in questions as vital as the feeding of its people, national defence and development, without leaving open any appeal, is, frankly, unacceptable.

90. When we speak of the other subject, utilization of the living resources of the sea, the situation, if not worse, is even more uncertain because of a tacit exclusion, something in the nature of common law, according to which the land-locked nations are merely overlooked.

91. In territorial waters, those which are over the contiguous zone and the zones of international fishing, it is an accepted fact that the land-locked States have no right to utilize such living resources. That leaves, of course, the resources of the high sea, which seem so difficult to utilize, even for the maritime Powers, which explains their disagreement with the coastal States.

92. But when we speak of the area under the sea, the land-locked nations have no jurisdiction over the continental shelf, the continental slope and below. Therefore they

6 *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-sixth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1971*, document S/10225.

are denied the practical possibility of extending their sovereignty over the marine depths by unilateral decision. The importance of such a possibility is being amply proved in the course of the negotiations being carried out in the Committee on the sea-bed, as well as in the Assembly itself.

93. We all know that there is uncertainty regarding the way in which the exploitable regions of the sea-bed, beyond national jurisdiction, are to be assigned, allocated or distributed. Conflicting interests in certain cases prefer the assignation of areas by country in order to guarantee exploration and exploitation directly by them or by granting them control over concessions given. In other cases, it is proposed that it be the international machinery that should, in a more or less determining way, control the exploitable zones. This, of course, is a simplistic and incomplete summary of that very complex problem. But the basic concepts are sufficient to give reason for the question that I want to ask, besides reflecting different points of view.

94. My question is the following. What position or what hopes or what possibilities are open to the land-locked nations in the allocation of exploitable zones of the sea-bed and ocean floor? Where can those blocks or sectors be located in any utilizable region? Is it to be opposite the coasts of the nearest coastal States, or is it to be in the far-distant areas of the sea-bed and ocean floor? Thus, for example, can Bolivia have assigned to it blocks or sectors in the Indian Ocean? Will Afghanistan be granted them in the Caribbean, and will Paraguay be given them in the North Atlantic?

95. It is perfectly easy to note that the land-locked nations, in the process of negotiation, have to confront much more complex problems than other countries, problems which are born of their very geographical situation, problems which directly or indirectly affect and weaken their negotiating position.

96. I have not forgotten, as some might infer from what I have said thus far, resolution 2750 B (XXV), which does deal with the problems of the land-locked States. But that is a procedural resolution which subtracts nothing and adds nothing to the operative and substantive part of the resolutions of the Assembly. It was the hardly satisfactory result of a concession to avoid the total omission of mention of the problems. The starting point was the principle that the land-locked States have specific problems, but within the context of the resolution, these specific problems can only be taken into account as part of "the special interests and needs of the developing countries". In other words, they should be included, but not given special consideration when dealing with that field. And could they have been excluded? In its operative part, resolution 2750 B (XXV) requests the Secretary-General to do three things: first, to bring up to date the memorandum of 1958 presented to the Conference in Geneva, to which I referred earlier; second, in the light of the events that have occurred in the meantime, to supplement that memorandum with a report on special problems of the land-locked States; third, to submit that study to the sea-bed Committee so that it may suggest "appropriate measures . . . within the general framework of the law of the sea, to resolve the problems". The sea-bed Committee, in turn, is asked to submit a report to the General Assembly on the question.

97. But these are all procedural decisions. They do not lay down basic principles or concepts regarding the indispensable special treatment that must be given in order to solve the specific problems of the land-locked nations. They only touch on those substantive questions in a very tangential and marginal fashion. The land-locked countries are left only with the hope that the Committee on the sea-bed will give appropriate attention to the true content of those subjects.

98. We have undertaken a task whose result in the form of conventions or other international agreements will, if successful, be in force for numerous generations. If the injustices I have mentioned are not redressed in time, the peoples of the land-locked nations will suffer irreparable consequences, which will inevitably be blamed on the United Nations.

