UNITED NATIONS

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL*/

Distr.
General

A/AC.138/SR.95
10 July 1973

ENGLISH
Original: FRENCH

COMMITTEE ON THE PEACEFUL USES OF THE SEA-BED AND THE OCEAN FLOOR BEYOND THE LIMITS OF NATIONAL JURISDICTION

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE NINETY-FIFTH MEETING*/

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Monday, 9 July 1973, at 10.55 a.m.

Chairman:	Mr. AMERASINGHE	Sri Lanka
Rapporteur:	Mr. VELLA	Malta

CONTENTS:

N.B. Participants wishing to submit corrections to this provisional summary record are requested to submit them in writing, preferably on a copy of the record itself, to the Official Records Editing Section, Room E.4121, Palais des Nations, Geneva, within three working days of receiving the provisional record in their working language.

*/ This provisional summary record, together with the corrections to be issued in consolidated form after the session, will constitute the final record of the meeting.

GE.73-48059

GENERAL STATEMENTS (continued)

The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had met to be informed of the progress of the work of the Sub-Committees and their Working Groups, but that it would first hear some delegations which had specifically requested permission to make statements. In that connexion, he recalled that the general debate had been concluded and that in principle, delegations would not ask for the floor except on a specific point relating to the negotiations in course or in order to submit a proposal.

Mr. BAKULA (Peru) re-stated the aims of the world conference that was to meet to establish a new régime governing the utilization and exploitation of the seas, as defined in General Assembly resolution 2750 C (XXV), and said that he wished to make a few comments on the subject. Firstly, the conference would be world-wide in scope; it was essential that all States should participate if the foundations were to be laid of a just, universal and stable order which would guarantee that the seas were used for the benefit of all mankind. Secondly, the conference would be responsible for elaborating a new convention on the law of the sea, to replace the 1958 conventions which were out-of-date and had been drafted in the absence of many States which had not acceded to independence at the time.

In followed that the standards to be established should take account of the new facts that had arisen in connexion with the law of the sea since the 1958 and 1960 conferences, and more particularly the fresh principles applied by a growing number of countries which affirmed their right to regulate the use of the resources of the seas adjacent to their coasts within a limit of 200 nautical miles. Those developments, which were currently regional in character, could not be ignored by the 1974 conference.

The third consideration was that account would have to be taken of the interests and needs of all States, particularly those of the developing countries, both coastal and land-locked. Fourthly and lastly, his delegation hoped that the Preparatory Committee would succeed in preparing, preferably by consensus, a text that would be acceptable to all and that it would concentrate its efforts along those lines.

After that survey, he wished to draw some conclusions from and make some comments on the current situation and prospects with regard to the elaboration of conventions on the law of the sea that would be adapted to the realities and needs of the day. The discussions that had taken place so far had brought out a very definite tendency to make a distinction in matters of ocean space between an area subject to the authority of the coastal States, with a maximum limit of 200 miles - apart from the case of continental shelves extending further - and an area subject to international jurisdiction beyond that limit. At the same time, the idea was gaining ground of setting up an international authority to take the necessary steps to administer the international area as the common heritage of mankind. The legal nature of the two proposed areas had yet to be defined, as had the limits of the rights and jurisdictions of the various States on the one hand and of the international authority on the other.

With respect to the area under the authority of the coastal State, there were again two theories: one which upheld the sovereignty and jurisdiction of the coastal State over the sea, the sea-bed and the subsoil thereof within the limits of the national area, and another which would divide the area under the authority of the State into a territorial sea 12 miles in width with a right of innocent passage and, beyond that limit, a patrimonial sea or economic zone with freedom of navigation and overflight. His country, which supported the 200-mile thesis, and which had defended its maritime sovereignty against the incursions of foreign fleets, protected its fisheries energetically and created a highly prosperous industry, would not retreat a single step with respect to the recognition of its sovereignty and jurisdiction over the sea adjacent to its coasts. It hoped that other States would defend themselves in the same way against the pretensions of the major Powers and their policy of hegemony.

With regard to the functions of the international authority responsible for the sea-bed area beyond the limit of national jurisdiction, controversy continued between the supporters of a simple mechanism with powers limited to issuing permits to private, State or multi-national undertakings to explore and exploit and said area for their own profit on payment of royalties to cover the cost of the administrative operation of the mechanism, and those who proposed that an international Authority be set up with adequate powers to explore and exploit the area and its resources,

either alone or in association with the interested undertakings. The international Authority would then also have the right to enact provisions concerning the protection and safety of human life, preservation of the marine environment and peaceful uses of the sea-bed area.

