

UNITED NATIONS

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



PROVISIONAL*/

Distr.
GENERAL

A/AC.138/SR.98

30 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-EIGHTH MEETING*/

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Monday, 30 July 1973, at 11 a.m.

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. AMERASINGHE	Sri Lanka
<u>Rapporteur:</u>	Mr. VELLA	Malta

CONTENTS:

- Interim reports on the work of Sub-Committees I, II and III
- Organization of work
- Statement by the representative of the Permanent Commission for the South Pacific

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.

INTERIM REPORTS ON THE WORK OF SUB-COMMITTEES I, II AND III

Mr. ENGO (Cameroon), reporting on the deliberations of Sub-Committee I, said that it had decided to operate basically as a Working Group, more especially by holding informal meetings. There was no new specific proposal to report. The Sub-Committee was pursuing its efforts to formulate draft articles for submission to the Conference. In his view, the important decisions regarding problems of substance could only be taken by the Conference itself; all that the Preparatory Committee could do was to reduce differences of views by limiting the number of variants in the proposed texts.

The Sub-Committee was facing two types of problems: firstly, the drafting of a recapitulative text drawn up on the basis of the many formal and informal proposals before it, which merited transmittal to the Conference, was not an easy task. Secondly, the submission of new proposals at the current stage was creating certain difficulties: some delegations feared that their draft would not appear in the official consolidated text, while others felt that it was too late to submit any drafts. He would endeavour to find a solution to that problem. In addition, the Chairman of Working Group I was to submit to Sub-Committee I on 1 August an important report containing an assessment of the work of his Group. It was his belief that new courses of action would emerge from that report.

Mr. GALINDO POHL (El Salvador), reporting on the work of Sub-Committee II, of which he was Chairman, said that the Sub-Committee had held three meetings, and that twenty new proposals had been submitted by a total of fifty delegations. The meetings had therefore been devoted to the presentation of drafts. Delegations had been able to state their views in full detail and determine the extent of their agreement or disagreement. Moreover, the Sub-Committee and its Working Group now had a new tool at their disposal, namely, the tentative comparative table of proposals, declarations, working papers, etc., relating to subjects and issues allocated to Sub-Committee II (SC.II/WG/Paper No.4). The document was very useful. It had been drawn up by the Secretariat and he wished, through Mr. Stavropoulos, to thank the officials who had helped to prepare it. With the forthcoming circulation of an initial consolidated text, the Sub-Committee would have all the material required to consider the questions entrusted to it and to produce texts capable of facilitating negotiations.

In regard to working methods, it had been decided that the Sub-Committee would meet mainly as a Working Group. As such, it had devoted three meetings to questions relating to fisheries, which amounted to 31 proposals in all, a figure which gave an idea of the difficulty of the task involved in drafting texts that were reasonably similar, or at least had few variants. The subject of fisheries had not been exhausted; the Working Group had therefore envisaged entrusting it to a sub-group, but had in the end decided in favour of direct consultations between the delegations concerned, without setting up a group to deal officially with fisheries.

Mr. van der ESSEN (Belgium) said that Sub-Committee III, of which he was Chairman, had held a meeting on Friday, 27 July at which it had concluded the general debate on the transfer of technology, after which five speakers had submitted papers on marine pollution and scientific research. The bulk of the work had nevertheless been done by Working Groups 2 and 3. Working Group 2, on pollution, had drafted seven articles, without variants, on the general and special obligations of States, technical assistance, detection and monitoring systems, and regional co-operation. A more delicate question still remained, that of pollution standards, on which it would undoubtedly be impossible to draft a text without variants. Working Group 3 (transfer of technology and scientific research) had held three meetings and had embarked on a discussion of definitions and objectives in oceanographic research. It had set up an informal group which had worked on the formulation of definitions and was to carry on with that task.

In his view, the only suitable working method for Sub-Committee III was to allow the two working groups to function as such, or as restricted groups. On those terms, he felt that the Sub-Committee would be able to make considerable progress with its basic task, which was to draw up draft articles.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN observed that in their reports, the Chairmen of the Sub-Committees had referred to the working methods of their Sub-Committees and working groups and had made a number of comments on the subject. He reiterated the precise terms of reference of the Committee and its Sub-Committees and strongly urged delegations to make statements which had a direct bearing on the terms of reference of the particular Sub-Committee in which they were participating, and not to encroach on the mandates of the other Sub-Committees.

