



Chairman: Mr. Paul Bamela ENGO (Cameroon).

AGENDA ITEM 91

Progressive development and codification of the rules of international law relating to international watercourses (concluded) (A/7991, A/C.6/L.812, A/C.6/L.814-816)

1. Mr. TESLENKO (Secretariat) explained that the information given in document A/C.6/L.812 on the administrative and financial implications of draft resolution A/C.6/L.810/Rev.1 also applied to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.6/L.816.

2. Mr. MANNER (Finland), introducing the draft proposals in document A/C.6/L.816 on behalf of the sponsors, said that the document contained a draft resolution identical to the one in document A/C.6/L.810/Rev.2, minus the sixth preambular paragraph, and a paragraph to be inserted in the Sixth Committee report. The sponsors hoped that their new proposal would allay the fears expressed by certain delegations about the importance which the International Law Commission should attach to the Helsinki Rules¹ when it considered the question of international watercourses.

3. In his delegation's view, it was essential for the Committee's report to contain a reference to those Rules, not only because they had been discussed at length in the Committee and were of a recent date but primarily because they were a milestone in the evolution of the law applicable to international watercourses, they helped to clarify the numerous theories existing on the subject and they provided a suitable legal framework for the development of water resources, particularly in countries which did not have adequate legislation in that sphere.

4. The sponsors of the draft proposals in document A/C.6/L.816 considered that the two texts in that document formed a whole and requested that they be voted on together.

5. Mr. NEUMAN (Argentina), noting that his statement at the 1234th meeting appeared to have been misinterpreted, pointed out that what he had tried to emphasize in connexion with the Helsinki Rules was that, in the entirely hypothetical case where, by some appropriate means, they were approved in their present form, their application would be purely supplementary; in other words, they

would apply only in the absence of any convention, agreement or binding custom among the States concerned, as set forth in article I of those Rules. As many delegations had stated, it was clear that the Helsinki Rules were only a draft prepared by a private association, so that in themselves they had no normative value, not even of a supplementary kind. He requested that the clarification which he had just given should be included in the summary record.

6. Mr. YASSEEN (Iraq), speaking on a point of order, said that the draft proposal before the Committee contained a new text which members of the Committee should be given an opportunity to study and, if necessary, to discuss.

7. His delegation wished to emphasize that the General Assembly had never asked the International Law Commission to take into consideration, in its work, the activities of one specific private organization and that it would not be right to depart from that tradition in the case under consideration. Reference was made in the second part of the joint draft proposal to a text—the Helsinki Rules—which had been drafted by a private organization; it thus conferred upon that organization a privileged status. While his delegation did not dispute the value of the Helsinki Rules, it thought that the Committee should have been able to consider all other texts on the question before having to take a decision on a proposal such as the one under discussion. It therefore thought that the reference to the Helsinki Rules should be deleted from the paragraph to be inserted in the Sixth Committee report to the General Assembly.

8. Mr. TRAORÉ (Ivory Coast) agreed with the representative of Iraq. The Ivory Coast had never been able to study a French text of the Helsinki Rules and therefore demurred at according special importance to those Rules. In addition, certain experiments had been conducted in Africa concerning the legal régime of international watercourses and he did not see why they should not be taken into consideration by the Commission together with the Helsinki Rules.

9. He therefore proposed the deletion of the words "such as the Helsinki Rules of 1966" from the paragraph to be inserted in the Sixth Committee report to the General Assembly.

10. Mr. DEBERGH (Belgium) associated himself with the statements made by the representatives of Iraq and the Ivory Coast.

11. Mr. SEATON (United Republic of Tanzania) said that, for the reasons given by several speakers, his delegation would abstain in the vote on the draft proposals in document A/C.6/L.816.

¹ International Law Association, *Helsinki Rules on the Uses of the Waters of International Rivers* (London, 1967).

12. Mr. NJENGA (Kenya) said that he would not insist on the oral amendment which he had submitted at the 1235th meeting being put to a vote, provided that it was understood that the Helsinki Rules would not form the basis of the work to be done by the International Law Commission on the question of international watercourses but would simply be taken into consideration by the Commission together with the other texts on the subject. If the two parts of the draft proposal in document A/C.6/L.816 were put to the vote together, his delegation would nevertheless have to abstain.