99. Mr. OGISO (Japan): It gives me great pleasure to speak in the First Committee on the subject of the sea-bed and the law of the sea, a subject to which my delegation attaches great importance.

100. We have before us the voluminous report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction *[A/8421]*, on the preparatory work of the Committee, as well as the reports submitted by the Secretary-General pursuant to the pertinent resolutions adopted at the last session of the General Assembly, which are summarized in the Committee's report. I wish to associate myself with a number of previous speakers in expressing my deep appreciation of the efforts made by the officers and members of the sea-bed Committee, as well as by the competent and devoted members of the United Nations Secretariat.

101. Since the adoption by the last session of the General Assembly of the two momentous resolutions 2749 (XXV) and 2750 (XXV), the Japanese Government has continued to study the principles, mandates and problems contained in those resolutions with a view to contributing to the effective deliberations of the Committee over the whole range of issues involved in the exploitation and use of the sea-bed and in the law of the sea. We have recently submitted a working paper *[A/AC.138/63]* outlining our proposal for a convention on the international sea-bed régime and machinery. In circulating that working paper, we decided to keep open our position on the delimitation of the international sea-bed area, in the light of the discussions and understanding developed at the two sessions of the sea-bed Committee held this year. We are indeed looking forward to fruitful and intensive exchanges of views with the members of the sea-bed Committee next year to facilitate progress towards the elaboration of the international régime for the sea-bed and the ocean floor.

102. Since the members of the First Committee who are also the members of the sea-bed Committee should have ample opportunity to discuss the substance of this question in the sea-bed Committee itself, I wish to limit my remarks on the procedural phase of the preparation of the further work of the sea-bed Committee and would like to comment briefly on draft resolution A/C.1/L.586/Rev.1, as supplemented by the introductory statement of the representative of Brazil yesterday.

103. In principle, we could support that draft resolution, which is concise and includes all the essential procedural matters. However, in view of the tight financial situation of the United Nations budget, I feel it difficult to justify the holding of both sessions at Geneva. It would involve too much expenditure, which could be reduced if we were to meet in New York. In particular, if the Committee wishes to have two five-week sessions, the expenses incurred in holding them at Geneva would amount to more than $400,000. We are inclined to think that at least one session, preferably the spring session, should be held in New York, which would reduce the financial expenditure by $200,000.

104. My delegation also sides with a number of other delegations in taking the position that four weeks would be the appropriate length for each session, if we all worked with due diligence and efficiency. It seems from our experience that to hold a session which is too lengthy will simply delay the emergence of compromise, which is indispensable in this kind of complicated problem of a legal and technical as well as a political nature.

105. Indeed, I fully endorse the suggestion made by the Chairman of the sea-bed Committee, Ambassador Amerasinghe of Ceylon, that all those who are interested in promoting agreement on the comprehensive list of subjects and issues relating to the law of the sea should hold consultations informally at an appropriate time between the conclusion of the General Assembly session and the first session of the sea-bed Committee in 1972, in order to reach an understanding that will expedite our work in the next session of the sea-bed Committee.

106. Indeed, we sincerely hope that we shall be able to engage in productive study and deliberations so that we may effectively discharge the mandate accorded to us in resolution 2750 (XXV).

107. I understand that the People's Republic of China now wishes to become a member of the sea-bed Committee. I fully share the view that such a big and important country as the People's Republic of China should have its proper place in the sea-bed Committee. My delegation supports a necessary arrangement during this session to enable the People's Republic of China to participate in the work of the sea-bed Committee.

108. In concluding my statement I wish to add that it may be right to change the formal name of the so-called sea-bed Committee, since it is too long and does not reflect the whole mandate entrusted to that Committee.

109. My delegation is earnestly looking forward to playing its part in the work of the sea-bed Committee next year in co-operation with all its members, in order to come back to the next session of the General Assembly with substantial progress and achievements reflected in our report.