In his view, the single purpose of consultations between sponsors of proposals that were similar was to cut down areas of disagreement; they were in no sense semi-official in character. The Chairmen of the Sub-Committees could arrange for such consultations, setting aside several afternoons in which they could take place. Delegations with comments to make on the organization of work were invited to take the floor.

Mr. KOLESNIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted that half of the time allotted to the Committee for its sixth session had already elapsed. He was perturbed at the slow progress of work, which, in his view, did not augur well for the successful outcome of the session itself and for the work of the future Conference. In Sub-Committee II, for example, his delegation felt that the only concrete achievement to report was the submission of a comparative table which was the work of the Secretariat, while the Sub-Committee's mandate was to reach agreement on draft articles on the régime of the high seas, the continental shelf, the territorial sea, the contiguous zone, fisheries and the conservation of biological resources. His delegation felt that it was impossible to reach such agreement unless small working groups, or contact, drafting or other groups, were established to deal with specific questions. That procedure was customary in the United Nations when rules of law were being codified: it had been used in the preparations for the 1958 Geneva Conference on the Law of the Sea, later for the Vienna Conference on the Law of Treaties, and it had proved its worth. He did not believe it possible to draft texts in meetings that were attended by more than eighty delegations. Some degree of organization was essential for the informal consultations that had been proposed, and that organizational role fell to the Officers of the Committee and Sub-Committees.

Mr. LEGNANI (Uruguay) wished to make several suggestions which, in the view of his delegation, should help to speed up the drafting of texts and to improve the quality of the drafts submitted to the Working Groups. Where a new proposal consisted not of a simple change in existing concepts or of a variant on a previous text, but introduced entirely new ideas, it should be submitted for consideration by the plenary Sub-Committee without discussion in the Working Group, except, obviously, in the case of proposals on which there had been an immediate consensus.

Secondly, if texts on matters which had already been discussed at length were to reflect the existing positions or principles accurately, the appropriate Working Group should consider them to ensure that the views reflected in the text had not changed.

Where positions had drawn nearer, the text should be referred to a sub-working group consisting of the delegations which had expressed the views in question, so that it could draft a more accurate text and transmit it to the officers of the Working Group for inclusion in the draft articles. It was essential to have, as soon as possible, a body of provisions that would serve as a basis for consultations among delegations and also for consultations which would be initiated with Governments in order to obtain their replies and comments. Such a body of provisions was also indispensable for the successful conclusion of negotiations leading to the agreements that were to determine the final form of the treaty enunciating the new law of the sea.

Moreover, to ensure a coherent presentation of the outcome of the work of the Sub-Committees, the provisions should be classified logically, in chapters, as and when they were completed by those bodies. The Secretariat might perhaps carry out that task with the assistance of a working group appointed by the Chairman. As to the negotiations themselves, which were naturally being carried on by means of consultations and in the context of the Committee - the focal point of preparations for the Conference - it might be advisable, initially, to establish a smaller committee, with the same Chairman, but made up of the delegations submitting proposals on the actual subject under consideration; in other words, the composition of the smaller committee would change according to the issue under discussion.

There were also some general questions relating to the treaty that had been referred to the three Sub-Committees and which, in the opinion of his delegation, should be considered in plenary Committee. He had in mind the questions of settlement of disputes, responsibility and liability for damage resulting from the use of the marine environment, regional agreements, and the question whether or not the organization that was to be established would be a specialized agency of the United Nations. Those were his delegation's suggestions with a view to speeding up the current work.

Lastly, his delegation had submitted to Sub-Committee II draft articles (A/AC.138/SC.II/L.24 and Corr.1) on the institution of the territorial sea. Referring to the spirit of compromise and conciliation in which the draft had been drawn up and to the substance of the main proposals, he went on to say that his delegation would like to see the draft annexed to the Committee's report to the Conference; for regardless of how it was dealt with in Sub-Committee II, it contained information and criteria that his country wished to make available to the participants in the Conference.