In addition to those powers, the Maltese delegation had proposed that the international Authority should exercise similar functions over the superjacent waters of the international sea-bed area and, inter alia, that it be empowered to adopt standards designed to protect the exercise of freedom of navigation and overflight in the area and to guarantee the conservation and rational exploitation of its living resources. Such a suggestion was favoured by Peru, which considered that the so-called high seas should be an international sea, subject to provisions enabling it to be used and enjoyed by all States as the common heritage of mankind.

On the other hand, his delegation could not conceal its astonishment at the suggestion which had been put forward - even though unofficially - whereby the concept of the common heritage would be extended to the whole of ocean space, including the sea, sea-bed and subsoil of the national area which began at the coast. The International Ocean Authority which would govern that "heritage" would adopt regulations to protect freedom of navigation and of overflight in the area as well as the laying of cables, pipes, etc. That Authority would delegate to the coastal States the exercise of some administrative functions and the right to apply the aforesaid provisions in an economic resources zone not exceeding 200 nautical miles, and would receive half the income accruing to those exploiting the resources of the sea-bed and its subsoil.

His delegation was convinced that those proposals were impracticable, at any rate in existing circumstances. In view of the grave difficulties and conflicts of interest that separated the developed from the less-developed countries, it would be illusory to bestow upon international organizations the powers which each State had the right and duty to exercise itself so as to utilize the adjacent sea for the advancement and welfare of its people. His delegation had already had occasion, during discussions in the First Committee at the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly, to explain why it was opposed to the idea that States should renounce their rights over the continental shelf in the name of a hypothetical common interest

when, in actual fact, only a few Powers would profit by it. The underprivileged nations could not be asked to renounce wealth that was vitally needed by their peoples. The Great Powers, which had formerly invoked "freedom of the seas" to justify their policy of domination, hoped to revive the concept under cover of the idea of a "common heritage". His delegation wished to state once again that from the outset, the concept of the "common heritage" had designated the zone and the resources lying beyond national jurisdiction, and that it intended to abide by that interpretation.

It should be recognized that some Great Powers accepted the limit of 200 nautical miles as an immutable element in the new formulation of the law of the sea. Nevertheless a simple recognition of that kind, if not qualified by the attributes requested by the coastal States, would not solve the problem. It was not only the extension or extent of the national area that was at stake, but the interests of the coastal populations within that area.

The countries that advocated a national area of 200 miles might have differing opinions as to the legal nature and the designation of that area, but they were agreed as to the rights which the coastal State should exercise, rights which expressed the natural relationship between the sea, the land and its inhabitants. It was on that relationship also that the legitimate priority of the coastal populations was based with regard to the disposal of resources in the coastal area. The powers requested by the countries championing the 200-mile limit, including protection of their sovereign rights over renewable and non-renewable resources, the sea-bed and its subsoil, preservation of the marine environment, and so forth, were intended to preserve the legitimate interest of the said coastal States and to promote their development. Peru, for its part, having eliminated all traces of colonialism, would oppose with the same determination any new form of colonialism on the seas. The coastal countries of the third world would not permit standards to be imposed upon them that encroached on their full right to dispose of the natural resources situated in their territories and in the adjacent seas. They knew that their cause was also that of other coastal nations, which although more developed had no hegemonic intent, and which shared their desire to establish a new legal order in which justice would replace the abuse of power.

Since March 1971, when the Committee had begun its work of preparing for the world conference, his delegation had been endeavouring to present with all possible clarity and frankness the positions of his Government on the main subjects under consideration. Its frankness had often been expressed in formulae which, if they appeared harsh, simply reflected the harshness of the living conditions of most of the Peruvian people. At the current and last stage of the preparatory work, his delegation wished to express in the form of a concrete draft the main basic principles that should be accepted and developed in the future convention on the law of the sea. A working paper was being prepared, in co-operation with other countries, to be submitted to Sub-Committee II, since it contained only provisions applicable to the national and international areas. In Sub-Committees I and III, however, his delegation would continue to defend the principles and proposals relating to the régime of the sea-bed beyond the limits of national jurisdiction, as well as the preservation of the marine environment, scientific research and the transfer of technology.