13. Mr. NDONG (Gabon) said that his delegation would abstain in the vote on the draft proposals, if the reference to the Helsinki Rules was retained in the paragraph to be inserted in the Sixth Committee report to the General Assembly.

14. Mrs. KRISPI-NIKOLETOPOULOU (Greece), supported by Mr. SECARIN (Romania), Mr. BOULBINA (Algeria) and Mr. CAVALCANTI (Brazil), moved that the paragraph to be inserted in the Committee report to the General Assembly should be voted on separately.

15. Mr. DANH SANG (Cambodia) supported the representative of Greece and said that his delegation would vote for the draft resolution and abstain in the vote on the paragraph to be inserted in the report, if the two texts were voted on separately; it would also abstain if they were voted on together.

16. Mr. SHITTA-BEY (Nigeria) pointed out that omission of the paragraph to be inserted in the report would not basically alter the idea which the sponsors wished to convey in document A/C.6/L.816. In accordance with paragraph 2 (b) of the draft resolution, the Commission would see the records of the discussion in the Sixth Committee. The Commission would easily be able to gather from those documents the importance which the different delegations attached to the Helsinki Rules. If the sponsors did not agree to withdraw the paragraph to be inserted in the report, he would formally propose that a separate vote be taken on the draft resolution.

17. Mr. TUTU (Ghana) supported the motion of the Greek delegation. If the draft resolution and the paragraph to be inserted in the report were voted on together, his delegation would abstain, because it considered that the reference to the Helsinki Rules discriminated against the other work done on the subject.

18. The CHAIRMAN recalled that, under rule 130 of the Assembly's rules of procedure, permission to speak on a motion for division could be given only to two speakers in favour and two speakers against. Since the Finnish delegation had spoken on behalf of the sponsors, he considered that the debate on the Greek motion for division was closed.

19. Mr. ROSENSTOCK (United States of America) appealed to the delegations which had requested a separate vote to withdraw their motion.

20. Mr. CHAMMAS (Lebanon) pointed out to the sponsors of the draft proposals in document A/C.6/L.816 that

the opening words of the paragraph to be inserted in the report—"It was agreed in the Sixth Committee"—were in no way indicative of the divergence of views which had emerged in the discussion.

21. Mr. ARYUBI (Afghanistan), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation would abstain in the vote, because it believed that the question needed to be studied in greater depth.

22. Mr. BREWER (Liberia) said that his delegation would have preferred such an important question to be referred to an expert group. In a spirit of compromise, however, it would vote for the draft proposals in document A/C.6/L.816, irrespective of whether a single vote or two separate votes were taken. It had supported the sixth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.6/L.810/Rev.2, because it had considered that the reference to the Helsinki Rules did not prejudice the question of their status.

23. Mr. EL HUSSEIN (Sudan) said that his country, which was situated in the Nile basin, had concluded agreements with the other riparian States. Those agreements could be a valuable contribution to the codification of international law on the subject. His delegation believed that the work to be done should be based on all the available documents and instruments. Consequently, it was not in favour of making a reference to a single document produced by a private organization. His delegation's position, which was certainly not to be interpreted as a value judgement on the Helsinki Rules, was simply a reflection of its unwillingness to grant precedence to any document. It would therefore vote against the paragraph to be inserted in the Committee report if a separate vote was taken on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.6/L.816, and would abstain on the resolution as a whole if there was no separate vote.

24. Mr. CHAILA (Zambia) said that, since the use of the resources of international watercourses was primarily a political matter to be decided by Governments, he was not in favour of making a reference to the Helsinki Rules, which were an academic work that Governments had not been able to study. Consequently, his delegation would abstain if the paragraph to be inserted in the report was put to a separate vote or if document A/C.6/L.816 was put to a single vote.

25. Mr. FREELAND (United Kingdom) said that, notwithstanding the reservations he had expressed with regard to the Helsinki Rules, he would vote in favour of document A/C.6/L.816 as a whole, on the understanding that the reference to the Helsinki Rules in no way implied endorsement of their contents and did not prejudice any decisions that the Commission might take when organizing its work. The sponsors had shown an accommodating spirit and it was reasonable for them to wish their proposal to be treated as a package. He therefore associated his delegation with the appeal made by the United States representative that there should not be separate votes on document A/C.6/L.816.