110. Mr. KOSTOV (Bulgaria) *(interpretation from French):* In the years since 1967 a vigorous and often confused debate has been going on in the United Nations on the various questions arising from the exploration and exploitation of the sea-bed and ocean floor. The divergent interests involved have prompted a variety of proposals for dealing with the problems.

111. The advance of new technology and its application to this field have taken on dimensions hitherto unknown, going beyond the traditional uses of the sea, shipping and fishing. The fact that the vast resources of the sea-bed and the ocean floor and the subsoil thereof are becoming progressively more accessible is a new and important phenomenon in the utilization of the seas and oceans which offers tremendous prospects for all of mankind. We know now that the sea contains more than two thirds of the potential food resources of our globe, which hitherto have been used little and very inefficiently.

112. However, all this means that juridical steps have to be taken to prevent these promising prospects from becoming a source of rivalry and harmful antagonism among nations. It has become obvious that the four Conventions[7] which now constitute the official code of international maritime law and which govern the activities of States in the sea environment are no longer sufficient. The law of the sea, which was conceived and established with much groping, chopping and changing of opinion, now has to be supplemented so that it may no longer be a source of conflict and struggle in these activities, but on the contrary a precious support, both infallible and universal.

113. It is for this purpose that in resolution 2750 C (XXV) the General Assembly decided to convene a conference on the law of the sea in 1973, whose task would be to study the possibility of drawing up an equitable international régime provided with an international machinery applicable to the zone of the sea-bed and the ocean floor, and the subsoil thereof, beyond the limits of national jurisdiction, to give a precise definition of the zone and also to study a broad range of related issues.

114. Pursuant to this resolution the enlarged Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction was to draw up reports on the preparatory work for the conference, and we now have before us a detailed report of the Committee *[A/8421]* which faithfully reflects the progress of its work.

115. In view of the limited time available it is not the intention of my delegation to go into the labyrinthine juridical problems entrusted to the Committee on the sea-bed and the ocean floor, which it must study in depth. As my country has been a member of the Committee since the outset, it has frequently had occasion to explain its position on various questions referring to the sea-bed and the ocean floor as well as to other related issues. We are therefore prepared to respond to the appeal of the Chairman of the Committee, Ambassador Amerasinghe *[1843rd meeting]*, by limiting our statement to some procedural matters whose solutions should enable us to go forward.

116. As the report makes abundantly clear, at the two previous sessions some useful, if very modest, work was done which enabled the organizational foundation to be laid for the preparatory work for the conference. For this success we have to thank the Chairman of the Committee, Ambassador Amerasinghe, the Chairmen of the three

7 Conventions signed at the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, held at Geneva from 24 February to 27 April 1958.

Sub-committees and the members of the respective Bureaux.

117. However, it is to be regretted that instead of trying to organize its work in a pragmatic way so as to ensure maximum efficiency, extremely precious time was lost in long and sterile discussions devoted to the so-called question of priority—despite the perfectly clear understanding that all the questions were closely interrelated, that no order of priority had been fixed in advance and that the equitable and correct solution of the problems was possible only provided a balance was struck between the interests of the various countries on the basis of the principle of the sovereign equality of States. This fact is all the more regrettable in light of the failure of Sub-Committee II to draw up even the list of questions, which it was supposed to submit for consideration. In this connexion I should like to recall that in Geneva my delegation presented a working document containing a list of items *[A/8421, annex I, sect. 5]* we felt was sufficiently flexible to allow Sub-committee II to get down to work if there was a genuine desire to resolve these questions and to prepare for the conference, and not to demonstrate the correctness of certain preconceived notions.

118. That, Mr. Chairman, is why we firmly support the suggestion made by the Chairman of the Committee that prior consultations be held in order to settle matters of procedure still outstanding and thus enable the Committee, and more specifically Sub-committee II to get started and, beginning with the next session, to work properly.

