

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-FOURTH SESSION

Official Records



**FIRST COMMITTEE, 1675th
MEETING**

Monday, 3 November 1969,
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Tribute to the memory of Dato Mohamed Ismail bin Mohamed Yusof, Permanent Representative of Malaysia to the United Nations, and Mr. Akili B. C. Danieli, Permanent Representative of the United Republic of Tanzania to the United Nations	1
Agenda item 32: Question of the reservation exclusively for peaceful purposes of the sea-bed and the ocean floor, and the subsoil thereof, underlying the high seas beyond the limits of present national jurisdiction, and the use of their resources in the interests of mankind: report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction (continued)	3

Chairman: Mr. Agha SHAHI (Pakistan).

Tribute to the memory of Dato Mohamed Ismail bin Mohamed Yusof, Permanent Representative of Malaysia to the United Nations, and Mr. Akili B. C. Danieli, Permanent Representative of the United Republic of Tanzania to the United Nations

1. The CHAIRMAN: It is with deep sorrow that I draw attention to the news of the untimely death of two Permanent Representatives to the United Nations. We have been shocked by the sudden loss of two distinguished colleagues: His Excellency Dato Mohamed Ismail bin Mohamed Yusof of Malaysia and His Excellency Akili B. C. Danieli of the United Republic of Tanzania.

2. I am sure that members of the Committee would wish me to express to the delegations of Malaysia and Tanzania our deep condolences, and to ask them to convey to their Governments and the families of the deceased our expressions of grief and sympathy.

3. Dato Ismail and Akili Danieli were two of the most valuable and highly regarded members of our brotherhood. Their death diminishes all of us. I would ask members of the Committee to rise and observe a minute of silence in tribute to their memory.

The members of the Committee observed a minute of silence.

4. Mr. MUGO (Kenya): My delegation has learned with great shock and a deep sense of sorrow of the untimely death of Ambassador Danieli of the United Republic of Tanzania. Mr. Danieli has been associated with the work of the United Nations for five years. Before he came to the United Nations he served his country with great distinction

in the Ministry of External Affairs and in the Ministry of Defence as well as in the President's office. Mr. Danieli was devoted to his duty and, as you are all aware, he was suddenly taken ill while carrying out his duties within this building. Mr. Danieli will be remembered for his cool temperament and the dignified manner in which he carried himself, both privately and publicly. He was a man of great integrity and the fine qualities he displayed won him the admiration, respect and friendship of his colleagues. His death is a great loss not only to Tanzania but to Africa, to the international community and, in particular, to Kenya, because of our close and fraternal relationship with Tanzania. On behalf of my delegation and the African group, we ask the Tanzanian delegation to convey our deepest sympathy to his bereaved family, to the Government and people of Tanzania.

5. My delegation has also learned of the sudden death of Ambassador Ismail of Malaysia. Ambassador Ismail, who was well known to all of us here, was a man who worked with great distinction, not only for his country but for the cause of mankind and peace. On behalf of my delegation, and the African Group, I extend condolences to his family and to the Government and the people of Malaysia.

6. Mr. KHANACHET (Kuwait) (*translated from French*): It was with profound sorrow that we heard this morning of the premature death of two very dear colleagues, Mr. Akili Danieli of the United Republic of Tanzania and Mr. Mohamed Ismail of Malaysia, with whom we worked for a number of years in the cause of the United Nations.

7. For those of us who knew both personally, our sadness is as deep as the sympathy we feel for their families, their peoples and their countries. For those of us who knew the dedication and the sincerity with which these two great men devoted themselves to the service of their country and the service of mankind, there is nothing we can do except express the deep grief that we feel and to say how much we regret their departure, which is an irreparable loss to the United Nations. Their integrity and intelligence, and the feelings of human brotherhood they constantly displayed both in their personal and official relations, made them win the sympathy, respect and esteem of all their colleagues.

8. On behalf of the Asian group, whom I have the sad honour to represent on this painful occasion, I ask the delegations of the United Republics of Tanzania and Malaysia to transmit to the families of the deceased and to the peoples of their country, as well as to their Government, our sincere condolences and our deepest sympathy.

9. Mr. JACKMAN (Barbados): I should like to be associated with the expressions of condolence which have been made by yourself and by the representatives of Kenya and

Kuwait on the sudden and unexpected death of two of our dear colleagues. I should like to speak, not only on behalf of my own delegation, but also on behalf of the other Latin American delegations over whom I have the honour to preside in their capacity as a Latin American group.

10. For Barbados, in particular, there is the sad fact to record that both these colleagues were bound to us through the sometimes ambiguous but always friendly ties of the Commonwealth. Certainly, in the work of this Organization for which my delegation and the group of which I have the honour to be the current President have the highest regard.

11. I should like to take this opportunity to request that the delegations of Malaysia and Tanzania convey to the families and Governments of our colleagues our deepest and most sincere sympathy at their passing.

12. Mr. PAVICEVIĆ (Yugoslavia): Allow me, in the name of the Yugoslav delegation to extend our deepest and most sincere condolences to the delegation of friendly Tanzania on the death of Ambassador Danieli. It is an irreparable loss for the people and Government of Tanzania, for Africa and for the international community.