26. The CHAIRMAN said that, of the two documents on which the Committee had to vote, the Indian draft resolution (A/C.6/L.814) should normally be put to the vote first.

27. Mr. JAGOTA (India) said that, in a spirit of compromise, he was willing to agree that the Greek motion for division should be put to the vote first. If that motion was rejected, he would withdraw his draft resolution. Otherwise, he requested that the latter should be put to the vote before the two parts of document A/C.6/L.816.

28. The CHAIRMAN took note of the statement by the representative of India and put to the vote the motion for division concerning document A/C.6/L.816 submitted by the Greek delegation.

The motion for division was adopted by 49 votes to 23, with 22 abstentions.

29. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote draft resolution A/C.6/L.814.

At the request of the Indian representative, the vote was taken by roll-call.

Ghana, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: India, Turkey.

Against: Greece, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Mali, Mongolia, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Romania, South Africa, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, China, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon.

Abstaining: Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Iran, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Southern Yemen, Spain, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Burma, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, France.

The draft resolution was rejected by 34 votes to 2, with 62 abstentions.

30. Mr. CHAMMAS (Lebanon), supported by Mr. SHITTA-BEY (Nigeria), proposed that the words "such as the Helsinki Rules of 1966" in the last paragraph of the proposals contained in document A/C.6/L.816 should be put to the vote separately.

31. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Lebanese proposal was accepted.

It was so decided.

32. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the retention of the words "such as the Helsinki Rules of

1966" in the last paragraph of the proposals in document A/C.6/L.816.

At the request of the Netherlands representative, the vote was taken by roll-call.

The Dominican Republic, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Finland, Haiti, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Liberia, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, South Africa, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yugoslavia, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Canada, Dahomey, Denmark.

Against: Ethiopia, France, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Hungary, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Mali, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Portugal, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Syria, Togo, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yemen, Algeria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cuba, Czechoslovakia.

Abstaining: Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guinea, Iran, Israel, Jamaica, Japan, Madagascar, Malaysia, Nigeria, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Rwanda, Singapore, Spain, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zambia, Afghanistan, Bolivia, Burma, Cambodia, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus.

The retention of the words "such as the Helsinki Rules of 1966" was rejected by 41 votes to 25, with 32 abstentions.

33. The CHAIRMAN, pursuant to the earlier decision, took a separate vote on the paragraph in its amended form to be inserted in the Sixth Committee's report.

The paragraph was adopted by 55 votes to none, with 39 abstentions.

34. The CHAIRMAN then put to the vote document A/C.6/L.816 as a whole, in its amended form.

Document A/C.6/L.816 in its amended form was adopted by 87 votes to none with 8 abstentions.

35. Mr. DERMIZAKY (Bolivia) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.6/L.816, because it believed that it was necessary to embark on the task of codifying the international law relating to international watercourses. There was no doubt that the first source of law on the subject should be the bilateral and multilateral agreements between States, but international codification was desirable for cases where no such agreements existed. Bolivia was particularly interested in the question, because there were two very important drainage basins in its territory. It was for that reason that it had voted in favour of General Assembly resolution 1401 (XIV), requesting the Secretary-General to prepare a report containing legal material with a view to studying the legal problems relating to the utilization and use of international rivers.

36. Mr. JARA RECALDE (Paraguay) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.6/L.816, on the understanding that paragraph 1 would not prevent the Commission from studying the law of the navigational uses of international water courses.

37. Mr. GÜNEY (Turkey) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.6/L.814, which envisaged several interesting possibilities for proceeding with the progressive development and codification of the rules of international law relating to international watercourses. It had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.6/L.816 for the reasons given at the 1234th meeting.

38. Mr. ROSENSTOCK (United States of America) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the compromise text concerning the Helsinki Rules because it found that text acceptable as a compromise but that its vote implied neither approval nor disapproval of the Rules.

39. Mr. DUPLESSY (Haiti) said that his delegation had not voted for the Indian draft resolution (A/C.6/L.814) because that text accorded undue importance to the Helsinki Rules and would thus hamper the Commission's attempts to codify the law relating to international watercourses.