119. Regarding the organization of the Committee's work in 1972, my delegation is prepared to accept the proposal that two sessions be held, neither of which should last more than five weeks. The question of the venue for the sessions has also engendered rather serious difficulties because of the big difference in the financial implications of the two alternatives, namely, Geneva and New York. We were impressed by the astronomical figure of $435,400, which the Secretary-General presents in document A/C.1/L.598/Add.1 as the estimated cost of the two sessions if they are held in Geneva. In view of the fact that both sessions of this year were held in Geneva, the difficulties experienced by a large number of Member States in regard to New York and the need to observe budgetary austerity, it seems that this question of the venue of the Committee sessions will have to be decided in a spirit of compromise by establishing the practice of alternation between Geneva and New York, in order to satisfy all States and to effect a maximum saving in the United Nations budget.

120. Apart from the question of venue, which we believe should be settled outside the draft resolution through consultations among delegations, we are prepared to support draft resolution A/C.1/L.586/Rev.1, sponsored by Algeria and other delegations. We can also vote in favour of the amendment presented by Sweden in document A/C.1/L.599.

121. Mr. BONNICK (Jamaica): My delegation is a little concerned at the amendment presented by the representative of Sweden to draft resolution A/C.1/L.586/Rev.1. As representatives will recall, last year, during negotiations on General Assembly resolution 2750 C (XXV), the First Committee ran into tremendous difficulty in arriving at a distribution among the various regional groups. Now, at that time the different regional groups made great concessions to the group of Western European and other countries to facilitate differences within that group.

122. In presenting his draft amendment, the representative of Sweden alluded to the fact that the People's Republic of China should be given a seat on the sea-bed Committee. My delegation has no disagreement with that; however, we believe that the four seats proposed by the representative of Sweden should in fact go to the developing countries, which are already under-represented on the sea-bed Committee. At this point I would mention that at the present time there are 21 States in the group of Western European and other countries, and they now have 18 seats. There are 10 States in the group of Eastern European and other countries, and they now have 10 seats. Therefore, as far as my delegation is concerned, if the Swedish amendment proposes the division of those seats among the countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America—those regional groups which are in fact under-represented in the sea-bed Committee—my delegation is prepared to support it. If that is not the case, my delegation would propose a subamendment to the operative paragraph of the Swedish amendment which would call for consultation with the under-represented regional groups. In short, between the words "with" and "regional groups" we would propose the insertion of the words "the under-represented".

123. The CHAIRMAN *(interpretation from French)*: Before adjourning the meeting I should like to draw the Committee's attention first to the statement just made by the representative of Jamaica and then to the amendment introduced by Sweden; we shall have to bear them in mind this afternoon when we may take up the draft resolution and the proposed amendment.

124. Mr. HJERTONSSON (Sweden): I should just like to comment very briefly on the proposal just made by the representative of Jamaica.

125. Of course, we have no objection to giving adequate representation to the regions of Africa, Asia and Latin America, and in the light of what the representative of Jamaica has just said I think we will consider the possibility not only of giving four seats to those continents but of satisfying all countries that are at present not members of the sea-bed Committee.

126. Mr. KRISHNADASAN (Zambia): I wish to refer briefly to the amendment presented by Sweden to the draft resolution. My delegation supports the amendment contained in document A/C.1/L.599 presented by the representative of Sweden. Equally, we have no objection to the subamendment proposed by the representative of Jamaica in this regard. Our main problem was excellently underlined by the representative of Bolivia earlier this morning when he very kindly pinpointed Zambia as an example of a land-locked country whose very livelihood depended not merely on its access to the sea, but also on its particular geographical position and the manner in which it was surrounded.

127. All that we can say at this stage is that we have every interest in seeing that the developing world is represented,

and more particularly the land-locked developing world. It is my understanding, although I am a newcomer in this body, that of the 14 land-locked countries in Africa only one is currently a member of the sea-bed Committee.

128. The CHAIRMAN *(interpretation from French):* I should like to state once again that I think some serious work has to be done, now that the Committee has an amendment and a subamendment before it. They must be studied very closely before we shall be able to vote on them. The consultations should not involve just one group but all groups, and should take into account the interests of all.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.

Litho in United Nations, New York 77101—October 1974—2,100