Mr. TAYLOR-KAMARA (Sierra Leone) said that as a coastal State, his country attached great importance to the future conference on the law of the sea on grounds of national security and of the conservation of its resources for development purposes. On the other hand, as a member of OAU, his country unreservedly supported that Organization's Declaration on the Issues of the Law of the Sea, published as a Committee document under the symbol A/AC.138/89.

His delegation observed that at the close of its spring session, the Committee had taken no substantive decisions, nor had it adopted any report, although it had dealt with a large number of questions assigned to it in General Assembly resolution 2750 C(XXV). His delegation noted further that besides Sierra Leone, a number of African, Asian and European States had declared themselves in favour of a 200 nautical miles limit, within which the coastal State would exercise its jurisdiction. For its part, his country had proclaimed a territorial waters limit of 200 nautical miles by an Act of 1971, those "territorial waters" comprising the territorial sea and inland waters. That initiative had been termed a "unilateral extension of territorial waters".

At the time of the 1958 and 1960 Conferences, Sierra Leone, like many other developing countries, had still been a colony, and consequently should not be bound by the terms of the conventions emanating from them, since the negotiations

had been carried out by the colonial powers. His delegation took the view that States should have the right to delimit their territorial seas in accordance with natural conditions and their development needs. Similarly it should be possible for adjacent marine resources to be used for the benefit of coastal States and neighbouring land-locked States, and not be plundered by distant nations. The law of the sea should no longer be an instrument of political, economic and military domination.

In his delegation's opinion, it should be possible to use a more flexible and precise method to determine the extent of a coastal State's jurisdiction over the continental shelf, to the extent that the statutory provisions of other States were not affected.

However that might be, the major objective of the Committee now appeared to be, to reconcile the divergent interests and views of countries. The Committee might perhaps wish to examine closely on the one hand maritime interests, as opposed to those of coastal States seeking control over wide areas of national jurisdiction, and on the other the interests of coastal States wishing to control the natural resources adjacent to their coasts, as opposed to the interests of long-distance fishing nations. It also thought that the land-locked countries' right of access to the sea should be recognized.

Whatever the size or width of the economic zone, his delegation thought that a coastal State should exercise full sovereignty over all the main minerals and over living resources, but should not interfere unduly with freedom of movement and overflight, and the laying of cables and pipes, by other States.

There were numerous States which had continental shelves extending beyond their territorial waters. The Committee might consider the possibility of finding a practical and workable solution to the question whether the continental shelf of a State ended at the same point as the territorial waters, or whether a State could reserve the right to claim the whole continental shelf, whether or not it extended beyond the limits of national jurisdiction.

As for marine pollution, his delegation supported the view that States should undertake to adopt the necessary measures, including legislation, to prevent pollution of the marine environment from any source, whether a land-locked or a coastal country. States should have the right to take measures within the limits of their national jurisdictions to protect the ecology of the zone where no internationally-agreed measures existed.

His delegation hoped for a treaty concerning the pollution of the sea-bed, whereby the contracting parties would be responsible not only for its local enforcement but also for keeping a close check on dumping activities in their respective areas.

Any international régime aimed at protecting the resources of the sea should take account of the various fishing methods. In addition, there should be no limitation on the freedom of scientific research in the oceans, which alone would make it possible for the numerous and valuable mineral resources of the sea to be exploited. Nevertheless, whenever research was to be undertaken that might affect the interests of a coastal State, that State should be given prior notification. Where necessary, scientists from that country could be invited to take part in the research work.

Mr. RATTRAY (Jamaica) said that as a result of the deliberations of the Sub-Committees and working groups, the interests of the international community were now beginning to appear in a truer perspective. It was time to make a realistic assessment of the situation with a view to taking the procedural measures necessary to ensure a greater harmonization and co-ordination of national and regional positions. The new legal structure which the Committee was seeking to establish would remain a fragile thing if the existing inequalities were perpetuated. The fact that the Committee had been endeavouring for three years to draw up a list of subject and issues relating to the law of the sea, and that it had begun to delimit the range of the various jurisdictional areas, clearly showed that the new régime must seek to reconcile national, regional and sub-regional interests, while at the same time taking account of the interdependence of the international community. In fact, ocean space was regarded as an area capable of meeting the needs of mankind, and it was for the Committee to create the over-all conditions in which that objective could be attained for the greatest benefit of all.