40. Mr. GONZALES GALVEZ (Mexico) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the retention of the words "such as the Helsinki Rules of 1966" in the paragraph to be inserted in the Committee report since it considered those Rules to be an important element in the codification of the law relating to international watercourses. He hoped, however, that the practice of voting on the inclusion of a paragraph in the Committee's report would not be repeated.

41. Mr. SECARIN (Romania) said that his delegation had voted against the Indian draft resolution (A/C.6/L.814) because it had not had time to study carefully the five proposals made in paragraph 1 of the text.

42. With regard to the draft proposals in document A/C.6/L.816, his delegation had voted against the retention of the words "such as the Helsinki Rules of 1966" in the paragraph to be inserted in the Committee report, because it saw no need to make specific reference to the Rules in the report; they had been referred to many times in the Committee and should not be given preferential treatment compared with the other studies on the law relating to international watercourses. Furthermore, the Commission should be given a free hand in undertaking the recommended study. His delegation had therefore abstained in the vote on the rest of the paragraph. It had voted for document A/C.6/L.816 as a whole.

43. Mr. GARCIA BAUER (Guatemala) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it believed it was important that a study of the question should now be undertaken. It had abstained on the question of including a reference to the Helsinki Rules in the paragraph to be inserted in the Committee's report on the grounds that it would be wrong to refer only to one

study which was, in fact, the work of a private organization. It nevertheless felt that the Helsinki Rules were important and should be included among the documents to be taken into account by the Commission.

44. His delegation regretted that it was unable to support the Indian draft resolution because it thought that a procedure for studying the question could be decided upon even at the present stage.

AGENDA ITEM 90

United Nations Programme of Assistance in the Teaching, Study, Dissemination and Wider Appreciation of International Law: report of the Secretary-General (*continued*) (A/8130 and Corr.1, A/C.6/L.811, A/C.6/L.813)

45. Mr. ALCIVAR (Ecuador), introducing draft resolution A/C.6/L.811, said that Ecuador had always supported the United Nations Programme of Assistance in the Teaching, Study, Dissemination and Wider Appreciation of International Law, which it considered to be one of the most effective ways of bringing peoples and nations together and establishing an international legal order based on justice and peace.

46. The various activities undertaken within the framework of the Programme, particularly the regional seminars in Africa and Asia, had already yielded tangible results; it was, however, regrettable that, due to the lack of funds available to the Programme, it had not been possible to organize a world symposium for the examination and possible settlement of legal problems of concern to the international community as a whole and it was to be hoped that such a symposium could be held shortly.

47. Mr. ZECEVIĆ (Yugoslavia) said that the Programme was one of the most effective ways of strengthening and promoting a broader understanding of international law. He welcomed the Secretary-General's report (A/8130 and Corr.1), which clearly illustrated the scope and variety of the measures taken to achieve the objectives of the Programme, particularly in the developing countries. Thanks to the efforts of the United Nations, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) and various other bodies and to the increasingly close co-operation between them, it had been possible to give States extremely useful assistance, particularly in the teaching of international law. He also welcomed the growing tendency of States to co-ordinate their bilateral assistance in that area within the United Nations.

48. Many newly independent States wished to have a sufficiently large and qualified legal staff to enable them to take an active part in the progressive development and codification of international law; the Programme played a fundamental role in that respect, by giving new States the opportunity and the means to do so.

49. His delegation whole-heartedly endorsed the Secretary-General's recommendations regarding execution of the Programme in 1971 and supported draft resolution A/C.6/L.811.

50. Mr. ANOLIN (Philippines) was glad that the close co-operation between the United Nations, UNESCO and UNITAR had enabled the Programme to operate efficiently and make the best use of its limited resources. The importance of the Programme derived from the fact that the improved dissemination and wider appreciation of international law would be bound to strengthen peace and bring nations closer together and would thus promote the objectives of the United Nations.

51. The mistrust recently displayed by certain States for international law was due to the fact that it had essentially been conceived by the Western countries and it did not make sufficient allowance for the new situation created by the accession to independence of many former colonies. Contemporary international law therefore had to evolve and the Programme should be encouraged precisely because it was an effective means of accelerating that evolution. It was for that reason that his delegation had co-sponsored draft resolution A/C.6/L.811.

