

UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



Distr.
GENERAL

A/AC.135/12
7 June 1968

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

AD HOC COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE PEACEFUL
USES OF THE SEA-BED AND THE OCEAN
FLOOR BEYOND THE LIMITS OF
NATIONAL JURISDICTION

SUMMARY OF VIEWS OF MEMBER STATES

Working paper prepared by the Secretariat as requested by the
Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee at the ninth meeting

Contents

- I. Introduction
 - II. Question of the definition of the sea-bed and the ocean floor, and the subsoil thereof, beyond the limits of present national jurisdiction
 - III. Question of the declaration of principles by the General Assembly
 - IV. Questions relating to the establishment of a legal régime
 - V. Question of the avoidance of national claims and activities which might prejudice the international character of the area
 - VI. Questions relating to the reservation of the area for exclusively peaceful purposes
 - VII. Questions relating to the development of the resources of the area for the benefit of mankind
 - VIII. Questions relating to the conservation of resources and the dangers of pollution from radio-active and other wastes
 - IX. Questions relating to international scientific co-operation
 - X. Other questions relating to the Committee's mandate, future machinery for considering the question and the need for co-ordination
- Appendix. List of statements by Members (including references to meetings and documents in which expressed)

I. INTRODUCTION

The Ad Hoc Committee was requested by General Assembly resolution 2340 (XXII) paragraph 2 (c) to prepare, for consideration by the General Assembly at its twenty-third session, a study which would include:

"(c) An indication regarding practical means of promoting international co-operation in the exploration, conservation and use of the sea-bed and the ocean floor, and the subsoil thereof, as contemplated in the title of the item, and of their resources, having regard to the views expressed and the suggestions put forward by Member States during the consideration of this item at the twenty-second session of the General Assembly".

In his statement at the ninth meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee on 27 March 1968 (A/AC.135/5), the Chairman, in summarizing suggestions and proposals made by members of the Committee for documentation from the Secretariat, said:

"For the purpose of paragraph 2 (c), the Committee would wish to have a working paper containing a summary of the views expressed by Member States in the General Assembly, in the Ad Hoc Committee and their replies to the Secretary-General's note verbale".

The attached working paper is accordingly submitted for the use of the Committee. Many of the suggestions made and views expressed by Member States, although not dealing directly with practical means for co-operation in the exploration, conservation and use of the sea-bed and the ocean floor, and the subsoil thereof, beyond the limits of present national jurisdiction, would appear to have a bearing on what recommendations are made by the Ad Hoc Committee and have therefore been taken into account.

In preparing this paper the Secretariat considered four possible methods:

(1) a single summary of the views of each Member set out under the name of the State concerned; (2) a summary of the views of each Member set out separately under broad analytical headings; (3) an analytical presentation, without attribution; and (4) some form intermediate between (2) and (3), involving both analysis and an indication of views expressed by Members on the point in question.

It has adopted the last method as best suited to the requirements of the work of the Committee. The first method would have entailed leaving until a later stage a considerable amount of analysis. This would also apply, to a

/...

significant extent, to the second method. Both would have entailed a great deal of repetition, so that it would have been necessary to choose between length and a reasonably comprehensive coverage of the specific points and suggestions advanced by individual Members.

It must be emphasized that the paper in no way purports to take the place of the official records of statements and views expressed which will be found in the verbatim records of the First Committee, the views of Governments as contained in documents A/AC.135/1 and Corr.1 and Add.1-8, and the summary records of the Ad Hoc Committee. For the convenience of members of the Committee, an alphabetical index to the statements is appended.

The suggestions and points of view expressed have been grouped under certain main headings based on the salient themes of the discussions at the twenty-second session of the Assembly and the first session of the Ad Hoc Committee, as well as of the views communicated by Member Governments.

It will, of course, be apparent that in this method too some duplication is inevitable. There is also room for differences of opinion as to the context in which an expression of opinion should be considered and the fragmentation of the views expressed by Members may obscure to some extent the view of each Member, taken as a whole. Equally, to keep the paper within manageable proportions, broadly similar points of view have been grouped together, with the inevitable result that the exact flavour of particular statements may have been lost. Also, some views by some Members on some subjects may have inadvertently been omitted.

Where references to Members are grouped in the text, the listing is in the alphabetical order of the names of the countries concerned.

Purely for the sake of convenience, the words "the area" have been used frequently throughout the paper to refer to the phrase "the sea-bed and the ocean floor and the sub-soil thereof beyond the limits of present national jurisdiction"; this usage, of course, has no significance other than that of saving space.

II. Question of the definition of the sea-bed and the ocean floor,
and the subsoil thereof, beyond the limits of present
national jurisdiction

Some Members stated that their acceptance of the resolution was on the understanding that, as explained by the representative of Belgium in introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors (First Committee, 1542nd meeting), the expression "the sea-bed and the ocean floor, and the subsoil thereof", as contemplated in the title of the item was used merely to describe the geographical area and did not prejudice any aspect of the question; it did not affect claims of sovereignty or jurisdiction on the part of individual States or reflect any view on the part of the Assembly regarding such claims (Brazil, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.4; Iceland, First Committee, 1543rd meeting; Netherlands, First Committee, 1542nd meeting; United States, First Committee, 1542nd meeting). The meaning of the expression, it was stated, could be defined and limited only as a result of the study by the Ad Hoc Committee itself (Belgium, First Committee, 1542nd meeting); territorial claims are and will continue to be subject to international law (United States, First Committee, 1542nd meeting).

The position of some Members was that the term "beyond the limits of present national jurisdiction" as contained in the agenda item referred to the actual jurisdiction currently exercised by each individual country, and not to some norms of positive international law which did not at present exist. Latin American Member States, it was pointed out, would have preferred the agenda item to read "beyond the limits of present national jurisdictions" so as to make this point clear. It was on this basis that they supported proposals for study of the question (Chile, First Committee, 1526th meeting; Ecuador, First Committee, 1528th meeting; El Salvador, First Committee, 1543rd meeting; Honduras, First Committee, 1527th meeting; Peru, First Committee, 1529th meeting).

A number of Members emphasized, however, that before much progress could be made in considering an international régime to apply to the sea-bed and the ocean floor and the subsoil beyond the limits of national jurisdiction, it was necessary first of all to define the area of implementation, which involved the definition of the limits of the national jurisdiction of coastal States over the continental shelf (Austria, First Committee, 1527th meeting; Belgium, views of

Governments, A/AC.135/1, Ad Hoc Committee, 5th meeting; Canada, First Committee, 1529th meeting, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1, Ad Hoc Committee, 4th meeting; Cyprus, First Committee, 1530th meeting; Denmark, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.2; France, First Committee, 1526th meeting, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.6; Iceland, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.8, Ad Hoc Committee, 3rd meeting; Libya, First Committee, 1525th meeting, Norway, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1; Sweden, First Committee, 1527th meeting, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1 and Corr.1; United Arab Republic, First Committee, 1528th meeting).

These limits, as established by the 1958 Geneva Convention on the continental shelf were, it was widely stated, insufficiently precise since that Convention had defined the limits of the continental shelf over which coastal States exercised jurisdiction as the 200-metre isobath or the limits regardless of depth which a coastal State was technically able to exploit.

A number of Members considered the criterion of exploitability unacceptable and feared that it might give rise to a too extensive interpretation which could lead to national appropriation of the sea-bed (Austria, First Committee, 1527th meeting; Canada, First Committee, 1529th meeting; Czechoslovakia, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting; Japan, First Committee, 1529th meeting; Malta, First Committee, 1515th meeting, Somalia, First Committee 1525th meeting; Sweden, First Committee, 1527th meeting, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1 and Corr.1) or considered that the lack of clarity in the definition created a risk of never-ending disputes regarding the limits of national jurisdiction (Belgium, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1) or that the definition had been rendered obsolete by technical progress (Iceland, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.8; Malta, First Committee, 1515th meeting; Norway, views of Governments, A/AC.125/1; United Arab Republic, First Committee, 1528th meeting). It was held that the Convention - which dealt with the continental shelf - could not reasonably be interpreted to cover the deep sea floor, at any rate not those parts of it which were not adjacent to the coast; although it would appear that there were arguments in favour of a restrictive interpretation, the relevant paragraph of the Geneva Convention required interpretation (Cyprus, First Committee, 1530th meeting; Sweden, First Committee, 1527th meeting, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1 and Corr.1), or needed to be thoroughly examined (India, First Committee,

1530th meeting). One Member stated that the Geneva Convention, which had only been ratified by thirty-seven countries, should not be taken as customary international law (Japan, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.3, Ad Hoc Committee, 5th meeting).

A number of Members emphasized that any question of a change in the definition of the continental shelf required careful study, and some indicated that the time might now have come to consider such a change. The following were some of the suggestions made in this connexion: it might be better to devise a form of wording for a change in the definition of the continental shelf which could be made in accordance with article 11 of the Geneva Convention and by a decision of the General Assembly (Ecuador, First Committee, 1528th meeting); it might be necessary to adopt an additional criterion such as a certain distance from the coast in order to define what areas were beyond national jurisdiction; this might entail opening the procedure for revision of the Continental Shelf Convention (Denmark, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.2); although the Geneva Convention on the Continental Shelf could not be revised before 1969, in accordance with its terms, studies could be undertaken by whatever body the Assembly decided to create and if they showed, as was probable, the need for revision, this could be undertaken at the proper time (United Arab Republic, First Committee, 1528th meeting); it would be desirable to seek more stable and permanent factors than exploitability in determining the continental shelf beyond the 200-metre depth; a definitive agreement acceptable to all would have to be arrived at in order to determine the legal delineation of the ocean floor (Turkey, First Committee, 1528th meeting, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1); the definition of the area would involve reconsideration of the work of the Geneva Conference 1958-1960 on the extent of the territorial sea and the continental shelf (France, First Committee, 1526th meeting); the continental shelf should not extend beyond a depth of 200 metres, and beyond that the ocean floor and its subsoil should remain res nullius (Madagascar, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1); as a basic principle the coastal nations should enjoy national jurisdiction on their continental shelves, while the submarine areas outside these shelves should be subjected to international jurisdiction (Iceland, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.8, Ad Hoc Committee, 3rd meeting).

Some Members felt that although the question of the definition of the continental shelf was not a prerequisite for starting discussions concerning the ocean floor beneath the high seas, the establishment of any international régime (see section IV) would require a precise definition. The outer limits of the continental shelf subject to national jurisdiction should be clearly defined in a treaty or treaties establishing an international régime for the ocean floor (Malta, First Committee, 1516th meeting, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1); the establishment of an international régime called for the determination of the limits of national jurisdiction over the sea-bed and the ocean floor and within this framework the establishment of limits of territorial seas and the continental shelf (Yugoslavia, First Committee, 1529th meeting); it would be necessary to determine the precise limits of the continental shelf when different legal principles had to be applied to the continental shelf and the sea-bed (France, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.6, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting; Iceland, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.8); a more precise determination of the scope of the sovereignty of coastal States might be needed in preparing a convention on the exploitation of the ocean floor (Finland, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.6); in a concession system for the exploitation of such resources there would have to be a rigid limit set to the area in which the coastal States had rights under the Geneva Convention on the continental shelf (Netherlands, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1); in developing the principles for the deep ocean floor the question of a definition would have to be considered (Ghana, First Committee, 1526th meeting; United States, First Committee, 1524th meeting).

In addition to the lack of clarity in the definition of the continental shelf, other questions arose, it was stated, in connexion with determining the limits of national jurisdiction: there was a wide diversity in regulations regarding the width of territorial waters (Czechoslovakia, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting); there was also no uniformity in national laws and regulations relating to the exploitation of the sea, the sea-bed and the subsoil outside internal waters (India, First Committee, 1530th meeting); since existing conventions on the law of the sea did not deal generally with the sea-bed outside certain limits, there was no clear-cut boundary to the rights of nations with coastal waters to the resources beyond those limits (United Kingdom, First Committee, 1524th meeting).

/...