In order to accomplish that task, the Committee should be careful not to underestimate the scope of any decisions it took concerning procedure and the organization of its work. It could no longer be content with general debates on the whole range of issues relating to the law of the sea. It must draw up an organizational plan, whose logical starting-point would be the consideration of fundamental issues in a regional or sub-regional context. An analysis of those issues

showed that there were areas of convergence and residual areas of divergence. The Committee could not usefully consider the areas of divergence until it had reconciled the various interests involved in the areas of convergence.

The areas of convergence were largely the result of accidents of geography and history which had created a very marked degree of interdependence between particular States. Thus, such questions as the delimitation of the territorial sea and the creation of new zones of economic jurisdiction assumed vital importance in relations between States. Whatever might be the justification for a zone of economic jurisdiction, it was essential that such a zone be acceptable to all the States which formed part of it. It would indeed be intolerable if, in the waters adjacent to several neighbouring States, a situation was created which would unduly disturb the traditional habits or economies of countries dependent on those waters for their very survival. The creation of zones of economic jurisdiction must therefore be accompanied by effective and permanent guarantees for the preservation of traditional rights in adjacent waters. Any zone of economic jurisdiction must accommodate the interests of neighbouring States, particularly those States whose traditional rights would be adversely affected by the extension of the jurisdictional limits of other neighbouring States, or those States geographically, biologically or ecologically disadvantaged which would derive little benefit from an extension of their jurisdiction.

Once it was recognized that the Committee was dealing essentially with patrimonial waters, the strategy to be followed in further negotiations became self-evident. The real starting-point for any global settlement of the many issues confronting the Committee was the reconciliation of regional interests on a regional basis in conformity with established principles and rights, which would be embodied in the global treaty itself. Admittedly, the global issues were no less important, but it would be unrealistic to attempt to settle the question of global interests before settling that of national jurisdictions in a regional or sub-regional context.

In that connexion, some of the proposals already submitted to the Committee reflected in a large measure matters of regional or sub-regional concern. Mention might be made, in particular, of the OAU declaration on the issues of the law of the sea (A/AC.138/89). At the current stage of the Committee's work, it was essential that every geographical region or sub-region should adopt a position regarding the particular issues confronting it. In that respect, it should be noted that there were many points of agreement, but also a fundamental divergence, between the OAU declaration and the draft articles submitted by Colombia, Mexico and Venezuela (A/AC.138/SC.II/L.21). It would seem that the underlying philosophy of the declaration was that the African countries should be given the right to exploit the resources of the sea throughout the area surrounding the African continent, in accordance with the economic interest of the African peoples. In addition, the declaration gave expression to a magnanimous concept of African brotherhood by providing for the exploitation of the living resources of coastal States by the land-locked and other disadvantaged countries. It was also generally known that the Latin American countries were making serious efforts to accommodate the interests of the disadvantaged countries of the region, one of which was Jamaica. Because of the geographical conditions peculiar to that region, it was perhaps more difficult than elsewhere to find a solution. But given the goodwill of the Latin-American States, there was every hope that complete agreement would be reached on the question.

He therefore considered that within the areas of convergence, delegations should seek to identify and reconcile their interests as speedily as possible within a regional or sub-regional context and that an effort should then be made to harmonize the interests thus reconciled as between the groups representing the various regions. Efforts should be oriented in that direction, because it was clear that only if those problems were solved could other problems posed in the residual areas be brought into proper perspective.

Mr. CARROZ (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations) said that at the end of its previous session the Committee had requested FAO to prepare an up-to-date version of its publication concerning limits and status of the territorial sea, exclusive fishing areas, fish conservation areas and the continental shelf (FAO Fisheries Circular No.127, 1971). The revised version, published under the

symbol FID/C/127/Rev.1, contained a summary in the form of a synoptic table of the rights invoked by coastal States as embodied in their legislation or in international agreements to which they were parties. The States concerned were urgently requested to indicate any changes that might have occurred since the publication of that document.

The Committee had also requested FAO to complete its document on the distribution and migrations of the most widely-known fish species. A new version of that document would be distributed in a few weeks.

REPORTS ON THE PROGRESS OF THE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMITTEES

Mr. ENGO (Cameroon), Chairman of Sub-Committee I, said that his Sub-Committee had held one meeting which had lasted only five minutes. The Working Group had then continued its work on the international machinery. But the Sub-Committee was to hold an important meeting that afternoon, at which the Chairman of the Working Group would submit a detailed progress report. He would therefore prefer to wait until the following plenary meeting of the Committee before making a full report on the situation. He outlined the difficulties which the Working Group was encountering in performing its task. It might perhaps be desirable to make some changes in working methods. It would seem necessary, in particular, to facilitate informal negotiations, which had now become indispensable.