52. Recalling the success of the training course organized by the United Nations in the Philippines in August 1969 in co-operation with UNESCO and UNITAR, he emphasized the importance which his delegation attached to regional symposia and, accordingly, to the provisions of operative paragraph 1 (c) of draft resolution A/C.6/L.811.

53. Mr. ARYUBI (Afghanistan) said that his Government had studied with great interest the Secretary-General's report on the Programme and emphasized the importance which the developing countries attached to the Programme, since it offered them the means to meet the challenges of the modern world. His delegation welcomed the progress made in the execution of the Programme in 1970 and noted with particular satisfaction the Secretary-General's recommendation (see A/8130 and Corr.1, para. 42) to expand the assistance offered under the Programme in the teaching of international trade law.

54. His delegation also felt that activities concerning the teaching of public international law should include courses on the structure, aims and activities of international organizations and of the United Nations in particular. It would support draft resolution A/C.6/L.811.

55. The CHAIRMAN announced that the United Republic of Tanzania had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.6/L.811.

56. Mrs. SLAMOVA (Czechoslovakia) said that her delegation welcomed the Programme, since it recognized that international law had an important role to play and felt that knowledge of and interest in that subject should be developed. Czechoslovakia participated in the Programme by granting fellowships, particularly to students from the developing countries, for study at the University of 17th November at Prague. It noted with satisfaction the activities undertaken within the Programme in 1970 and particularly the role played by the Secretariat, UNITAR and UNESCO; it recommended that the Programme should be continued and expanded and that ways should be sought of enabling more people to benefit from it.

57. Other speakers had drawn attention to the duplication which existed in activities relating to the teaching and study

of international law. Her delegation wished to stress the need for improved co-ordination between the United Nations and the other international organizations concerned. Her delegation considered that the financing of activities under the Programme should be covered by voluntary contributions and that the relevant draft resolution should include a provision to that effect.

58. She announced that Czechoslovakia intended to supply interested institutions in developing countries with legal publications and to grant scholarships to students from those countries to enable them to study at the University of 17th November at Prague.

59. Mrs. DALYANOGLU (Turkey) expressed the condolences of her delegation to the delegation of Singapore in connexion with the death of the President of Singapore.

60. Her delegation commended the excellent results of the Programme for 1970, which had been achieved without any substantial budgetary increase, and took the opportunity to thank the Governments which, by offering scholarships or voluntary contributions, had helped to make the Programme possible. She extended special thanks to UNESCO and UNITAR for their constructive participation—for UNESCO's efforts to strengthen the teaching of international law and UNITAR's organizing of regional seminars and training courses.

61. With regard to the future, her delegation approved the recommendation of the Secretary-General (*ibid.*) on continuing the Programme along the same lines as in 1970 and supported the work of preparing teaching materials and establishing regional institutes or chairs of international trade law in order to provide training in that field. On the subject of the UNESCO programme for 1971, her delegation considered that the organization of short-term consultant missions, mentioned in paragraph 45 of the Secretary-General's report, would be a very constructive way of strengthening the teaching of international law. It hoped that UNESCO and UNITAR would consider publishing and disseminating information on the seminars and refresher courses held under the auspices of the United Nations system, thus enabling countries which had been unable to participate in those meetings to derive some benefit from them.

62. Her delegation had doubts regarding the advisability of the 50 per cent increase in the expenditure of the Programme which would result from the implementation of paragraph 1 (c) of draft resolution A/C.6/L.811. It hoped that the sponsors of the draft resolution would try to devise a text acceptable to all delegations.

63. Her delegation invited delegations to consider the possibility of preparing programmes on a two- or three-year basis, as the Legal Counsel had proposed (1229th meeting). Her delegation would support any efforts in that direction.

64. Mr. TETRI (Finland) welcomed the way in which the Programme had been carried out in 1970, particularly the activities involving international trade law. Those activities had gained even greater actuality and importance. His delegation supported the efforts of the Secretary-General to promote co-operation between the United Nations and

other organizations active in the field of international law; unfortunately, twelve of those seventeen international organizations had failed to provide the information requested by the Secretary-General concerning their activities.