The difficulties of securing agreement on any new definition of the continental shelf were recognized. Any discussion of the question, it was stated, would have to start with, or take into account existing international instruments, in particular the Geneva Conventions (Australia, First Committee, 1529th meeting, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting; Canada, First Committee, 1529th meeting, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1, Ad Hoc Committee, 4th meeting; Iceland, Ad Hoc Committee, 3rd meeting; India, First Committee, 1530th meeting; United States, First Committee, 1524th meeting); these Conventions conferred rights which were valued and retained by their signatories and were mutually recognized as between many Members of the United Nations (Australia, First Committee, 1529th meeting; United States, First Committee, 1524th meeting). Discussion, it was stated, would also have to start from existing State practice which suggested that the exploitability clause of the Continental Shelf Convention had received substantial interpretation in the practice of States (Australia, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting; Canada, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1, Ad Hoc Committee, 4th meeting); this clause should be taken into account by the Ad Hoc Committee (Guatemala, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.5). It was also said that States could not be expected to abandon rights which had been recognized by international law and were being exercised on a world-wide basis (Canada, First Committee, 1529th meeting); the problem was whether States would agree to limit their claims in favour of some international arrangement curtailing their jurisdiction to some agreed distance from their shores (Ireland, First Committee, 1525th meeting); there would have to be intensive study of the principles to define the sea-bed and the ocean floor beyond the limits of national jurisdiction before any decision was taken which would fundamentally alter the Geneva Convention or restrict the claims of sovereignty of coastal Powers (Belgium, First Committee, 1529th meeting); it was questionable whether it would be possible in the present circumstances to obtain the consensus of a sufficient number of coastal States to secure substantial amendments to article 1 of the Convention (Norway, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1).

A number of Members emphasized that the jurisdiction of coastal States over their continental shelves was an established legal principle which was recognized in the Geneva Convention and in accordance with the agenda item was excluded from consideration by the Assembly and by the Assembly's resolution from the

/...

mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee (Argentina, First Committee, 1543rd meeting, Ad Hoc Committee, 5th meeting; Ecuador, Ad Hoc Committee, 5th meeting; El Salvador, First Committee, 1543rd meeting, Ad Hoc Committee, 4th meeting; Honduras, First Committee, 1527th meeting; Iran, First Committee, 1544th meeting; Thailand, First Committee, 1542nd meeting, Ad Hoc Committee, 6th meeting; United Republic of Tanzania, Ad Hoc Committee, 4th meeting). It was important, certain Members emphasized, that the jurisdiction of coastal States over the continental shelf should be safeguarded in the Ad Hoc Committee's discussions (Argentina, Ad Hoc Committee, 5th meeting; Turkey, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1). The jurisdiction of States over the resources of submarine areas extending at least to the abyssal depths was, it was stated, not in dispute; the proposed study should therefore deal with the deep ocean floor (Canada, First Committee, 1529th meeting, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1, Ad Hoc Committee, 4th meeting).

Similarly, it was stated, the existing jurisdictions and sovereignty of coastal States over their territorial waters - the width of which had not been agreed on at the Geneva Conference - was a legal fact which was not a matter for discussion and was equally excluded from consideration by the First Committee under the agenda item and by the Ad Hoc Committee by its mandate (Argentina, Ad Hoc Committee, 5th meeting; Chile, First Committee, 1526th meeting; Ecuador, First Committee, 1528th meeting, Ad Hoc Committee, 5th meeting; El Salvador, First Committee, 1543rd meeting, Ad Hoc Committee, 4th meeting; Honduras, First Committee, 1527th meeting; Peru, First Committee, 1529th meeting, Ad Hoc Committee, 6th meeting; Philippines, First Committee, 1544th meeting; United Republic of Tanzania, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting). In this connexion, special reference was made to the Declaration of Santiago of 1952 under which Chile, Ecuador and Peru had established their jurisdiction and sovereignty over a maritime zone to a distance of 200 miles from the coast; this jurisdiction extended to the soil and subsoil of the ocean (Chile, First Committee, 1526th meeting; Honduras, First Committee, 1527th meeting; Peru, First Committee, 1529th meeting) and by other Members specifically to the continental shelf and territorial waters under their jurisdiction (El Salvador, First Committee, 1543rd meeting; Philippines, First Committee, 1544th meeting; Thailand, First Committee, 1542nd meeting).

The question of jurisdiction over the continental shelf and the territorial seas, it was suggested, should not be reopened so as to preserve the original unanimity under which the Committee had been established (El Salvador, Ad Hoc Committee, 4th meeting). To create and accentuate such controversial issues at this time might overcomplicate the problems politically (Hungary, First Committee, 1544th meeting).

The national jurisdiction of coastal States, it was stated, should not mean only the subsoil of territorial waters but also extend to the sea-bed outside territorial waters where traditional practices as well as international agreements permitted such an extension (Saudi Arabia, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.2). In this regard, one Member stated that it wished to safeguard its rights over certain fisheries on the sea-bed beyond its territorial waters which it had exercised for some twenty centuries (Ceylon, First Committee, 1526th meeting).

Many Members considered that the question of the definition of the limits of national jurisdiction should be carefully studied by the Ad Hoc Committee, and in particular by its Legal Working Group. As regards the Committee's mandate, it was suggested that it should define, although in a tentative way, what was intended by the phrase "limits of present national jurisdiction", contained in the Assembly's resolution (Italy, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.2). In defining the limits of the area, one Member stated, the Ad Hoc Committee could not confine itself to present national jurisdiction because that would be to resign from the responsibility and mandate given to it by the Assembly; by freezing the present situation it would be asking nations to abide by principles of delimitation at present unknown (Iceland, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.8, Ad Hoc Committee, 3rd meeting). Another Member stated that the present imprecise description of the area of implementation in the Committee's mandate was unsatisfactory. It might conceivably be taken to imply that any claims to national jurisdiction over the sea-bed and the ocean floor (theoretically) would have to be recognized. To eliminate such a possibility there should be excluded from the area concerned by the resolution only those parts of the sea-bed to which national jurisdiction could be extended according to international law (Sweden, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1 and Corr.1).

III. Question of the declaration of principles by the General Assembly

At the Assembly's twenty-second session, various Members expressed the view that, pending consideration of the establishment of an international legal régime for the sea-bed and the ocean floor and the subsoil beyond the limits of national jurisdiction (see section IV), certain basic principles should be enunciated by the Assembly at the current session, either in the form of a declaration or in a resolution, to guide whatever body the Assembly might decide to establish to consider the question.

While the number of principles suggested for adoption, as well as their formulation, varied, they included one or more of the following points:

- (1) That the area be reserved for peaceful purposes (see section VI);
- (2) That the area should not be subject to national appropriation or sovereignty beyond the limits of present national jurisdiction (see section V);
- (3) That the resources of the area should be regarded as a common heritage and used for the benefit of all (see section VII);
- (4) That they should be used primarily for the benefit of developing countries (see section VII).

A number of Members, however, were of the opinion that, in view of its complexity, the whole subject of international action with regard to the sea-bed and the ocean floor beyond the limits of national jurisdiction required detailed study before decisions were taken relating to the substance of the matter. Some Members considered that, in particular, it was premature to formulate at the current Assembly session basic international legal principles (Byelorussian SSR, First Committee, 1544th meeting; Canada, First Committee, 1529th meeting; Hungary, First Committee, 1544th meeting; Iceland, First Committee, 1528th meeting; Italy, First Committee, 1528th meeting; USSR, First Committee, 1525th meeting; United Kingdom, First Committee, 1524th meeting; United States, First Committee, 1530th meeting). Such principles, it was stated, required careful study (Iceland, First Committee, 1528th meeting; United Kingdom, First Committee, 1524th meeting); should not be formulated with undue haste (Italy, First Committee, 1528th meeting; USSR, First Committee, 1525th meeting); and should be developed progressively - this

/...

might be undertaken by the proposed Committee on the Oceans (United States, First Committee, 1524th and 1530th meetings). One Member expressed the view that if there was no agreement for including in a resolution a series of regulating principles, it should not be pressed (Mexico, First Committee, 1529th meeting). One Member expressed the hope that the principles to be applied would emerge when the Ad Hoc Committee and other agencies entered into details (Finland, First Committee, 1544th meeting).

At the first session of the Ad Hoc Committee, it was suggested that the Committee should at its second session draw up a declaration analogous to that on outer space and recommend it to the Assembly for adoption. The declaration might, it was suggested, reiterate, among others, the following principles: (a) the sea-bed and the ocean floor underlying the high seas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction are a common heritage of mankind and, as such, are not subject to national appropriation and should be used exclusively for peaceful purposes for the benefit of all countries, particularly the developing countries; (b) the activities of States in the exploration and use of the sea-bed and ocean floor shall be carried out in accordance with international law, including the Charter, in the interest of maintaining international peace and security and for promoting international co-operation and understanding; (c) the United Nations should provide direction and purpose to international and ~~intergovernmental~~ activities with regard to the sea-bed and ocean floor and the subsoil (India, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting). This suggestion was supported by another Member which held that the adoption of such a declaration could provide a meaningful framework for the orderly study of the exploration and exploitation of the sea-bed and the ocean floor. The different principles to be embodied in the declaration should be explored thoroughly - they should be simple and precise giving no room for rigidity or ambiguity and at the same time they should not create unnecessary difficulties (United Arab Republic, Ad Hoc Committee, 8th meeting). Another Member stated that it was interested in the idea of a declaration which would include as many principles as possible that might be enumerated on the basis of general agreement. It endorsed the significance of certain basic principles: (a) that the concept of national sovereignty is not applicable to the area; (b) that the Principles and Purposes of the Charter should apply to the exploitation of its resources;

/...

(c) that the exploitation of the resources should be strictly for peaceful purposes and no military bases should be established; (d) that the exploitation should be in the interests of mankind as a whole keeping in view the needs of developing countries (Pakistan, Ad Hoc Committee, 8th meeting).

One Member stated that it was in favour of the adoption of a binding declaration which would bar the ocean floor to military purposes (Czechoslovakia, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting).

It was suggested that the General Assembly should express its support in principle for the prohibition of the use for military purposes of the sea-bed beyond the limits of national jurisdiction (USSR, Ad Hoc Committee, 3rd meeting). Support for this suggestion was expressed (Poland, Ad Hoc Committee, 6th meeting; United Arab Republic, Ad Hoc Committee, 8th meeting) and it was stated that a partial test ban prohibiting nuclear testing under water gave the suggestion considerable weight as a further step towards general and complete disarmament (United Arab Republic, Ad Hoc Committee, 8th meeting).

IV. Questions relating to the establishment of a legal régime

The need for a study of the legal status of the sea-bed and the ocean floor beyond the limits of national jurisdiction, and the subsoil thereof, was widely recognized. Further knowledge of the area was necessary, as well as a careful study of the legal principles involved. This concerned not only the definition of the area, i.e. the limits of national jurisdiction (see section II), but also the status of the sea-bed beyond those limits.

A number of Members emphasized the need for care, in particular, in formulating the principles and/or regulations which would be involved in creating an international régime for the area. It was considered that to attempt such a formulation at that stage might be premature and should not be done hastily (Argentina, First Committee, 1543rd meeting; Australia, First Committee, 1529th meeting; Bulgaria, First Committee, 1529th meeting; Canada, First Committee, 1529th meeting; Ceylon, First Committee, 1526th meeting; Iceland, First Committee, 1528th meeting; Italy, First Committee, 1528th meeting, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting; Sweden, First Committee, 1527th meeting; USSR, First Committee, 1525th meeting; United Kingdom, First Committee, 1524th meeting; United States, First Committee, 1524th meeting; Yugoslavia, First Committee, 1529th meeting): the establishment of a legal system to govern the exploitation of resources would require a thorough re-examination and undoubtedly revision of existing concepts of international law (Ceylon, First Committee, 1526th meeting); the possibility of internationalizing the resources of the abyssal depths might require new concepts and needed careful and thorough consideration - it was premature to try to decide on how essentially land-based principles should be transposed into under-the-sea rules (Canada, First Committee, 1529th meeting); any undue haste was inadmissible in the preparation of international legal principles; it was too serious a matter and if it was to be done it had to be done well and not in a way which would cause great difficulties because of hasty decisions; in its study the Ad Hoc Committee should above all take into account the existing international legal principles and standards relating to the sea-bed and ocean floor; the formulation of legal rules governing the activities of States with respect to the use of the sea-bed should be based on the existing principles of international law, it should

/...

not restrict the principle of freedom on the high seas and other rights enjoyed by States under the international rules now in force (USSR, First Committee, 1525th meeting, Ad Hoc Committee, 3rd meeting); in view of the complexity of the subject, a progressive development of general standards and principles was suggested; before States could accept contractual obligations more legal studies and scientific and technical assessment would be necessary (United States, First Committee, 1530th meeting, Ad Hoc Committee, 3rd meeting).