Mr. POCH (Spain), commenting on the organization of the Committee's work, observed that the United Nations and the Committee itself used five working languages; but to all intents and purposes the Committee was using only one of them, namely English, while the other languages played only a secondary rôle. He hoped that it would be possible to remedy that situation. In view of the large number of Spanish-speaking delegations, he also wondered why there were no Spanish précis-writers. The Spanish translation services were unquestionably efficient, but a paradoxical situation arose in which the Spanish translators had to retranslate into Spanish a summary drafted in English or French.

In addition, there was a delay in circulating the summary records, particularly in Spanish. Moreover, documents appeared in the English version several days before the same texts in the other languages, something that was understandable when the original text was in English, but much less so when the original text was in Spanish, for example. Again, the Sub-Committees normally worked on English texts and the comparative table existed only in English. That situation was a handicap to non-English-speaking delegations. He regretted having to make such comments, but felt that he was obliged to draw attention to that factual situation in the hope that steps would be taken to remedy it.

The CHAIRMAN said that he would contact the Secretariat and do everything possible to satisfy the representative of Spain.

Mr. YANKOV (Bulgaria) thought that the Committee was embarking upon an important stage in its deliberations. He recalled that under the terms of the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, the Committee had the tasks of drawing up draft treaty articles on the international régime applicable to the area and resources of the sea-bed and ocean floor, and the subsoil thereof, beyond the limits of national jurisdiction; and to draw up a complete list of questions bearing on the law of the sea and of draft articles on those questions. It was time for the Committee to make a frank and serious evaluation of the situation. The Conference, which would have to take up highly complex questions, was extremely important for the vast majority of members of the international community, and its success had to be assured. The Committee should therefore do all in its power to facilitate the work of the Conference; in other words, it should not only prepare the documents but also identify the main problems to be considered and indicate the differences

of opinion prevailing on substantive aspects. The Conferences which had given fruitful results, such as the first Conferences on the Law of the Sea, the Vienna Conferences on Diplomatic and Consular Relations and the Conference on the Law of Treaties, had been carefully prepared. The Committee now had a comparative table and a recapitulative list, while interesting proposals had been put before it. It remained for it to identify the principal problems and to find, through negotiation, areas of understanding which would ensure the success of the Conference. It was necessary to give Governments a clear picture of the situation and to take steps to ensure that the Conference would not become yet another committee on the peaceful uses of the sea-bed.

The Committee therefore bore a heavy responsibility. How should it proceed to ensure the success of the Conference? The Chairman had made a number of suggestions which the Bulgarian delegation fully supported. Earlier speakers had also put forward interesting proposals on the procedure to be adopted in their future work. What was most disquieting was the status of the work of Sub-Committee II. In the opinion of his delegation, it would be advisable to organize negotiations. The informal groups of delegations which had made proposals on the same subject might, for instance, be brought together. The aim should be to reconcile points of view in order to submit joint texts and to reduce the number of variants as much as possible. The organization of negotiations was very important, because experience had shown that if such a step were not taken, valuable time was likely to be wasted before the negotiations took place spontaneously. His delegation therefore formally proposed that the Chairman of Sub-Committee II and the Chairman of the Working Group of the Whole should take steps to arrange such negotiations. It would also be useful for the contact groups to meet again under the leadership of the Chairman of the Committee. Past experience showed clearly that such meetings could be useful when the need arose. His delegation therefore formally requested the Chairman to explore the possibility of holding meetings of contact groups as soon as possible, and in any case not later than the beginning of the following week.

Mr. CISSE (Senegal) said that the African Group was concerned about the slow progress of the work and the meagreness of the results obtained. The reason might be that many of the delegations had not yet received the instructions necessary to enter into negotiations with a view to narrowing divergencies of views. His delegation associated itself with the proposals made by the representatives of the USSR, Bulgaria and Uruguay. It supported the idea of convening contact groups under

the chairmanship of Mr. Amerasinghe so as to embark forthwith upon the work of reconciling views as far as possible. The representative of Uruguay had suggested that sub-working groups and negotiating groups should be set up. By doing so, concrete results could be obtained. Without the political will to hold negotiations, the work of the Committee would not produce the results necessary to ensure the success of the Conference.

Mr. ZEGERS (Chile) felt that the Committee was in a delicate situation, as often happened at that stage in international negotiations. His delegation thought that there were good reasons to be both pessimistic and optimistic. The work of preparing the treaty articles had undoubtedly been delayed, particularly in Sub-Committee II. Nevertheless progress had been made on the political plane, in the course of formal and informal discussions which had taken place in the sub-committees. It should not be forgotten, however, that the nature of the Committee was quite different from that of the International Law Commission which had prepared the 1958-1960 Conferences. The Committee was a political and diplomatic organ, and its work had legal and economic aspects as well, but all its members were Government representatives.