The CHAIRMAN said that the necessary steps would be taken to ensure that the delegations concerned had at their disposal every facility for holding informal consultations.

Mr. GALINDO POHL (El Salvador), Chairman of Sub-Committee II, said that the Sub-Committee had held one meeting during the previous week and that the Working Group of the whole had met on three occasions. During the meeting of the Sub-Committee, he had made a statement on procedure which had been endorsed without discussion. Accordingly, the Sub-Committee was now following the procedure adopted at its session in New York. As a result of that agreement, the Working Group would have as much time as was needed for a thorough consideration of the questions falling within the mandate of the Sub-Committee. The Working Group had decided to fix 16 July as the time-limit for the submission of proposals; that would not, however, prevent States, if they considered it necessary, to submit further proposals at a later stage, either during the current session or at the forthcoming conference. The sole purpose of that decision was to facilitate the Committee's work.

At the most recent meeting of the Working Group, those Latin-American countries which had submitted the draft articles (E/AC.138/SC.II/L.21) and the States members of OAU which had sponsored the declaration contained in document A/AC.138/89 had announced their intention of meeting with a view to combining the two documents into one. That was a very important step, which betokened a genuine desire to reach an agreement.

The Working Group had continued consideration of the questions to which priority had been given in New York.

He was somewhat concerned about the report of Sub-Committee II and the report of the plenary Committee. In the past, the time devoted to substantive questions had been limited as a result of general debates and procedural discussions. It was possible that that might happen again during the present session. It would perhaps be useful, therefore, to begin consideration of the main outlines of the report within a few days. Delegations should also be kept informed of developments, and draft reports should be distributed in advance. The Sub-Committee would thus be able to devote more time to substantive questions and to limit to a reasonable period the time taken up in the preparation of its report. In his opinion, due consideration must be given to that question.

The CHAIRMAN asked why the Working Group had set 16 July as the deadline for the submission of proposals. The representatives of the Latin-American groups and of the OAU would be given all the necessary facilities for meeting informally with a view to reaching an agreement. Like Mr. Galindo Pohl, he thought that the drafting of the report should begin as soon as possible, but pointed out that everything depended on the result of the substantive discussions, which obviously had priority. He urged delegations not to become involved in long discussions.

Mr. KEDADI (Tunisia), Chairman of the Working Group of the Whole of Sub-Committee II, pointed out that the Chairman of Sub-Committee II had already reported on the progress made by the Working Group. With regard to the indicative date of 16 July chosen for the submission of proposals, he said that proposals submitted after that date would be treated in the same way as the others. In setting that date, it had simply been intended to give delegations a working tool so that all of them would have the documentation needed to participate in the negotiation phase.

In the Working Group of the Whole, delegations had shown that the importance of the time-factor had not escaped them. They desired that the substance of questions should be taken up without delay so that the preparation of the draft articles could go forward. He commended the spirit displayed by the members of the Working Group in that respect, and welcomed the suggestions that had been made with regard to informal contacts. Some delegations had already agreed to meet in those conditions: three from Africa, three from Latin America, and Australia. Others would undoubtedly follow their example. He looked upon that as a satisfactory method of preparing a joint text.

Mr. CASTANEDA (Mexico) noted that both the Chairman of the Sub-Committee and the Chairman of the Working Group had requested that negotiations should begin immediately so that progress could be made with the preparation of joint texts.

In that connexion, he had noted that the serious questions raised in Sub-Committee II had led delegations to make a number of proposals based on fundamental but divergent ideas. Some delegations, for instance, had stated that they were in favour of the establishment of an economic area. That idea, which had not yet been clearly and fully defined, was one of the bases for the position adopted by the African group. An almost identical idea had been defended by some Latin-American countries as well, namely, Colombia, Venezuela and his own country. He felt that if countries held similar views on a fundamental matter, they should negotiate among themselves so as to bring those views into closer alignment.

In the Working Group of Sub-Committee II, the representative of Senegal had appealed in that sense to the Latin American countries, suggesting that a meeting should be held between the countries of the two regions, in which three countries would act as spokesmen for Africa. A meeting of that kind could be very useful, as the delegations taking part might succeed in adopting a joint text to express the fundamental ideas which they shared. Even if the negotiations did not lead to agreement on all points, it should be possible to reflect every trend in a collective text.