A number of Members emphasized in particular that it would be necessary to maintain the principle of non-interference with the freedom of the high seas (Canada, First Committee, 1529th meeting; Finland, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.6; France, First Committee 1526th meeting; Greece, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.7; Japan, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.3; Norway, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1; USSR, Ad Hoc Committee, 3rd meeting; United Kingdom, First Committee, 1524th meeting, Ad Hoc Committee, 6th meeting): the Geneva Convention on the High Seas, it was pointed out, contained the basic principles of freedom of navigation and fishing, freedom to lay submarine cables and pipelines and freedom to fly over the high seas - those must be maintained (Norway, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1); the relation between the future régime of the sea-bed and the existing régime of the high seas would have to be considered (Yugoslavia, First Committee, 1529th meeting); although there appeared to be a distinction between the sea as such and the new field of the ocean floor, nevertheless some existing rules of international law affected the sea-bed and the ocean floor, for example those relating to the laying of cables and those relating to stationary fishing installations; IMCO could usefully take part in the search for an international solution to safeguard the principle of the freedom of the seas (France, First Committee, 1526th meeting); the freedom of the high seas, including the freedom of fisheries on the high seas, had been internationally established for a long time and should be safeguarded (Japan, Ad Hoc Committee, 5th meeting); existing international instruments needed to be taken into account, including the four Geneva Conventions: those involved, as between many Member States, an extensive system of reciprocal recognition of each other's rights, not only in respect of the resources of the sea-bed but in respect also of fisheries and the living resources of the sea (Australia, First Committee, 1529th meeting);

/...

the rights of parties under the Geneva Conventions should be safeguarded; a legal system was needed to regulate the area not covered by those Conventions (Colombia, First Committee, 1528th meeting, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.2). It was stated that the principle of the freedom of the high seas could also be related to the ocean floor, and the prohibition of occupation contained therein would refer also to attempts to subject any part of the ocean floor to national purposes (Finland, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.6); the hope was expressed that the elements of international law requiring the high seas to remain an open theatre should continue to be extended to the soil beneath the high seas (United Republic of Tanzania, First Committee, 1527th meeting).

The relation between the exploitation of the resources of the deep ocean floor and the rights subsisting under the Continental Shelf Convention would also have to be examined (Australia, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting; Guatemala, views of Governments A/AC.135/1/Add.5).

The primary interest of coastal States to off-shore resources, it was stated, should continue to be respected (Argentina, First Committee, 1543rd meeting; Canada, First Committee, 1529th meeting; Greece, views of Governments A/AC.135/1/Add.7; Iceland, views of Governments A/AC.135/1/Add.8, Ad Hoc Committee, 3rd meeting; Saudi Arabia, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.2). The coastal State should, it was stated, have priority where the subsoil lay beyond its national jurisdiction (Saudi Arabia, ~~views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.2).~~

In the absence of generally recognized principles of international law, the study of problems of exploitation of the resources of the deep ocean floor should begin with existing State practice, which showed that exploration permits had already been issued over areas of the ocean floor in widely different geophysical circumstances (Canada, First Committee, 1529th meeting, Ad Hoc Committee, 4th meeting).

On the other hand, some Members stressed the importance of there being no undue delay in deciding on the legal status of the ocean floor underlying the high seas; delay, it was stated, would only increase the complexity of the matter (Liberia, First Committee, 1528th meeting); as long as uncertainty concerning that legal status left the field open for unilateral declarations of appropriation, there was no point in calling for international action with a view to a disciplined

/...

exploration of the ocean floor (Libya, First Committee, 1525th meeting); greater emphasis should therefore be put on the legal arrangements needed to regulate the international use of the resources of the area (Sierra Leone, First Committee, 1528th meeting).

One Member pointed out that opinions differed on the legal status of the area: one view was that for sedentary fisheries and other purposes a State might, by strictly local occupation, acquire sovereignty and property in the surface of the sea-bed provided it did not interfere with the freedom of navigation, and that the subsoil beneath the sea-bed was no man's land which could be acquired by occupation with the same proviso concerning the freedom of the seas; another view was that the non-fishery resources of the high seas outside territorial waters and the sea-bed beyond the continental shelf belonged to the international community and were therefore subject to the jurisdiction and control of the United Nations. The question of legal status therefore required careful study. The Member expressed general agreement that the area was not subject to national appropriation (China, First Committee, 1525th meeting).

One member stated that since existing conventions on the law of the sea did not deal generally with the sea-bed outside certain limits, it would be necessary to reach agreement on the legal status of the ocean bed before much progress could be made (United Kingdom, First Committee, 1524th meeting).

It was pointed out that there was no uniformity in national laws and regulations relating to the exploration of the sea, the sea-bed and the subsoil outside internal waters - in that connexion the issue of a further volume in the legislative series of the law of the sea (as referred to by the Secretary-General in document A/C.1/952) would be useful (India, First Committee, 1530th meeting).

Some Members referred to the two major gaps in available knowledge identified by the Secretary-General (A/C.1/952) in accordance with Economic and Social Council resolution 1112 (XL) - (a) the legal status of the deep sea resources; and (b) ways and means of ensuring that the exploitation of these resources benefit the developing countries, and stated that they would welcome the more comprehensive report (to include study of the legal framework and administrative machinery for the development of resources) suggested by the Secretary-General (India, First Committee, 1530th meeting, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting; Ireland, First Committee,

/...

1525th meeting; Malta, Ad Hoc Committee, 4th meeting; Mexico, First Committee, 1529th meeting, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1).

The holding of a conference on the question was suggested: it might be necessary to have a special conference to spell out in concrete detail and solely for the benefit of and in the interests of mankind the advantages and benefits to be derived from the sea-bed and the oceans (Bolivia, First Committee, 1530th meeting); a conference should eventually be held which would elaborate a convention or protocol or treaty embracing the constituent elements involved in the entire problem (United Republic of Tanzania, First Committee, 1527th meeting); it should be considered whether it would not be necessary to hold a new United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea in the near future to examine the various interrelated problems affecting the deep ocean floor, the continental shelf and the resources of the superjacent waters (Iceland, Ad Hoc Committee, 3rd meeting).

As to the character of the régime to be established, a number of Members expressed the view that in order to ensure that the area was not subject to national appropriation and/or that its resources were utilized for the benefit of all mankind, it should be placed under international control and jurisdiction (Cyprus, First Committee, 1530th meeting; Ghana, First Committee, 1526th meeting; Liberia, First Committee, 1528th meeting; Malta, First Committee, 1516th meeting; Sierra Leone, First Committee, 1528th meeting; Sweden, First Committee, 1527th meeting, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1 and Corr.1; Trinidad and Tobago, First Committee, 1526th meeting): it should be administered by a special agency which should assume jurisdiction as a trustee for all countries and should be given wide powers to regulate, supervise and control all activities on or under the oceans and the ocean floor, including the power to regulate commercial exploitation of the ocean floor (Malta, First Committee, 1516th meeting); the dimensions of the undertaking that could be envisaged after a study of the existing literature on the subject and the objectives envisaged would probably make such an agency necessary - it should not merely be a body to guide sovereign States in the exploration and use of the deep ocean floor but should actually appropriate the area for the peaceful use of mankind (Ghana, First Committee, 1526th meeting); title to the sea-bed and ocean floor beyond the internationally accepted limits of national jurisdictions could possibly vest in the United Nations on behalf of and in trust for all the nations of the world; international control of the resources for the benefit of

mankind was a demanding necessity in the interests of peace and survival (Cyprus, First Committee, 1530th meeting); the proposal to vest control of the deep sea-bottom resources in an international body was timely and worthy of consideration (Finland, First Committee, 1544th meeting); for the resources of the ocean-bed to be used in the interests of mankind as a whole, exploration and exploitation activities would need to be subordinated to an international régime (Sweden, First Committee, 1527th meeting, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1 and Corr.1); the Ad Hoc Committee should study the possibility of recommending the institution of an international agency to regularize exploitation of resources with special reference to the needs of developing countries (Sudan, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1); once the principle was accepted that the resources of the sea-bed and ocean floor should be exploited for the benefit of all countries it would be possible to come closer to the goal - the setting up of a body which, through modern techniques and the development of international co-operation, would be able to exploit the resources of the high seas in a peaceful and organized manner (Libya, First Committee, 1543rd meeting); an international agency which would have agreed functions might be considered (Pakistan, Ad Hoc Committee, 8th meeting); in due time it might be agreed that the creation of a new agency would be the best course to follow (United Arab Republic, First Committee, 1528th meeting); the possibility of establishing an international régime for the sea-bed and ocean floor beyond the limits of national jurisdiction should be examined - if established, such a legal régime would be for the common benefit and would be essential for orderly exploitation of resources and for the benefit of all, including landlocked and developing countries (Thailand, Ad Hoc Committee, 6th meeting).

One Member, in submitting an outline of an international system of control over the economic exploitation of the sea-bed and ocean floor (see section VII) did so on the assumption that the exploitation of the resources in the interests of mankind, including aid to developing countries, could only be assured by exploitation under the supervision of the United Nations as the agent of the community of nations; pending the preparation of a convention on the subject, the General Assembly might state the principle of United Nations supervision over exploitation of the natural resources of the ocean-bed (Netherlands, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1).

/...

Some Members stressed the aspect of international co-operation and of the regulation of the activities of Member States: to ensure full and effective use of resources, there had to be a central authority which would give direction and purpose to the activities of Member States in the area; the United Nations should provide the necessary direction and purpose to international and intergovernmental activity in the area (India, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting); the United Nations, more than any other existing body, had a basic responsibility in regulating activities in the area and ensuring that the resources would be brought within the province of international co-operation for human betterment (Jamaica, First Committee, 1529th meeting); it was urgent that the United Nations undertake action to ensure that the wealth from the subsoil of the oceans be used for the benefit of mankind and primarily for the benefit of developing countries (Chile, First Committee, 1526th meeting); it was necessary to recognize the need and urgency of setting up international rules that would govern the utilization and exploitation of the sea-bed and ocean floor before they became bones of contention between countries possessing advanced techniques and means which would establish a fait accompli and endanger peace and security in the world, but the agreement of the great Powers which had the means of controlling the application of those principles was necessary (Tunisia, First Committee, 1529th meeting); there were already some generally recognized rules and principles governing the activities of States in that field, although those did not answer all the complicated legal questions posed by the progress made in oceanography and technology; in formulating legal questions requiring further study, the Ad Hoc Committee should proceed from the fact that the formulation of legal rules governing the activities of States with respect to the use of the sea-bed should be based on existing principles of international law and should not restrict rights enjoyed by States under the international rules now in force (USSR, Ad Hoc Committee, 3rd meeting); the Ad Hoc Committee might recommend the early development of general principles to govern the activities of States and their nationals in the exploration and use of the ocean floor so as to maintain international peace and security and promote international co-operation, scientific knowledge and economic development (United States, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1, Ad Hoc Committee, 3rd meeting); first it was necessary to prohibit the area for military, particularly nuclear, purposes and then to define

/...

the principles and criteria for peaceful international co-operation and their application (Romania, Ad Hoc Committee, 6th meeting); the Ad Hoc Committee should study concrete steps to promote international co-operation and co-ordination in the exploration and exploitation of the area and the feasibility of drafting comprehensive international instruments governing such activities of exploration and exploitation (China, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1); an attempt to provide a legal framework for future action by Governments could be considered (Italy, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting).

One Member suggested that beyond the 200-metre depth the ocean floor and its subsoil should remain res nullius. In that event, it did not consider it necessary to establish international jurisdiction over the area but the Ad Hoc Committee could take up the question of what advantage there would be in giving consideration to the establishment of an international body to supervise and oversee activities on the ocean floor and make certain they did not violate such rules as were adopted at the international level (Madagascar, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1).