It would seem therefore that the Committee would have to envisage two methods of work. It should in the first place draw up treaty articles, but concurrently it should prepare a political foundation for an international solution. Negotiations should therefore be directed towards those two objectives. The Chairman had suggested that contact groups for various regions be brought together, and he had been supported by a number of delegations, in particular the Bulgarian delegation. The global problems which the Conference had to settle could be discussed at those meetings together with the possibility of working out a political basis for an international solution. It was also necessary to find a method of enabling the Sub-Committee to submit drafts of articles to the Conference, in a single text if possible, and in any case with the smallest possible number of variants on each question. What had to be decided was how to organize the work to that end. Sub-Committee II had not yet been able to submit the texts of articles with their alternatives but was already engaged in preparing comparative lists, examining the comparative table that had already been drawn up and amalgamating into one those proposals that had points in common. The Chairman of the Sub-Committee and the Chairman of the Working Group could invite the authors of the proposals to meet together to carry out the work of merging the different proposals. The possibility of setting up small working groups, preceded by consultations between the different delegations, should also be explored.

His delegation thought that it would be useful for the Bureau to meet in order to draw up, in the light of the present discussion procedural proposals for submission to the next plenary meeting. The meeting of the Bureau might take place during the current week.

He congratulated the Secretariat on its work so far, but associated himself with the Spanish representative's comments on Spanish texts.

Mr. GARCES (Colombia) said that his delegation was less pessimistic than that of the USSR with regard to the work accomplished in Sub-Committee II, as it realized the heavy responsibilities borne by that Sub-Committee. The meeting held by the Working Group of Sub-Committee II on 27 July had made it possible to measure the difficulties involved in creating small working groups before the Sub-Committee had reached a consensus on the basis of the comparative table. Colombia was not opposed to the idea of setting up groups of that kind but thought that the important problem was to arrive at a general political agreement. If the formula of small groups was thought to be useful, however, the establishment of such groups by the Committee would have the advantage of making their status unambiguous. His delegation thought it desirable that the Contact Group which, in March/April, had done such good work on the list of subjects and questions, should be re-formed under the leadership of the Chairman of the Committee.

He thanked the Secretariat for the publication of the comparative table. The compilation of draft articles was a difficult task, but it had to be done particularly in the interests of the small delegations which could not attend all the group meetings. Colombia, like Spain, wished to point out to the Secretariat that it had difficulty in following the progress of the work because of the delays in circulating translations and summary records.

Mr. BAKULA (Peru) agreed with the comments made by the representative of Spain on the translations and summary records and said he had noted the assurances given by the Chairman on the subject.

The Chairman had made a statement on working methods which seemed to him highly acceptable. He recalled that Sub-Committee II had decided by consensus that it should work on the basis of the comparative table and of the sequence of questions it had adopted. While he believed that delegations defending similar positions would find it

profitable to establish contact, he had doubts with regard to the creation of informal small groups. He noted that the proposal had not yet found wide support. It might be preferable to keep to the methods which the Sub-Committees had already adopted in the light of their experience; that would at least avoid a procedural debate which would waste time.

Like the Chilean representative, he thought that the Committee should not abide by precedents such as that of the 1958 Conference. The situation was not the same, and it would be illusory to consider it so. The International Law Commission had then been entrusted with the task of drawing up a draft convention. Today a different method would have to be applied in view of the interests at stake. It was not only a question of undertaking a work of codification; what they were witnessing was more in the nature of a confrontation. The differences of opinion were very profound. The Bulgarian representative had just referred to that fact in speaking of the need to fill the gaps that existed. Peru had posed a number of questions in Sub-Committee II which had remained unanswered, that indicated that many delegations were still unable to clarify their positions and hence make it possible to progress with the discussions.

The important need, therefore, was to arrive at a political understanding providing a basis for an international solution, as the Chilean representative had said. He did not believe that any progress could be made in that respect by having recourse to restricted negotiating groups. On the other hand he was in favour of reviving the activities of the contract group or of any other formula which would allow the remaining time to be put to good use.