The African countries, however, also wished to embody the ideas of the Declaration of Addis Ababa in a legal text. Their intention was commendable but should not delay negotiations with Latin America. In his opinion, the African countries should not await the preparation of a definitive text: on the one hand, such a text crystallized positions and would complicate the negotiations; and on the other, time was pressing and that approach was liable to leave too little time

for the elaboration of a common text. He therefore urged the African group to participate in the negotiations forthwith, without waiting for a text to be produced on the basis of the ideas contained in the Declaration of Addis Ababa.

The CHAIRMAN also stressed the value of informal consultations, and hoped that such a procedure would be accepted by the Chairmen of all the sub-committees and working groups. All delegations were entitled to participate in the consultations, not merely those which had submitted proposals.

Mr. VAN DER ESSEN (Belgium), Chairman of Sub-Committee III, drew attention to a change in the membership of the bureau of the Sub-Committee: Mr. Espinosa Valderrama of Colombia had been replaced as Vice-Chairman by Mr. Zuleta from the same delegation.

Sub-Committee III had so far held only one meeting, on the afternoon of Wednesday, 4 July. It had decided to proceed with the programme of work approved in the spring of 1972. The fourth item on that programme - transfer of technology - was still awaiting consideration, and a general discussion was to be held. The list of speakers for the general discussion would be closed on the evening of Wednesday, 11 July.

Referring next to the two Working Groups of Sub-Committee III, he said that one of them, which was concerned with environment and pollution, was doing excellent work under the leadership of Mr. Vallarta of Mexico. The other, set up at the close of the spring session to deal with scientific research and the transfer of technology, had not met so far, as its Chairman, Mr. Olszowka, had not yet arrived.

Mr. STAVROPOULOS (Under-Secretary-General for Legal Affairs), representing the Secretary-General, introduced the documents which the Secretariat had been requested to prepare for the session.

The report entitled "Economic significance, in terms of sea-bed mineral resources, of the various limits proposed for national jurisdiction" (A/AC.138/87), had been prepared in response to the requests made by the General Assembly in resolutions 3029 B and C. The Secretary-General had thought it more appropriate to combine the reports requested in one document, as the basic data involved were the same in each case. The General Assembly resolutions specified that the studies were to be based on the information at the disposal of the Secretary-General. At the same General Assembly session, it had been explained that the Secretary-General should also rely on consultant assistance and on information which Governments might

be able to provide. The material available to him applied to four limits which were specified in document A/AC.138/87. He had also benefited from the expertise of consultants drawn from a number of countries. As the report had had to be issued rapidly, it had been impossible to correct some errors.

In accordance with a request made by the Committee at its spring session, the Secretariat had also prepared a report on "Examples of precedents of provisional application, pending their entry into force, of multilateral treaties, especially treaties establishing international organizations and/or régimes" (A/AC.138/88). The precedents selected had been used to illustrate certain characteristic procedures. Of the eight cases studied, four concerned the preparatory arrangements made with respect to certain specialized agencies, and the fifth related to the International Atomic Energy Agency. The 1968 International Sugar Agreement had been examined as an example of the provisional application of an agreement setting up an international commodity organization. The last two cases concerned the provisional application of two regional treaties establishing an international régime and an international body respectively. The nature of the arrangements made in each case was indicated in a comparative table on pages 6, 7 and 8 of the document.

The third document requested from the Secretariat (at the spring session, like the second), entitled "Sea-bed mineral resources: recent developments" (A/AC.138/90), was actually an interim report. It was not exhaustive but simply indicated new and significant developments that had occurred since the submission of document A/AC.138/73 on the same subject. In accordance with the undertaking given by the Secretary-General at the last session, a more detailed report, prepared under General Assembly resolution 2750 A (XXV), would be submitted in 1974.

Following the announcement by Mr. HALL (Secretary of the Committee) of the meetings to be held by the Committee, its sub-committees and their working groups during the week, and in regard to the comments made on the subject by Mr. ENGO (Cameroon), Chairman of Sub-Committee I, Mr. BEESLEY (Canada) and Mr. THOMPSON FLORES (Brazil), the CHAIRMAN urged the Committee to make the best possible use of the facilities at its disposal as regards summary records and interpretation at meetings. To do so, it was necessary that even the small delegations should be represented at more than one meeting at a time. That might be difficult to achieve during the current week, but he hoped they would manage to do so during the next few weeks.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.