As to the method of the establishing a legal régime for the area, a number of countries suggested that that should be done by means of an international treaty or convention: the agency to administer the oceans and the ocean floor beyond the limits of national jurisdiction should be established by a treaty which would define the outer limits of the continental shelf subject to national jurisdiction, and establish generally acceptable principles with regard to the use of the deep seas and of the ocean floor (Malta, First Committee, 1516th meeting); the result of the work of the committee, which it was proposed should be established, could lead to the adoption of an international convention defining the principles to regulate the exploration and exploitation of the resources of the area and, if necessary, setting up an appropriate international régime to regulate such exploration and exploitation (Chile, First Committee, 1526th meeting); the Legal Working Group should co-operate with the Legal Working Group of the IOC with the aim of preparing a draft convention on international rules governing exploration and exploitation of the mineral resources underlying the high seas (Czechoslovakia, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting); the use of the sea-bed and the ocean floor and the subsoil underlying the high seas should be effected by means of an international convention (Dahomey, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1); a more

/...

comprehensive and specific legal system than the existing one was required, so that a special convention on the exploitation of the ocean floor should be elaborated (Finland, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.6); the best way to safeguard the interests of States would be to adopt a treaty declaring the sea-bed and ocean floor beyond the limits of national jurisdiction and/or continental shelf a nuclear and military free zone under international control and jurisdiction and to constitute an international consortium for exploiting its resources (Liberia, First Committee, 1528th meeting); if the limitation of the continental shelf to a depth of 200 metres was imposed the Ad Hoc Committee should consider the advisability of concluding international conventions under the auspices of the United Nations fixing the limits within which the ocean floor and subsoil could be used by all, without appropriation of any kind (Madagascar, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1); it would be desirable for the whole system of control, which was proposed (see above) to be laid down in a world-wide convention, which could be drafted by a special committee of appropriate composition (Netherlands, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1); the task should culminate in the approval of a treaty or convention on the subject (Mexico, First Committee, 1529th meeting).

Certain basic principles were suggested for incorporation in a treaty establishing an international régime: (1) the area was not subject to national appropriation (see section V); (2) it should be reserved exclusively for peaceful purposes (see section VI); (3) scientific research not directly connected with defence should be freely permissible and its results available to all (see section IX); (4) the resources of the area should be exploited primarily in the interests of mankind, with particular regard to the needs of poor countries (see section VII); (5) exploration and exploitation should be conducted in a manner consistent with the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter and in a manner not causing unnecessary obstruction of the high seas or serious impairment of the marine environment (see above, and section VIII) (Malta, First Committee, 1516th meeting). A number of Members expressed agreement with some or all of these principles (see relevant sections).

Specific suggestions were made that the Ad Hoc Committee consider certain of these principles following guidelines in existing international instruments: in regard to the principle of reservation for peaceful use - articles I, V, VII and X of the Antarctica Treaty of 1 December 1959 (Belgium, views of Governments,

/...

A/AC.135/1), and article IV of the Treaty on Outer Space (Denmark, views of Governments, A/AC.135.1/Add.2); the principle that the area was not subject to national sovereignty and that exploration and use should be free to all - relevant articles of the Convention on the High Seas and the Treaty on Outer Space (Denmark, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.2); the principle of freedom of scientific research - article 5, No. 8, of the Convention on the Continental Shelf, article 2 of the Antarctica Treaty and article 1, paragraph 2 of the Treaty on Outer Space (Norway, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1).

Other principles which it was suggested should be incorporated were: that exploration and exploitation should be conducted with due regard to corresponding interests of other States (cf. article IX of the Treaty on Outer Space) and that States should inform the Secretary-General as well as the public and international scientific community as far as practicable of any activities in the area and of their nature (cf. article XI of the Treaty on Outer Space) (Denmark, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.2).

At the current stage of the development of the law relating to the deep ocean bed, it was stated, such principles as peaceful usage, demilitarization, benefit sharing and abdication of sovereignty and of sovereign rights would be new principles requiring careful elaboration and development (Canada, First Committee, 1529th meeting).

The legal principles applicable to the sea-bed of closed seas would probably, it was stated, not be the same as those applying to the sea-bed of open seas and the oceans (France, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.6); it could be useful, it was stated, to study the differences in the scope of the resolution as applied to those different areas (Italy, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.2, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting).

Special rules, it was suggested, would need to be drafted on specific problems, for example on responsibility (Belgium, Ad Hoc Committee, 5th meeting).

In elaborating a new régime to govern the economic development of the ocean bed, it would be necessary to take into consideration the marine environment and to study anew the question of national jurisdiction over the superjacent waters in the light of the new situation (Iceland, First Committee, 1543rd meeting, Ad Hoc Committee, 3rd meeting). The problems of the legal status of the water mass between the surface of the high seas and the sea-bed would have to be studied (Yugoslavia, First Committee, 1529th meeting).

/...

The question of the possible conflict of interest between the traditional maritime activities, such as shipping and fishing, and exploration activities should, it was suggested, be carefully examined by the Ad Hoc Committee (Norway, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1). Exploitation of the resources of the sea-bed should not, it was stated, interfere with the traditional uses of the sea for navigation, communications, fishing or meteorological needs but should on the contrary encourage such uses (Bulgaria, First Committee, 1529th meeting); it should not interfere with maritime traffic and ocean fishing, which were secured by the principle of freedom of the high seas (Finland, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.6; Norway, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1); the principle of non-interference with the freedom of the high seas should be maintained subject only to the strict requirements essential to effective exploitation (Canada, First Committee, 1529th meeting); there was a need, it was felt, for safety regulations governing sea-bed research and exploration or these new activities might encroach on the traditional activities of the sea such as navigation and fishing (France, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.6); there were also questions connected with the protection of transoceanic telegraph and telephone cables, and the establishment of artificial islands or similar installations on or above the deep ocean floor (Norway, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1).

It was stated that there was also the problem of agreeing on principles to avoid disturbances of the biological, chemical and physical balances of the seas, to prevent pollution, and to help to conserve the living resources of the sea (Iceland, First Committee, 1528th meeting, Ad Hoc Committee, 3rd meeting; United States, First Committee, 1524th meeting, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1); such principles might also establish guidelines relevant to the exploitation of mineral resources (United States, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1); the problem of protection of the areas being exploited would also have to be considered; articles 24 and 25 of the Geneva Convention on the High Seas concerning the prevention of pollution of the seas were apparently too general in many respects (Finland, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.6); the safety aspects and aspects connected with the pollution of the sea, the air and the subsoil itself would need to be carefully studied in formulating any régime for the sea-bed - guidelines might be found in safety codes promulgated in connexion with the exploitation of national continental shelves - one such code was forwarded for information (Norway, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1 and Add.1) (see also section VIII).

It was widely emphasized that the resources of the area should be exploited for the benefit of all countries, including developing and land-locked countries. Attention was called to the special situation of land-locked countries (Afghanistan, First Committee, 1528th meeting; Austria, Ad Hoc Committee, 6th meeting; Czechoslovakia, First Committee, 1544th meeting; Hungary, First Committee, 1544th meeting; Nepal, 1639th plenary meeting; Paraguay, 1639th plenary meeting). Land-locked countries, it was stated, should have, equally with other countries, rights of access to, and participation in, international efforts to exploit the resources of the area; that was a logical consequence of the universally accepted right of land-locked countries to free access to the sea (Afghanistan, First Committee, 1528th meeting); they should be ensured an appropriate share of the benefits to be derived from exploitation (Austria, Ad Hoc Committee, 6th meeting).

V. Question of the avoidance of national claims and activities which might prejudice the international character of the area

A number of Members expressed themselves in agreement with the preinciple that the sea-bed and the ocean floor and their subsoil beyond the limits of present national jurisdiction should remain international in character and not be subject to national sovereignty or national appropriation of any kind.

Some Members considered that the General Assembly should state this principle in a declaration of principles or in a resolution (Chile, First Committee, 1526th meeting; Cyprus, First Committee, 1530th meeting; Ghana, First Committee, 1526th meeting; India, First Committee, 1530th meeting, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting; Libya, First Committee, 1525th meeting; Malta, First Committee, 1516th meeting, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1; Mexico, First Committee, 1529th meeting; Pakistan, Ad Hoc Committee, 8th meeting; Sweden, First Committee, 1527th meeting; Trinidad and Tobago, First Committee, 1526th meeting; United Republic of Tanzania, First Committee, 1527th meeting).

It was suggested that this principle followed from the accepted principles of the freedom of the high seas (Finland, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.6), and that on those grounds the Assembly might adopt a resolution ruling out occupation of any part of the ocean floor (Netherlands, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1). It was proposed that that principle should be incorporated in (Malta, First Committee, 1516th meeting) or its establishment considered in the formulation of (Denmark, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.2) an international régime. It was suggested that the Assembly should seriously consider forthwith the possibility of declaring its intention to place the ocean bed under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United Nations (Turkey, First Committee, 1528th meeting).

A number of Members considered or hoped that the present situation in regard to claims of sovereignty over the sea-bed and ocean floor and the subsoil beyond the limits of present national jurisdiction and the exploitation of their resources, in particular by highly developed countries, should be frozen (Afghanistan, First Committee, 1528th meeting; Cyprus, First Committee, 1530th meeting; India, First Committee, 1530th meeting; Indonesia, First Committee, 1544th meeting; Malta, First Committee, 1516th meeting; Mexico, First Committee, 1529th meeting;

/...

Somalia, First Committee, 1525th meeting; Sweden, First Committee, 1527th meeting; Thailand, First Committee, 1542nd meeting; Trinidad and Tobago, First Committee, 1526th meeting; United Arab Republic, First Committee, 1528th meeting; United Republic of Tanzania, First Committee, 1527th meeting).

It was proposed that the General Assembly should appeal to Member States to refrain from extending their claims to sovereignty over the area (Malta, First Committee, 1516th meeting, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1), or from taking measures to appropriate the ocean floor or its resources and from military activities (Sweden, First Committee, 1527th meeting) or that the Assembly should adopt a resolution containing provisions to ensure that a freeze should be established de facto and de jure on the prevailing situation regarding the resources of the area (Mexico, First Committee, 1529th meeting).

Certain suggestions were made as to the duration of the proposed "freeze". It was suggested that claims should be frozen until a generally acceptable definition was reached of the submarine areas over which the coastal State might exercise sovereign rights (Malta, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1), pending a generally accepted status for the ocean floor (Afghanistan, First Committee, 1528th meeting), pending agreement on the definition of the sea-bed and the ocean floor and their utilization beyond the continental shelf (United Arab Republic, First Committee, 1528th meeting) until the treaty culminating the work of the United Nations in regard to the area entered into force (Mexico, First Committee, 1529th meeting), until general agreement was reached on the distribution of benefits from exploitation activities (Somalia, First Committee, 1525th meeting) or pending United Nations deliberations on the subject (Sweden, First Committee, 1527th meeting).

It was suggested further that efforts should be made forthwith to ensure that there were no attempts to appropriate the lands under the high seas and that the deep seas and ocean floor remained the legacy of all human beings (United States, Ad Hoc Committee, 3rd meeting). A prohibition of the sea-bed for any military undertaking, it was suggested, would lessen the temptation of extending national jurisdiction over the area; the Ad Hoc Committee should consider appropriate measures aimed at freezing the present situation to avoid national claims and activities - except scientific ones - on the ocean bed until the Committee's work

/...

was successfully completed (Sweden, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1). It was also proposed that the Ad Hoc Committee should study the possibility of the recommendation of measures (including a declaration or treaty) designed to prevent national appropriation of hitherto unclaimed areas of the sea-bed and ocean floor and the subsoil by governmental acts declaring possession or jurisdiction (Sudan, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1). However, the Ad Hoc Committee's attention was drawn to the possibility that the proposed arrangement might prompt some States arbitrarily to extend their territorial waters zone (Greece, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.7). To assist the Ad Hoc Committee, it was suggested that a legal document should be prepared by the Secretariat listing the extent and nature of claims of States to jurisdiction over the sea-bed and ocean floor in the light of national legislation, authoritative pronouncements of Governments and opinions of recognized legal experts (Malta, Ad Hoc Committee, 4th meeting).