Mr. ENGO (Cameroon), Chairman of Sub-Committee I, thanked the delegations which had paid tributes to the work of that Sub-Committee.

It was his understanding that the proposal to establish restricted groups was related to questions which did not fall within the competence of Sub-Committee I. If that were not so, the proposal did not seem to him to be appropriate to the present situation; it could be discussed more fruitfully at a later date.

Sir Roger JACKLING (United Kingdom) said that some delays in the progress of the work could give rise to concern in the context of what had to be done in preparation for the Santiago Conference. The United Kingdom delegation was, however, satisfied with the progress made in Sub-Committees I and III and in their Working Groups.

Those bodies appeared to be using sound working methods. Greater difficulties were facing the Chairmen of Sub-Committee II and its Working Group. Nevertheless, the Committee should guard against any exaggeration or panic on the matter. The provisional comparative table of proposals, statements, working documents, etc., relating to the subjects and issues referred to Sub-Committee II, had been distributed very recently, and delegations had had only two or three days to assess its contents.

He did not believe that over-rigorous methods of work should be contemplated. Lengthy procedural discussions had already taken place in Sub-Committee II and its Working Group. It would be better henceforward to leave the choice of the best method of reducing divergencies of views on the draft articles to the good judgment of those bodies. The main requirements in consultation procedures were flexibility and pragmatism.

Mr. WARIOBA (Tanzania) said that he too was somewhat disappointed at the progress of work, but he agreed with the United Kingdom representative that the Committee should not yield to panic. The work of preparing draft articles, which was part of the Committee's terms of reference, was still far from being completed; however, the problem was not merely to prepare drafts - on the contrary, there were too many - but rather to achieve agreed texts on the main questions. The real difficulty was to reach agreement on the substance of those questions, and the solution was not to establish drafting groups or small negotiating groups.

One proposal which had met with some support was aimed at the re-establishment of the contact group. In that connexion, like the representatives of the United Kingdom and Cameroon, he favoured a flexible approach. Each of the Sub-Committees had already discussed its procedure. Negotiations on the substance had already been started in Sub-Committee I; in Sub-Committee II, some measure of agreement had already been achieved on 27 July concerning the manner of proceeding with negotiations. Sub-Committee III was conducting various stages of its work concurrently. It would therefore be preferable to leave the Sub-Committees free to choose their methods of work and see what they could achieve. If it was decided to re-establish the contact group, that should at least await the moment when adequate negotiations on the substance had led to some result. The contact group should not meet without knowing exactly what questions it was to study.

Mr. MOORE (United States of America) agreed with the Chairman that the Committee's main task was to prepare draft texts - agreed texts or variants - for the Conference. He also agreed with several previous speakers that means should be sought of making more rapid progress in that task. But progress had already been made: a number of draft articles had been submitted, a comparative table had just been distributed, recapitulating the questions under study by Sub-Committee II, and the discussions in the three Sub-Committees had rendered progress on some subjects possible.

It was mainly in Sub-Committee II that work should be speeded up. The United States delegation had already stated that it was in favour of establishing restricted groups to discuss certain matters referred to that Sub-Committee. Among the proposals put forward at the present meeting to speed up the work, he supported the notion of re-establishing the contact group, which had proved very useful in March and April. The meetings of that group, however, should in no way hamper the Sub-Committees in their work. Rather, it should simply constitute an unofficial framework within which ways of speeding up the work in the next four weeks could be sought.

The CHAIRMAN noted that a mass of documents - draft texts, proposals, comparative tables, etc. - had already been submitted. As had been stated, the Committee should not yield to panic but should study ways of reaching agreement more quickly. In that connexion, the authors of texts and proposals should not work in isolation; on the contrary, they should hold unofficial meetings. He hoped that the Chairmen of the Sub-Committees would organize such meetings.

He agreed that the contact group should be re-established, and was gratified that there had already been broad support for that proposal. The group had done good work in preparing a list of subjects. He also agreed, however, that it should not hamper the Sub-Committees. He would request the geographical groups to nominate the members of the contact group and would consult the Chairmen of the Sub-Committees on the matters which it should discuss in order to reach political solutions.

In his view, it was only then that restricted consultative groups should meet. He would raise the matter at the meeting of the officers of the Committee and Sub-Committees to be held on Thursday, 2 August, and would report the results to the Committee on Monday, 6 August.