65. His delegation supported the recommendations of the Secretary-General on the execution of the 1971 Programme and wished to stress the usefulness of the seminars organized in Geneva in connexion with the sessions of the Commission. It announced that the Government of Finland would again contribute \$1,500 for scholarships to enable students from developing countries to participate in the Seminar on International Law in Geneva in 1971. It also announced that it would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.6/L.811.

66. Mr. TUTU (Ghana) said that his delegation noted with pleasure the activities organized by UNITAR, UNESCO and UNCITRAL under the Programme, and he announced that the Government of Ghana would play host to a regional seminar which was to be held at Accra in January 1971.

67. The Programme was of considerable interest to developing countries. The results of the seminars and refresher courses organized by UNITAR had been fruitful. Moreover, the studies completed by UNITAR or in progress, which were mentioned in paragraphs 38-40 of the Secretary-General's report, were most useful. Ghana therefore hoped that Member States would continue to encourage UNITAR's efforts.

68. His delegation was also satisfied with the activities of UNESCO. It noted that the draft programme for 1971 and 1972 included fellowship schemes for post-graduate studies at The Hague Academy of International Law, and that arrangements had been made to organize a regional round table meeting and to enable two professors of international law from developing countries to lecture in foreign institutions.

69. His delegation regretted that participation in seminars and refresher courses had fallen short of its expectations and suggested that travel grants should be made to participants from developing countries invited to the regional seminar at Accra and to the regional training and refresher course in Latin America. Some Member States had made voluntary contributions towards the financing of the Programme, but those contributions alone would not enable the goal to be achieved.

70. The representatives of the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union had, at the 1235th meeting, requested explanations on paragraph 1 (c) of draft resolution A/C.6/L.811 and had expressed surprise at the fact that the matter had not been discussed by the Advisory Committee on the Programme; the sponsors of the draft resolution had decided to include the sub-paragraph on the basis of information which had come to their attention well after the Advisory Committee had completed its discussion on the Secretary-General's draft report and after that Committee's decision had been taken. In view of the pressure of time, and since only minor expenditure was involved and Member States, in any case, would have had to state their position on the issue in the Sixth Committee, it had been

deemed advisable to bring the matter before the Committee in order to save time, especially as all the members of the Advisory Committee were also represented in the Committee. He stressed the importance attached by developing countries to the assistance referred to in the sub-paragraph and appealed to Member States to give serious consideration to the question. The expenditure involved might be minimal, but it constituted a considerable drain on the budgetary resources of a developing country. Furthermore, the USSR representative had hinted that enthusiasm had flagged because the subjects proposed for the seminars were of no interest to the participants. On the contrary, the subjects were indeed of interest to the developing countries and were being discussed either by the Sixth Committee or by the Commission. The estimated expenditure involved in paragraph 1 (c) was \$23,000. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.6/L.811, including his delegation, trusted that the members of the Committee were anxious to ensure the continued success of the seminars and regional courses and that they would therefore approve the expenditure envisaged in paragraph 1 (c) and the draft resolution as a whole.

71. Mr. RAMBISOON (Trinidad and Tobago) welcomed the Ghanaian offer to hold a regional seminar at Accra for participants from African States since those countries' legal problems differed, depending upon their economic, social and political situation. He commended the work of UNITAR, UNESCO and other agencies in promoting the teaching, study, dissemination and wider appreciation of international law.

72. He welcomed the fact that, in training in international law, stress had been laid on international trade law, which was of considerable importance for all States; the teaching and study of the law concerning the sea-bed and the ocean floor should also be emphasized. He announced that his Government would make a contribution of \$1,000 to the Programme; his delegation supported draft resolution A/C.6/L.811.

73. He expressed condolences to the delegation of Singapore in connexion with the death of the President of Singapore.

*Tribute to the memory of Mr. Yusof bin Ishak,
President of Singapore*

74. The CHAIRMAN paid tribute to the memory of Mr. Yusof bin Ishak, President of Singapore; he expressed his condolences to the delegation of that country and requested it to convey the condolences of the Sixth Committee to the family of Mr. Ishak.

On the proposal of the Chairman, the members of the Committee observed a minute's silence in tribute to the memory of Mr. Yusof bin Ishak, President of Singapore.

75. Mr. CHAO (Singapore) thanked the members of the Committee and the Chairman for the sympathy they had expressed to the delegation of Singapore and the family of Mr. Ishak.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.