One Member stated that it could not accept that some other country could interpret as a "claim" something which its Constitution called a sovereign right with respect to the maritime areas belonging to it; it could even less accept that what other countries called "claims of sovereignty linked to the sea-bed and the ocean floor" might in some capricious fashion be "frozen" for an indefinite period in the future (Honduras, First Committee, 1529th meeting). This Member and others holding similar views emphasized that the areas under consideration by the United Nations were those lying outside the actual jurisdictions proclaimed and maintained by individual States (see under section II).

It was also stated that to "freeze" the present situation would be to ask nations to abide by principles of delimitation of the area which were in the stage of evolution and likely to be transformed through the further deliberations of the Ad Hoc Committee (Iceland, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.8, Ad Hoc Committee, 3rd meeting).

VI. Questions relating to the reservation of the area for exclusively peaceful purposes

A considerable number of Members specified their support of the principle that the sea-bed and the ocean floor beyond the limits of present national jurisdiction should be used exclusively for peaceful purposes and endorsed the view that the use of the ocean bed for military ends should be prevented.

Some Members considered that that principle should be stated by the General Assembly in a declaration of principles or in a resolution.^{1/} (Chile, First Committee, 1526th meeting; Cyprus, First Committee, 1530th meeting; Ghana, First Committee, 1526th meeting; India, First Committee, 1530th meeting, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting; Malta, First Committee, 1516th meeting; Pakistan, Ad Hoc Committee, 8th meeting; Somalia, First Committee, 1525th meeting, Sweden, First Committee, 1527th and 1542nd meetings, Trinidad and Tobago, First Committee, 1526th meeting; United Arab Republic, First Committee, 1528th meeting; United Republic of Tanzania, First Committee, 1527th meeting). It was suggested that if agreement could not be reached on a series of regulating principles, it would be helpful to state in a resolution that one of the aims towards which the future work of the Assembly should be directed was the reservation of the area exclusively for peaceful purposes (Mexico, First Committee, 1529th meeting).

Another formulation was suggested in the Ad Hoc Committee: that the General Assembly should express its support in principle for the prohibition of the use for military purposes of the sea-bed beyond the limits of national jurisdiction (USSR, Ad Hoc Committee, 3rd meeting). Support was expressed for this suggestion (Poland, Ad Hoc Committee, 6th meeting; United Arab Republic, Ad Hoc Committee, 8th meeting). One Member supported the idea of elaborating a binding declaration which would bar the ocean floor to military purposes (Czechoslovakia, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting).

^{1/} See also references below to the body or bodies which should study such action.

It was also suggested that the report of the Ad Hoc Committee to the Assembly's twenty-third session might include a recommendation for the conclusion of an international convention embodying the principle of exclusive reservation for peaceful purposes of the sea-bed and ocean floor (Iceland, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.8).

The establishment of this principle in the formulation of an international régime for the area (see section IV) or in a treaty to govern its use was also emphasized (Denmark, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.2; Finland, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.6; Liberia, First Committee, 1528th meeting; Malta, First Committee, 1516th meeting; United Arab Republic, First Committee, 1528th meeting).

Many Members referred to the experience gained in connexion with the Declaration and the Treaty on Outer Space as well as the Antarctica Treaty of 1959 as offering valuable precedents (Argentina, First Committee, 1543rd meeting; Belgium, First Committee, 1529th meeting; views of Governments A/AC.135/1; Chile, First Committee, 1526th meeting; Denmark, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.2; Finland, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.6; Ghana, First Committee, 1526th meeting; Iceland, Ad Hoc Committee, 3rd meeting; India, First Committee, 1530th meeting, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting; Japan, Ad Hoc Committee, 5th meeting; Norway, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1; Romania, Ad Hoc Committee, 6th meeting; Somalia, First Committee, 1525th meeting; United Arab Republic, First Committee, 1528th meeting).

Some of these Members cited specific clauses of these treaties as offering useful guidance: article 4 of the Treaty on Outer Space (Denmark, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.2; Norway, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1); articles I (affirmation of principle), V (nuclear explosions), VII (supervision) and X (contrary activities) of the Antarctica Treaty (Belgium, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1).

Some Members, however, expressed doubts concerning the similarity of the problems of those areas to those involved (Italy, First Committee, 1528th meeting; Liberia, First Committee, 1528th meeting).

It was emphasized that the arms control and security aspects of the problem required thorough consideration (Australia, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting; Belgium,

/...

First Committee, 1529th meeting; France, First Committee, 1526th meeting; Netherlands, First Committee, 1525th meeting; Yugoslavia, First Committee, 1529th meeting).

It was said that it was necessary to seek effective arms control measures as part of the evolving law of the deep ocean floor; their development, it was suggested, should come under the mandate of a proposed Committee on the Oceans (United States, First Committee, 1524th meeting). It was stated that a code of law would have to be drawn up to govern the peaceful use of the ocean deeps (USSR, Ad Hoc Committee, 3rd meeting), and that the establishment of a legal régime for the area should in the end result in having the area and its resources reserved exclusively for peaceful purposes (Yugoslavia, First Committee, 1529th meeting).

It was suggested that it would be necessary to clarify and consider the implications of the terms "peaceful use" as used in General Assembly resolution 2340 (XXII) (Canada, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1; Italy, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.2). In studying the implications for international peace and security of the peaceful use of the deep ocean floor, the Ad Hoc Committee, it was suggested, should consider: (1) the relationship of the deep ocean floor to the marine environment as a whole and to the present political and security situation; and (2) the principles which might best assure that exploration and use of the deep ocean floor will be conducted in accordance with the principles and purposes of the Charter and will help maintain international peace and security (United States, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1).

It was suggested that the questions involved might be considered in:

(1) A standing committee, which some Members were in favour of establishing at the twenty-second session of the Assembly (Chile, First Committee, 1526th meeting; Malta, First Committee, 1516th meeting; Netherlands, First Committee, 1525th meeting; United Kingdom, First Committee, 1524th meeting; United States, First Committee, 1524th meeting);

(2) The Ad Hoc Committee, after this was established (Japan, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.3; Madagascar, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1; Malta, Ad Hoc Committee, 4th meeting; Norway, Ad Hoc Committee, 6th meeting; Sudan, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1; USSR, Ad Hoc Committee, 6th meeting; United Republic of Tanzania, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting; United States, First Committee, 1542nd meeting, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1);

/...

(3) The Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (Australia, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting; Italy, First Committee, 1528th meeting, Ad Hoc Committees, 7th meeting; Hungary, First Committee, 1544th meeting; Netherlands, First Committee, 1525th meeting, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1; Poland, Ad Hoc Committee, 6th meeting; United Kingdom, First Committee, 1524th meeting; USSR, Ad Hoc Committee, 3rd meeting).

Some Members suggested that both the ENDC and the proposed standing committee or the Ad Hoc Committee should be concerned. It was suggested that the Committee on the Oceans should co-operate with the ENDC (United States, First Committee, 1524th meeting); that following preliminary discussion of arms control problems in the proposed committee, there would be a useful role for the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament to play in studying the disarmament implications (United Kingdom, First Committee, 1524th meeting); that the Ad Hoc Committee might draw upon the valuable experience and work of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (Norway, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1).

The view was also expressed that the question of the peaceful use of the area had to be considered in the context of the whole problem of disarmament (France, First Committee, 1526th meeting; Australia, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting; Italy, First Committee, 1528th meeting, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting; United Kingdom, First Committee, 1524th meeting). It was stated that disarmament, primarily nuclear disarmament, would once and for all remove the danger of the ocean floor and the sea-bed being used for military purposes (USSR, First Committee, 1525th meeting, Ad Hoc Committee, 3rd meeting). It was suggested, however, that partial measures might be considered where those seemed to offer a possibility of progress (Austria, Ad Hoc Committee, 6th meeting; Australia, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting).

Some Members emphasized that the military aspects of the question needed to be dealt with urgently (Austria, Ad Hoc Committee, 6th meeting; Chile, First Committee, 1526th meeting; Malta, First Committee, 1515th meeting; Sweden, First Committee, 1527th meeting).

Further studies to assist the Ad Hoc Committee in considering the question were suggested: a document on the present and clearly foreseeable technology for the military exploitation of the area (Malta, Ad Hoc Committee, 4th meeting); a study

/...

of the most suitable and effective means of ensuring that the sea-bed and subsoil underlying the high seas are used exclusively for peaceful purposes, and that the installation of nuclear weapons in them is expressly prohibited (Mexico, First Committee, 1529th meeting; views of Governments, A/AC.135/1); a study of the work of the ENDC with regard to the area (Norway, Ad Hoc Committee, 6th meeting).

It was also suggested that the Ad Hoc Committee should take up the question of the movement of submarines at increasingly great depths and measures for supervising their temporary stationing (Madagascar, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1) and that it should study the possibility of recommending ways and means by which the United Nations can forestall the development of international tension resulting from the appropriation of the area for military purposes (Sudan, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1). It was stated that the installation of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction and the establishment of military bases should be prohibited; the question as to whether military manoeuvres and test explosions should be allowed should be thoroughly studied (Norway, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1). The possible installation of nuclear weapons on the bed of the sea and other uses of the ocean floor for warlike purposes, it was held, warranted study and solution by the General Assembly; there was a need for an express prohibition on the use of the sea-bed and ocean floor for warlike purposes or for the stationing of weapons of mass destruction (Ecuador, First Committee, 1528th meeting). It was also stated that researches into the nature of the work of other United Nations bodies should enable the Committee to determine whether States or groups of States had been exercising military or quasi-military activities in that region, and to recommend to the General Assembly that any activity of a military character should be banished from the area and to States that they retreat from any propensity for such military exercises (United Republic of Tanzania, Ad Hoc Committee 7th meeting).

VII. Questions relating to the development of the resources
of the area for the benefit of mankind

The majority of Members emphasized that the resources of the area should be the common heritage of mankind and developed for the benefit of all. A number of them considered that the General Assembly should state that as a principle, either in the form of a declaration or in a resolution (Chile, First Committee, 1526th meeting; Cyprus, First Committee, 1530th meeting; Ghana, First Committee, 1526th meeting; India, First Committee, 1530th meeting, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting; Malta, First Committee, 1516th meeting; Pakistan, Ad Hoc Committee, 8th meeting; Sweden, First Committee, 1528th meeting; Trinidad and Tobago, First Committee, 1526th meeting; United Republic of Tanzania, First Committee, 1527th meeting).

A number of Members also considered that the resources should be developed primarily for the benefit of poorer countries. Some of them suggested that that also should be included in whatever declaration or statement was made by the General Assembly (Chile, First Committee, 1526th meeting; India, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting; Malta, First Committee, 1516th meeting; Pakistan, Ad Hoc Committee, 8th meeting; Sweden, First Committee, 1527th and 1542nd meetings).

The importance of this objective was also stressed: the Assembly should state that the needs of poor countries, representing that part of mankind which is most in need of assistance, should receive preferential consideration in the event of financial benefits being derived from the exploitation of the sea-bed and ocean floor for commercial purposes (Malta, First Committee, 1516th meeting); it was urgent that the United Nations undertake action to ensure that the wealth from the subsoil of the ocean be used for all mankind or primarily for the benefit of the developing countries - as UNCTAD had done with regard to the rules of international trade, the Ad Hoc Committee might formulate new principles with respect to the exploitation of the resources of the sea (Chile, First Committee, 1526th meeting, Ad Hoc Committee, 8th meeting); as important as the possible adoption of a legal system to govern the exploitation of the resources would be the allocation of the profits from such operations to strengthening the economies of developing countries (Colombia, First Committee, 1528th meeting, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.2); among the main objectives of the Committee which it was proposed should be established would be to ensure the international character of the resources involved and their equitable

/...

distribution among all countries, but with due regard to the compelling needs for special assistance to the developing countries (Cyprus, First Committee, 1530th meeting); the resources to be derived from exploitation should contribute above all to the campaign against under-development (Dahomey, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1); the Ad Hoc Committee should consider the institution of an international agency to regularize exploitation of resources with special reference to the needs of developing countries (Sudan, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1); it seemed reasonable to believe that when new natural resources were discovered a greater share might be allotted to cover the needs of developing countries than from a mere reallocation of resources already in use (Finland, First Committee, 1544th meeting).