He suggested that Mr. Rodrigo Valdez, Secretary-General of the South Pacific Permanent Commission, should be invited to speak.

It was so decided.

Mr. VALDEZ (Secretary-General, Permanent Commission for the South Pacific), thanked the Chairman and the members of the Committee for having invited him to speak. His organization, set up by Chile, Ecuador and Peru, worked for the conservation and rational exploitation of the marine resources of those three countries. It had already been invited to take part in the Conferences on the Law of the Sea held in Geneva in 1958 and 1960, and it was represented at the annual meetings of the FAO Committee on Fisheries and the biennial Conferences of FAO.

The Permanent Commission worked in close contact with official fisheries research institutes in the three countries. It had published technical works, in particular on the varieties of fish found along the coasts of Chile, Ecuador and Peru and on the maritime laws of those countries.

The South Pacific countries provided a specific example of what international co-operation could do for the rational exploitation of the resources of the sea, scientific research and the conservation of the marine environment. Those three countries had large fish catches - more than 13 million tons in 1971, or 18.8 per cent of the world catch.

It would soon be 21 years since the Governments of Chile, Ecuador and Peru had adopted, at Santiago, the declaration extending their exclusive sovereignty to a limit of 200 miles. That declaration had been recognized as having had an historic effect on the development of the law of the sea. The adoption of the 200-mile limit had therefore not been an arbitrary act. It had been decided upon by the Government of Chile, Ecuador and Peru principally to fulfil their obligation of providing their peoples with the necessary means of economic development. In so doing, they had acted on the basis of scientific considerations: the effect of the Pacific anti-cyclone, the movement of currents and counter-currents, particularly the Humboldt current, the related formation of mineral and organic elements giving rise to phytoplankton and zooplankton, the presence of a great many varieties of fish in areas where the phytoplankton and zooplankton developed into veritable marine pastures, and other considerations. In particular, bio-ecological research in the Humboldt current had shown that from September to March, large quantities of various species of fish abounded in the current, while a great many varieties moved beyond the 200-mile limit between April and August; the coastal States therefore had to protect those varieties against over-exploitation by foreign fleets, which had, for example, led to the virtual extinction of whales.

He also emphasized the economic importance of fishing and the fishing industries, which provided a living for more than half a million people in Peru, Ecuador and Chile. In particular, the fishmeal industry in Peru -- the most important in the world employed 27,000 people. Fishing products accounted for almost one-third of Peru's export earnings.

The aim of Ecuador's five-year plan for the transformation and development of fisheries was the exploitation of fish resources with a view to improving the nutrition of the people and developing its foreign trade.

In Chile, fishing activities had developed satisfactorily and the fishing catch of the Chilean fleet, which could reach 1,500,000 tons, was the ninth largest in the world. The Chilean fishmeal industry was the third largest in the world and the Government had recently made considerable efforts to improve fish prospecting.

The co-ordinated policies of the three Pacific States and the activity of a tripartite consultative and research body had made possible phenomenal progress in the sphere of fishing. At the same time, those States had adopted legislative measures to protect the marine environment in the areas within their national jurisdiction, and the Permanent Commission had consistently provided support in the struggle against marine pollution. The countries of the Andean Group had studied the preparation of basic plans to develop small-scale and industrial fishing.

FAO statistics showed that the world fish catch in 1953 had amounted to 25,700,000 tons, of which the Pacific countries had accounted for 264,000 tons, or 1 per cent. In 1971, the world catch had amounted to 69,400,000 tons, of which the South Pacific countries had accounted for 13 million tons, or 18.8 per cent.

From the commercial point of view exports of marine products from Chile, Ecuador and Peru had risen from 31,000 tons in 1953 to 2,300,000 tons in 1971, or from 1.4 to 29.5 per cent of world exports. In the sphere of industry, those three countries had provided 50.4 per cent of processed fish products in 1971.

Those figures bore eloquent testimony to the extraordinary development achieved by those three countries since their adoption of the 200-mile limit. It had strengthened their economies, provided employment for thousands, raised the standard of living of their peoples and helped to feed others throughout the world.

The Permanent Commission for the South Pacific would continue to co-operate actively in efforts to ensure that the fishing resources of the world's seas were used more effectively for the benefit of mankind.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.