One Member appealed to the technically advanced countries to bear in mind their special responsibilities in furthering the cause of development by undertaking to make the fruits of any exploitation available to all (Indonesia, First Committee, 1544th meeting).

An international convention, it was suggested, could fix the percentage of income to be paid into a joint fund to promote the development of poor countries unable to exploit the resources of the ocean floor themselves (Madagascar, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1).

It was suggested that a Secretariat study should include an examination of the various alternatives open to the international community for ensuring that land-locked and poor countries obtain an appropriate share of the benefits that might accrue from the exploitation of on-bottom and sub-bottom resources of the sea-bed, including the geophysical slope, beyond present national jurisdiction (Malta, Ad Hoc Committee, 4th meeting).

It was suggested also that the funds from the exploitation of the resources of the area might assist the finances of the United Nations (Cyprus, First Committee, 1530th meeting; United Arab Republic, First Committee, 1528th meeting).

It would be important, one Member considered, for the Ad Hoc Committee to define, although in a tentative way, what was the meaning of the expression "the interest of mankind" used in resolution 2340 (XXII) in connexion with economic exploitation (Italy, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.2).

A number of Members considered that, in order to ensure that the resources should be developed in the interests of mankind as a whole and not in the interests

/...

of technologically advanced countries, they should be placed under international control and jurisdiction (see section IV).

It was suggested that they might be administered by an international agency on behalf of the world community (Ghana, First Committee, 1526th meeting; Liberia, First Committee, 1528th meeting; Libya, First Committee, 1543rd meeting; Malta, First Committee, 1516th meeting; Sudan, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1), that the establishment of such an agency might be considered (Pakistan, Ad Hoc Committee, 8th meeting; Sweden, First Committee, 1527th meeting; United Arab Republic, First Committee, 1528th meeting) or that the establishment of a new special administrative organization should be carefully considered (Finland, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.6).

An international régime, it was stated, could also establish an orderly system for the exploitation of the sea-bed in the most economic way and create guarantees against the uses of the resources in a manner inconsistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations or in a manner causing unnecessary obstruction or pollution of the oceans (Sweden, First Committee, 1527th meeting, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1 and Corr.1).

It was suggested that the resources might be developed collectively (Nigeria, First Committee, 1526th meeting), or that there should be collective action in the control, operation and disposal of the natural resources and distribution of the wealth to be derived therefrom; ~~therefore an international consortium should be~~ instituted as machinery for that purpose (Liberia, First Committee, 1528th meeting).

Development by a system of leases or licences was suggested. The powers of the special agency which it was proposed should be created to administer the area should, it was suggested, include the power to regulate the commercial exploitation of the ocean floor, granting exploration rights and leases in respect of mineral, petroleum and other resources in the area within its jurisdiction. After deduction of administrative and other legitimate expenses, including support to oceanographic research, revenue should be used to further either directly or through the United Nations Development Programme the development of poor countries (Malta, First Committee, 1516th meeting).

Judging from the experience in the North Sea exploitations, a system of licensing would be desirable; although in principle the United Nations should be the

/...

main beneficiary, the nearest coastal State should also benefit to a limited extent (Iceland, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.8, Ad Hoc Committee, 3rd meeting).

One Member explained that in regard to the exploitation of the resources of its continental shelf, its legislation provided for a system of exploitation licences, which included area fees and royalties, the undertaking by the licensee of a strict working programme with progressive surrender of the area granted, as well as separate licences regarding installations. It considered it premature to make suggestions regarding the system to be applied to the granting of rights of exploitation in the subsoil of the ocean floor beyond the limits of present national jurisdiction, but did not consider that a solution could be found in an unlimited right of annexation by national States and still less by public and private companies (Norway, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1).

An outline of an international system of control for the exploitation of the natural resources of the ocean floor beyond the continental shelf was submitted by one Member on the assumption that the uses of these resources in the interests of mankind could only be assured by exploitation under the supervision of the United Nations as the agent of the community. The outline provided for a double-concession system for exploitation in the area concerned, under which the United Nations would give concessions to States which would act as a sort of administering authority in respect of any exploitation concession they might grant to enterprises; the United Nations share of the Government take would be for aid to developing countries. Provision was made, inter alia, for machinery for United Nations supervision and control, certain priorities or special rights to coastal States, procedures for the settlement of disputes, etc. (Netherlands, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1).

The advantages and disadvantages of the different means of exploiting the resources should be examined, it was suggested. Among these, the method of concessions should be considered, not necessarily to one State or one company, but also the possibility of granting concessions to groups of States, including land-locked States and developing countries whose economies were sufficiently advanced (Belgium, Ad Hoc Committee, 5th meeting).

Attempts should be made, it was suggested, to make the exploitation profitable for those undertaking it, e.g., by an international concession system where the licensee might give part of the profit to the United Nations (Finland, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.6).

It was recognized that in exploiting the resources of the area, care must be taken to ensure that the traditional uses of the high seas, for example, for fishing and communications were not impaired, and it was suggested that safety measures would be required in this connexion (see section IV); measures would need to be taken in particular to combat the dangers of pollution (see section VIII). Any methods of exploiting the geophysical resources of the area which might cause harm to marine flora or fauna must, it was stated, be avoided (Greece, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.7).

The primary interest of coastal States in off-shore resources should, it was stated by certain Members, be taken into account (Argentina, First Committee, 1543rd meeting; Canada, First Committee, 1529th meeting; Iceland, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.8, Ad Hoc Committee, 3rd meeting; Greece, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.7; Saudi Arabia, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.2). This was also provided for in the international concession system suggested by one Member (Netherlands, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1). Further, it was stated that exploitation of the potential resources of the sea-bed and the ocean floor should not jeopardize the interests of the coastal State, threaten its security or infringe upon its right to take necessary measures to safeguard its sovereignty (Saudi Arabia, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.2).

It was also suggested that to avoid conflict between States intending to exploit the same geographical area, consideration should be given to devising a system giving priority to a State which had notified the Secretary-General of intended activity in a clearly defined geographical area and which started carrying out that activity within a certain time-limit, as long as it effectively continued exploiting the area in question. It might be found appropriate to lay down that exploitation activities in the area might only be undertaken by States, by inter-governmental organizations or by private individuals or companies acting under the authority of a State (Denmark, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.2).

Care should be taken, it was stated by some Members, not to delay or impede the exploration of resources, which would require large capital investments and reasonable profit and security to those undertaking such activities (Argentina, First Committee, 1543rd meeting; Belgium, First Committee, 1529th meeting, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1; Canada, First Committee, 1529th meeting; Finland, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.6; Japan, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.3; United

Kingdom, First Committee, 1524th meeting): Principles would have to be examined which were designed to pay due regard to the necessity of stimulating technological investigation of the marine areas so as to make their wealth fully realizable as soon as possible (Canada, Ad Hoc Committee, 4th meeting); it should also be borne in mind particularly that the legal system to be set up should not hinder the possibility of speedy progress, to which not only extremely advanced techniques but also the investment of immense amounts of capital had to be applied (Argentina, First Committee, 1543rd meeting); if applied strictly, the use of resources in the interest of mankind might delay such use indefinitely; prospecting would be very costly and might not be undertaken unless there was some expectation of profit - it should therefore either be financed by the United Nations or a reasonable profit should be allowed to enterprises undertaking prospecting or exploitation in which case only excess profits would be applied for the benefit of mankind; the second alternative would be less costly to the United Nations (Belgium, First Committee, 1529th meeting, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1); the question would have to be examined of paying due regard on the one hand to the possible occurrence of large capital involvements on the part of those countries, agencies or instrumentalities which might actually carry out mining explorations or operations and to the consequent need for having a secure basis for planning and maintaining such activities and on the other hand to the interests of countries likely to remain unable for some time to take an active part in such development activities (Canada, First Committee, 1529th meeting, Ad Hoc Committee, 4th meeting); discussions in the Ad Hoc Committee should not lead to discouraging or delaying exploration of the sea-bed and ocean floor and the exploitation of their resources by States, including those which have advanced marine technology (Japan, views of Governments, A/AC.135/L/Add.3, Ad Hoc Committee, 5th meeting); the economic interest of all nations must be recognized and protected but at the same time there was no doubt that the establishment of the industries necessary to develop the resources of the sea-bed would require the investment of very large amounts of capital and that considerable thought would have to be given as to how those installations and investments should be protected - it was necessary to avoid action which

/...

would in any way hamper the rapid development of the techniques which would be necessary for the exploration and use of the sea-bed (United Kingdom, First Committee, 1524th meeting); it was not contemplated that the technological skill of the developed countries should be placed without reward at the disposal of the international organization which was to be entrusted with the management of the sea-bed and the ocean floor (Ceylon, First Committee, 1526th meeting).

A particular problem, which it was suggested should be studied by the Ad Hoc Committee was the economic consequences of large-scale exploitation of such mineral resources of the ocean as cobalt, manganese and nickel on existing world markets and on the economies of countries producing such minerals, particularly developing countries (Argentina, Ad Hoc Committee, 5th meeting; Austria, Ad Hoc Committee, 6th meeting; Belgium, Ad Hoc Committee, 5th meeting; South Africa, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1). The possible implications for world trade and prices might, it was suggested, be discussed in a Secretariat study (Malta, Ad Hoc Committee, 4th meeting).

It was suggested that the Committee's study should be extended to include surveys of the resources of the continental shelf and the superjacent waters in areas as yet undeveloped, even though that did not form part of the subject in question (Guatemala, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.5). The study by the Ad Hoc Committee of the various aspects of the question could, it was stated, be expected to throw light on the potential for economic exploitation of the ocean floor's resources; a series of questions, including questions on the technical and economic aspects was submitted for consideration by the Committee (United States, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1). It was suggested that Secretariat studies should be made of known resources and the potential of contemporary technology regarding economic exploitation of the area (Malta, Ad Hoc Committee, 4th meeting).

It was suggested that the co-operation of the technical bodies concerned and of those playing an important part in trade and development such as UNCTAD might be useful (Chile, Ad Hoc Committee, 4th and 8th meetings; Italy, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting); in particular, collaboration of the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development and the Committee for

Development Planning should be sought, as well as that of UNCTAD and the International Bank. At a later date the Bank, either directly or through the International Development Association might provide the financing (Chile, Ad Hoc Committee, 4th and 8th meetings).

/...

VIII. Questions relating to the conservation of resources and the dangers of pollution from radio-active and other wastes

The dangers of widespread pollution from the dumping of radio-active and other wastes were emphasized by a number of Members. Some Members considered that existing measures to control such pollution were inadequate or ineffective (Finland, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.6; Malta, First Committee, 1515th meeting; Sweden, First Committee, 1527th meeting). It was suggested that a study might be made of the present situation regarding the contamination of the sea-bed from the dumping of radio-active wastes (Mexico, First Committee, 1529th meeting, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1), or that the Secretary-General should ask the International Atomic Energy Agency for a report on radio-active pollution (Ecuador, First Committee, 1528th meeting).

Many Members emphasized in general the need to avoid duplication with the work of other intergovernmental bodies, and for co-ordination of activities; some Members made that point explicitly in regard to problems of pollution and the conservation of the living resources of the sea. One Member urged the international organizations concerned, such as IAEA, IMCO and FAO to continue their work on problems of the disposal of radio-active waste and the dumping of industrial wastes with a view to establishing as quickly as possible binding rules governing the disposal of such wastes (Ireland, First Committee, 1525th meeting). Effective international action, it was stated, was required to halt the increasing pollution of the marine environment; the subject was dealt with in the Convention on the High Seas and was being studied by FAO and a working group of the IOC; all those efforts must be co-ordinated and must lead to concrete measures on the part of Governments (Belgium, First Committee, 1529th meeting). In any future studies regarding pollution and the disposal of radio-active wastes, the United Nations should not attempt to duplicate the work of other international bodies already working in that field, especially the IOC, FAO, IMCO and the IAEA (Australia, First Committee, 1529th meeting). The question of marine pollution, one Member considered, fell within the province of IMCO (France, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting). Current and future studies in respect, inter alia, of pollution would sooner or later have to be co-ordinated with United Nations efforts, one Member stated (Canada, First Committee, 1529th meeting).

It was suggested, however, that the international community as represented by the United Nations had a responsibility for the safe disposal of radio-active waste (Indonesia, First Committee, 1544th meeting). It was further suggested that the control of pollution required a positive international supervisory and regulatory régime (Malta, First Committee, 1516th meeting; Sweden, First Committee, 1527th meeting). The agency administering such a régime should, it was suggested, have over-all responsibility for keeping the problem of ocean pollution under control; it should act in collaboration with the IAEA, IMCO and other specialized bodies whose advice, if endorsed by the agency, could be incorporated in an enforceable code of law for the accepted use of the deep seas and of the ocean floor (Malta, First Committee, 1516th meeting).

Some Members suggested specifically at the twenty-second session that a committee with a broad mandate might consider questions relating to the prevention of marine pollution and the conservation of the living resources of the sea (Ghana, First Committee, 1526th meeting; Netherlands, First Committee, 1525th meeting; Somalia, First Committee, 1525th meeting; Trinidad and Tobago, First Committee, 1526th meeting; United States, First Committee, 1524th meeting).

Although not specifically referred to in resolution 2340 (XXII), the problem of the effect of the utilization of the ocean floor and its subsoil on the living resources of the sea should, it was thought, be considered by the Ad Hoc Committee, in particular because of the dangers of pollution (Iceland, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.8, Ad Hoc Committee, 3rd meeting; Italy, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.2, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting). The Committee could, it was suggested, consider what principles might be agreed upon to help conserve the living resources of the seas, to prevent pollution, and to avoid disturbance to the biological, chemical and physical balances of the sea; such principles, it was stated, would be directly relevant to international co-operative effort in exploring the ocean floor and might establish guidelines relevant to the exploitation of its resources (United States, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1). Some Members, on the other hand, considered that the Ad Hoc Committee should confine itself exclusively to matters concerned with the sea-bed and the ocean floor, or should consider questions relating to the oceans and their resources only in so far as they were affected by future human activities on the ocean floor (see section X).

A number of Members emphasized the need to guard against dangers to marine life and hazards to traditional uses of the high seas, such as fishing, which might result from exploration and exploitation activities on the ocean floor and its subsoil. Adequate safety regulations, it was emphasized, would be needed (Finland, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.6; France, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.6; Iceland, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.8; Norway, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1). In exploiting geophysical resources, it was stated, methods which might harm marine flora or fauna must be avoided (Greece, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.7). It was emphasized that the problems of guarding biological resources against pollution from excavation for mineral resources, oil products and explosions involved in exploring for minerals were immense and required serious examination (Norway, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1; Poland, Ad Hoc Committee, 6th meeting). It was suggested that the Ad Hoc Committee might find some guidelines in safety codes recently promulgated in connexion with the exploitation of national continental shelves (Norway, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1, Ad Hoc Committee, 6th meeting). The code of safety regulation adopted by one Member was described (Norway, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1) and a copy of the regulations forwarded for the Committee's information (A/AC.135/1/Add.1). Steps taken by one Member in pursuance of the recommendations in the Geneva Convention on the High Seas regarding the prevention of pollution were also referred to (Finland, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.6).

IX. Questions relating to international scientific co-operation^{1/}

Some Members emphasized that the principle of the freedom of all States to carry out scientific research and exploration in regard to the sea-bed and ocean should be maintained.

Useful guidelines in that connexion, it was suggested, were to be found in the treaties on Antarctica and outer space (Norway, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1; Sweden, First Committee, 1527th meeting). It was suggested that that was one of the principles on which a consensus should be sought at the twenty-second session of the Assembly (Turkey, First Committee, 1528th meeting). It was proposed that the principle that scientific research with regard to the deep seas and ocean floor, not directly connected with defence, shall be freely permissible and its results available to all should be incorporated in a treaty establishing an international régime for the area (Malta, First Committee, 1516th meeting). Rules and regulations to ensure that scientific research in regard to the use of the sea-bed and ocean floor for peaceful purposes remain free and permissible and that its results be made available to all countries without discrimination must, it was stated, be drafted by the proper bodies within the United Nations family of organizations. They must be equally adhered to by all States and observed by their national institutions and by individuals. Wide publicity must be assured and access to the findings guaranteed (United Arab Republic, First Committee, 1528th meeting).

The need for improved international co-operation in oceanographic research was also stressed. Principles, it was stated, should be agreed on to form a basis for improved international co-operation in scientific research into the sea-bed and it was necessary to examine how scientific information on that subject might be made more readily available (United Kingdom, First Committee, 1524th meeting). The Ad Hoc Committee, it was suggested, might consider what organizational and procedural arrangements should be made for Member States to have access to existing and new scientific data relating to the ocean floor (United States, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1). The international agency, which it was proposed should administer an international régime for the area, should in its administrative expenses include funds for supporting oceanographic research (Malta, First Committee, 1516th meeting).

^{1/} See also sections VIII and X.

International co-operation in oceanographic research was held to be important, in particular for strengthening the research activities of developing countries in marine science. The indication of practical measures called for by the Assembly's resolution 2340 (XXII) could include more specific data on the activities being carried out through international co-operation and should lay emphasis on effective technical and scientific assistance to less developed countries (Brazil, First Committee, 1527th meeting, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.4, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting). Urgent consideration should be given to the means of financing studies to enable developing countries to gain expertise in the marine sciences and oceanography so that they might bear their share of responsibility (Jamaica, First Committee, 1529th meeting).

The attention of the Ad Hoc Committee was called to the announcement by the President of the United States on 17 January 1968 of the United States intention to launch with other nations an exploration of the ocean depths to tap its wealth and its energy and its abundance, and his proposal on 8 March that the United States consult with other nations on steps that could be taken to launch an International Decade of Ocean Exploration for the 1970's. It was hoped that the general concept of an Exploration Decade would generate proposals as to content, method, scale and scope which could be discussed between nations and in the United Nations and its specialized agencies, including the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and the World Meteorological Organization. The Ad Hoc Committee, it was suggested, might wish to have an exchange of views on the subject and to consider making proposals for consideration by the Assembly at its next session: it might recommend development of a broad international programme for the exploration of all aspects of the marine environment, including the living and mineral resources. Particular attention had been given in preliminary thinking to projects of the living resources and biological dynamics of the sea; the preparation of ocean floor and continental shelf maps, and coring and drilling to contribute to geological knowledge; and the further investigation of basic ocean processes such as current systems and the interaction between the sea and atmosphere. Those and other ideas might, if Governments desired, be analysed by a suitable expert body to reach a co-operative programme based on agreed

priorities and the co-ordination of efforts of individual States. An appropriate share of the task, it was proposed, would also be undertaken by each of the intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations dealing with the oceans. The Economic and Technical Working Group of the Ad Hoc Committee, it was suggested, might give consideration to the relevance of the Exploration Decade since it could be a most practical manifestation of international co-operation (United States, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1, Ad Hoc Committee, 3rd meeting).

This proposal was welcomed as a practical contribution to improving international efforts in exploring the marine environment (Italy, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting), and as a good way to encourage general interest in the question (Pakistan, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting). The proposal, it was thought, might be discussed in the Ad Hoc Committee at an appropriate stage (Australia, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting; Austria, Ad Hoc Committee, 6th meeting; United Arab Republic, Ad Hoc Committee, 8th meeting; United Kingdom, Ad Hoc Committee, 6th meeting). Some Members expressed a wish for further details concerning the proposal (India, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting; United Arab Republic, Ad Hoc Committee, 8th meeting).

It was also suggested that there was a need for a technical and scientific study - if there was agreement - of the dynamics of the morphology and the physical/chemical development of the ocean depths and their subsoil (Peru, Ad Hoc Committee, 6th meeting). One Member thought it would be desirable to ascertain precisely what were the living organisms in constant physical contact with the sea-bed and the subsoil, but it doubted if this was feasible (Belgium, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1). Another Member suggested that it would be useful to consider the flora of the seas and oceans in view of their importance for the food needs of mankind (Italy, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.2).

Many Members stressed the particular importance of the activities in international scientific co-operation on marine questions of the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission of UNESCO. The need for close co-operation and consultation with that organization was generally agreed. It was suggested that as problems of scientific research were already being dealt with by the Commission, any duplication of effort in that field should be avoided (Belgium, First Committee, 1529th meeting), that the IOC, in co-operation with other international organizations,

/...

should continue to deal with the evaluation of scientific and technical aspects of the exploitation of the ocean floor's resources, and that Member States should be asked to intensify their co-operation with it (Czechoslovakia, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting); that a report from the IOC might be requested by the Secretary-General in undertaking a study of the whole item (Ecuador, First Committee, 1528th meeting); and that as the IOC was the international organization most qualified on the scientific aspects of the question, it would be logical to ask it to prepare for the Committee giving an account of the scientific aspects (USSR, Ad Hoc Committee, 6th meeting). The representative of UNESCO, speaking for the IOC, promised that organization's co-operation (Ad Hoc Committee, 4th and 6th meetings) and in reply to a request by the Chairman on behalf of the Committee for a paper on the scientific aspects of the question, stated that documentation would be submitted to the Ad Hoc Committee's next session (Ad Hoc Committee, 9th meeting). It was also suggested that the Ad Hoc Committee's Legal Working Group should co-operate with the group of experts established by the IOC with the aim of preparing a draft convention on the basic principles governing scientific exploration on the high seas (Czechoslovakia, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting).

The need for co-operation with other intergovernmental organizations as regards activities in oceanography, including, in particular, co-operation with the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization, FAO and WMO, as well as the World Health Organization, the ACC Sub-Committee on Marine Science, and the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development, was also stressed by a number of members (see section X). There was also a need, it was stated, to co-ordinate the efforts of States and other international scientific organizations (Bulgaria, First Committee, 1529th meeting) and to contact national institutes (Czechoslovakia, First Committee, 1544th meeting). It was suggested that the Ad Hoc Committee, in addition to the intergovernmental bodies referred to in the Assembly's resolution might wish to consult with the International Council for Scientific Unions concerning work done by its Special Committee on Oceanic Research (South Africa, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1).

X. Other questions relating to the Committee's mandate, future machinery for considering the question and the need for co-ordination

Some Members thought that questions relating to the sea-bed and the ocean floor could not be isolated from questions relating to the marine environment as a whole (Iceland, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.8, Ad Hoc Committee, 3rd meeting; Netherlands, First Committee, 1525th meeting; United States, First Committee, 1530th meeting, Ad Hoc Committee, 3rd meeting). It was proposed that a Committee on the Oceans should be established to deal with all proposals placed before the Assembly on marine questions (United States, First Committee, 1524th meeting), and that the Ad Hoc Committee, while focusing its attention on the peaceful uses of the sea-bed should take into account related matters pertaining to the deep oceans which could not be logically separated from the problem of the sea bottom (United States, Ad Hoc Committee, 3rd meeting). In this connexion, some Members emphasized the importance of considering the problem of protection against pollution (Iceland, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.8, Ad Hoc Committee, 3rd meeting; Italy, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.2, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting, see also section VIII). It was suggested further that the Ad Hoc Committee might consider the question of the flora of the seas and ocean in view of their importance for the food needs of mankind (Italy, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.2), and the juridical nature of the epicontinental sea as well as the conservation of the living resources of the superjacent waters (Iceland, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.8, Ad Hoc Committee, 3rd meeting). It was further suggested that the Committee's study should be extended to include surveys of the resources of the continental shelf and the superjacent waters in areas as yet undeveloped, even though that did not form part of the subject in question (Guatemala, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.5).

Some Members, however, considered that the scope of the study was already so wide that it should be confined to questions relating to the sea-bed and the ocean floor and their subsoil (Argentina, Ad Hoc Committee, 5th meeting; Belgium, First Committee, 1529th meeting, Ad Hoc Committee, 5th meeting; Chile, First Committee, 1526th meeting; India, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting; Trinidad and Tobago, First Committee, 1526th meeting; United Kingdom, First Committee, 1524th meeting).

/...

Certain Members expressed the view that the scope of the proposed arrangements should be limited to the resources of the subsoil (Argentina, Ad Hoc Committee, 5th meeting; Belgium, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1). One Member thought that the Ad Hoc Committee should confine itself to the sea-bed and the ocean floor and exclude from its consideration matters relating to the waters and the exploitation of their resources except as those might be affected by activities relating to the sea-bed and the ocean floor, but it conceded that the need to consider the question of marine pollution from the use of the oceanic subsoil was an important point (United Kingdom, Ad Hoc Committee, 6th meeting). Another Member considered that the Ad Hoc Committee could take into account the implications and consequences of the exploration and exploitation of the sea-bed and the ocean floor as far as they were relevant to a more thorough understanding of the question (Brazil, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.4). One Member feared that there was a danger of a dispersal of effort in relation to the main task, which was the preparation of a factual and conceptual basis for the determination by the General Assembly of a specific objective of international action which would effectively ensure the reservation exclusively for peaceful purposes of the sea-bed beyond present national jurisdiction and the use of its resources in the interests of mankind; it might be necessary to exclude for the time being from the discussion of the working groups specific subjects not directly related to the main task (Malta, Ad Hoc Committee, 4th meeting).

A number of Members emphasized that the Ad Hoc Committee should consider its mandate under paragraphs 2 (a) and 2 (b) of resolution 2340 (XXII) before attempting to consider the mandate under paragraph 2 (c); judgements concerning practical means to promote international co-operation, it was suggested, must follow the initial fact-finding stage (Australia, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting; Canada, Ad Hoc Committee, 4th meeting; India, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting; Italy, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting; Malta, Ad Hoc Committee, 4th meeting; Romania, Ad Hoc Committee, 6th meeting; USSR, Ad Hoc Committee, 6th meeting). It was suggested that a survey of the practical means to promote international co-operation in the exploration, conservation and use of the sea-bed and ocean floor and their resources could only be prepared on the basis of a preliminary expert study and discussion in the working groups on the legal, technical and economic aspects of the activities of States with regard to the sea-bed and ocean floor (USSR, Ad Hoc Committee,

/...

6th meeting); the practical means under paragraph 2 (c) should be examined on the basis of reports from the working groups (India, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting); the first task was an inventory of the current situation and the questions deriving therefrom; on the basis of this inventory, recommendations could be formulated as to whether future actions should be devoted solely or mainly to enlarging knowledge of the sea-bed and its subsoil or to fostering wider forms of international co-operation in the exploitation of their resources for the benefit of mankind (Italy, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting).

It was also suggested that the Committee should consider its task under paragraph 2 (a) before those under paragraphs 2 (b) and 2 (c); before it had available an adequate survey of present international activities and existing international agreements the Committee could not offer advice on the other two more abstract questions (United Kingdom, Ad Hoc Committee, 6th meeting).

The fact-finding aspect of the Ad Hoc Committee's work was also stressed. The purpose of the studies called for under subparagraphs (a) and (b), it was stated, was to enable Member Governments to obtain information and analysis of possible alternatives rather than to make specific recommendations to the General Assembly - the indication regarding practical measures could include more specific data on the activities being carried out through international co-operation; references to international co-operation should lay emphasis on effective technical and scientific assistance to less developed countries (Brazil, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.4); the Ad Hoc Committee should enumerate the various problems indicating the advantages and disadvantages of various solutions, without taking any position on them (France, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.6, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting).

One Member stated that paragraph 2 (c) should be interpreted in the context of the resolution as a whole and particularly of its operative parts; paragraph 1 implicitly required the Committee to consider the ultimate goal or goals of international action, while paragraph 2 (c) requested the Committee to provide the Assembly with an indication of immediate practical measures that could be taken to promote such international co-operation as would hasten the achievement of such an ultimate goal or goals. The Committee should not consider in depth the tasks under paragraphs 1 and 2 (c) until it had had time to consider the information referred to under paragraphs 2 (a) and (b) (Malta, Ad Hoc Committee, 4th meeting).

/...

After the establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee, certain views were expressed concerning future machinery.

One Member stated that on fulfilment of its task the Ad Hoc Committee would present its report to the Assembly at its twenty-third session and would cease to exist; the future would have to be decided by the Assembly at the twenty-third session. The composition of the Ad Hoc Committee in no way prejudged the composition of the body which, if Members thought it necessary, might be set up to work on the substance of the problem in future (USSR, First Committee, 1544th meeting).

Another Member, recalling its proposal that the General Assembly establish a Committee on the Oceans, expressed the hope that as a result of the work of the Ad Hoc Committee the Assembly at its twenty-third session would be in a position to establish such a committee, with a broad mandate to develop law and to promote international co-operation with respect to the ocean and the ocean floor (United States, 1639th plenary meeting). The Member recalled that its proposal had been that such a committee could act as a servant of the General Assembly in considering all proposals placed before the Assembly on marine questions, and make recommendations on such proposals to the Assembly for action; assist the Assembly in promoting long-term international co-operation in marine science; and assist the Assembly in considering questions of law, including such matters as rights of use and exploration, arms control, and problems of pollution (United States, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1).

Another Member stated that it had been in favour of a more permanent body with a broader mandate which would provide a framework adequate to the magnitude of the issues involved and reflect the concern of the United Nations. The agreed provisional nature of the Ad Hoc Committee reflected the understanding that the General Assembly would be called upon to approve further action on the question of the peaceful uses of the area as a consequence of the preliminary work entrusted to the Ad Hoc Committee (Brazil, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting).

One Member stated that after considering the Ad Hoc Committee's report the Assembly would probably have to decide how the task should be continued. The Member favoured the establishment of a standing committee of the United Nations, along the lines of the Committee on Outer Space, which would ensure some co-ordination between

/...

the international bodies concerned with oceanographic problems. This committee, it was proposed, would be a co-ordinating committee composed of representatives of Member States and be provided with secretariat services through the present Secretariat facilities. It might have two sub-committees: one administrative and legal and the other economic; purely scientific questions would be referred to the IOC (France, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.6).

Another Member stated that it attached importance to the idea of establishing an international framework through which all related matters of the mandate and those of the future could be dealt with; such a practical step, it stated, could best enhance international co-operation and serve to co-ordinate existing and future activities in that field (United Arab Republic, Ad Hoc Committee, 8th meeting).

After a careful study of existing activity in the area, one Member stated, the Committee should be in a better position to indicate to the Assembly (1) whether it should continue this inquiry under the auspices of an international "instance" and (2) the methodology which the Assembly might best employ (United Republic of Tanzania, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting).

The need for co-operation with other intergovernmental bodies concerned with various aspects of oceanographic questions was generally acknowledged. Duplication with their activities, it was emphasized should be avoided (Australia, First Committee, 1529th meeting; Belgium, First Committee, 1529th meeting; Bulgaria, First Committee, 1529th meeting; Chile, First Committee, 1526th meeting; Czechoslovakia, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting; El Salvador, First Committee, 1543rd meeting; France, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting; Iceland, First Committee, 1528th meeting; Iran, First Committee, 1529th meeting; Italy, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting; Japan, First Committee, 1529th meeting; Madagascar, First Committee, 1524th meeting; Nigeria, First Committee, 1526th meeting; USSR, First Committee, 1525th meeting; United Kingdom, Ad Hoc Committee, 6th meeting; see also sections VIII and IX). Organizations which were referred to in particular by Members included the IOC and also FAO, IMCO, WMO and IAEA; some Members also referred to the ENDC in connexion with disarmament questions (see section VI). One Member questioned whether the economic aspects of the exploitation of the sea-bed should be dealt with directly by the Ad Hoc Committee or eventually also by the Economic and Social Council; it should not be dealt with simultaneously by

/...

two United Nations organs as this caused unnecessary expense (Czechoslovakia, Ad Hoc Committee, 7th meeting).

It was also suggested that it would be of value to complement the survey of the activities of international organizations by a survey of national activities on the basis of information to be provided by Governments (United Kingdom, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1, Ad Hoc Committee, 6th meeting).

The need for co-ordinating existing studies and activities of the various intergovernmental bodies concerned with different aspects of the sea-bed was also widely felt; some Members, in particular, stressed the primary importance of such co-ordination (Bulgaria, First Committee, 1529th meeting; Nigeria, First Committee, 1526th meeting; USSR, First Committee, 1525th meeting, Ad Hoc Committee, 3rd meeting; Yugoslavia, First Committee, 1529th meeting). It was proposed that the Ad Hoc Committee should recommend to the General Assembly increased and closer co-ordination of the activities of those international bodies which were already participating in the study of the sea-bed (USSR, Ad Hoc Committee, 3rd meeting). Co-ordination of the activity of organizations dealing with the study and exploitation of the area should be taken into account, it was suggested, when an international convention was being elaborated (Finland, views of Governments, A/AC.135/1/Add.6).

APPENDIX

LIST OF STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS*

<u>Member country</u>	<u>First Cttee. meeting</u>	<u>Plenary meeting</u>	<u>Views of Govts. Document No.</u>	<u>Ad Hoc Cttee. meeting</u>
Afghanistan	1528		A/AC.135/1	
Argentina	1543			5
Australia	1529			7
Austria	1527			6
Belgium	1529, 1542	1639	A/AC.135/1	5
Bolivia	1530			
Brazil	1527		A/AC.135/1/Add.4	7
Bulgaria	1529			
Byelorussian SSR	1544			
Canada	1529, 1544		A/AC.135/1	4
Ceylon	1526			
Chile	1526			4, 8
China	1525		A/AC.135/1	
Colombia	1528		A/AC.135/1/Add.2	
Cuba			A/AC.135/1	
Cyprus	1530			
Czechoslovakia	1544			7
Dahomey			A/AC.135/1	
Denmark			A/AC.135/1/Add.2	
Ecuador	1528			5
El Salvador	1543			4
Finland	1544		A/AC.135/1/Add.6	
France	1526		A/AC.135/1/Add.6	7
Gabon			A/AC.135/1/Add.2	
Ghana	1526			

* Only statements relating to the substance of the matter, and not procedural interventions, are included.

<u>Member country</u>	<u>First Cttee. meeting</u>	<u>Plenary meeting</u>	<u>Views of Govts. Document No.</u>	<u>Ad Hoc Cttee. meeting</u>
Greece	1529		A/AC.135/1/Add.7	
Guatemala			A/AC.135/1/Add.5	
Honduras	1527			
Hungary	1544			
Iceland	1528, 1543		A/AC.135/1/Add.8	3
India	1530, 1544			7
Indonesia	1544			
Iran	1529, 1544			
Ireland	1525			
Italy	1528, 1544		A/AC.135/1/Add.2	7
Jamaica	1529		A/AC.135/1	
Japan	1529, 1543		A/AC.135/1/Add.3	5
Liberia	1528 ^a			8
Libya	1525, 1543			
Madagascar	1528		A/AC.135/1	
Malta	1515, 1516 1530, 1542	1639	A/AC.135/1	4
Mexico	1529		A/AC.135/1	
Morocco			A/AC.135/1/Add.4	
Nepal		1639		
Netherlands	1525, 1542		A/AC.135/1	
Niger			A/AC.135/1	
Nigeria	1526			
Norway	1525		A/AC.135/1 and Add.1	6
Pakistan				8
Paraguay		1639		
Peru	1529			6
Philippines	1544			

LIST OF STATEMENTS (3)

<u>Member country</u>	<u>First Cttee. meeting</u>	<u>Plenary meeting</u>	<u>Views of Govts. Document No.</u>	<u>Ad Hoc Cttee. meeting</u>
Poland	1526			6
Romania	1543			6
Saudi Arabia			A/AC.135/1/Add.2	
Sierra Leone	1528			
Somalia	1525			
South Africa			A/AC.135/1	
Sudan			A/AC.135/1	
Sweden	1527, 1542		A/AC.135/1 and Corr.1	
Thailand	1542			6
Trinidad and Tobago	1526			
Tunisia	1529			
Turkey	1528		A/AC.135/1	
USSR	1525, 1544			3, 6
United Arab Republic	1528			8
United Kingdom	1524, 1542	1639	A/AC.135/1	6
United Republic of Tanzania	1527			7
United States	1524, 1530 1542	1639	A/AC.135/1	3
Venezuela	1524			
Yugoslavia	1529			