13. My delegation would also like to express its deepest condolences to the delegation of Malaysia on the death of Ambassador Mohamed Ismail, a very prominent representative of Malaysia and a prominent figure in international life.

14. Mr. ÅSTRÖM (Sweden): We have all learned with shock and deep sorrow of the sudden deaths of Ambassador Danieli of Tanzania and Ambassador Ismail of Malaysia. These are sad tidings for all of us in the United Nations, for the colleagues of these two outstanding representatives.

15. May I, personally, as well as on behalf of the group of Western European and other countries, express these feelings and ask the delegation of Tanzania to be good enough to convey our most sincere condolences to his Government and to the family of Ambassador Danieli; we also ask the delegation of Malaysia to express our condolences to the family of Ambassador Ismail, and to the Government and people of Malaysia.

16. May I add a personal word? We of the Swedish delegation learned to know Ambassador Danieli extremely well, not only because of the relations between our countries, but also because he was the Chairman of the Social Committee of the Economic and Social Council. We mourn his death deeply.

17. Mr. AMERASINGHE (Ceylon): I would like to speak for Ceylon, in addition to the representatives who have spoken on behalf of the Asian group. I do so for a very special reason. It was with a deep sense of grief that the delegation of Ceylon heard the sad news of the sudden and untimely deaths of our two colleagues, Ambassador Ismail of Malaysia and Ambassador Danieli of the United Republic of Tanzania. They were close and dear friends of mine, and apart from that, they were colleagues for whom I had an especial regard and esteem. Ambassador Danieli was also the Vice-Chairman of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed. In that capacity, I was always able to rely on his unfailing co-operation. We shall miss him very much

in that Committee. I ask you, Mr. Chairman, to convey to the delegations of Malaysia and the United Republic of Tanzania our sense of deep sympathy with them in their loss.

18. Mr. ARORA (India): My delegation is grieved and shocked at the passing away of two distinguished and great ambassadors, Ambassador Ismail of Malaysia and Ambassador Danieli of the United Republic of Tanzania. The representative of Kuwait has already expressed on behalf of the Asian countries our sentiments on this sad occasion. My delegation would like to join with other delegations in conveying our sincerest condolences to the families of Ambassador Ismail of Malaysia and Ambassador Danieli of the United Republic of Tanzania and to their delegations and Governments.

19. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary): We have learned with deep grief the sad news of the untimely passing away of Ambassador Danieli of the United Republic of Tanzania and Ambassador Ismail of Malaysia. It is a great loss for the United Nations, for their families and for their countries. Both of them were very talented and active diplomats in many Commissions of the Organization. We have lost in them not only good colleagues but excellent friends as well. May I join the speakers before me on behalf of the socialist countries, including Hungary, in expressing our condolences, and request that they be forwarded through their delegations to the Governments of the two countries and to their peoples.

20. Mr. EL-ERIAN (United Arab Republic): The representative of Kenya has already expressed the feelings of the African group. I should like to add my voice, not only because Ambassador Danieli of Tanzania and Ambassador Ismail of Malaysia were great representatives of two countries with whom we have close, cordial and brotherly relations, but because I have personally worked with those two distinguished and esteemed sons of the United Nations. The United Nations family has today lost two distinguished members. You have already expressed our deep sorrow for this sudden loss, Mr. Chairman. I should like to ask the delegations of Tanzania and Malaysia to convey to their Governments and to the families of the two distinguished representatives our condolences, our grief and our sympathy.

21. Mr. PHILLIPS (United States of America): I should simply like to add our profound sense of shock and our sense of loss over the untimely passing of those two distinguished colleagues about whom so much has properly been said this afternoon. Ambassador Danieli of the United Republic of Tanzania and Ambassador Ismail of Malaysia are no longer with us. That is a hard thing to understand when one remembers that it seems just a few days ago that they were seated beside us at a table similar to this one. Their passing is a loss to all of us, many of whom counted those two colleagues as close personal friends. I would merely ask you again, Mr. Chairman, to convey on behalf of my delegation the very profound sense of loss and sorrow that we feel to the Governments of the two countries concerned, but more especially to the families of our two former colleagues.

22. Mr. MEHDI (Pakistan): The representative of Kuwait has already fully articulated the sense of grief that we feel

in Asia at this untimely loss. My delegation would like to associate itself with the condolences that have been expressed at the sad and untimely deaths of Ambassador Ismail and Ambassador Danieli. Through you, Mr. Chairman, we would like to request the delegations of Malaysia and Tanzania to convey to the bereaved families and to their Governments our sincerest condolences and most profound sense of grief.

23. Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY (United Republic of Tanzania): The grief of my delegation was compounded in the last 24 hours when we received the news of the passing of Ambassador Ismail of Malaysia. It was a terrible shock to our delegation because we did not know of his illness. We felt that somehow the Afro-Asian world was doomed to some special visitation. We sincerely hope that if indeed there is any truth in a hereafter, and if those of us in the Afro-Asian world should have to endure some of the inconveniences in that hereafter that we endure today in the present world, then the task of those two eminent gentlemen will continue. It is clear then that their work is unfinished.

24. We should like to express our sincere gratitude to our colleagues who have expressed their sympathy to our delegation and who have tendered their condolences to the family of Ambassador Danieli and to the delegation and Government of the United Republic of Tanzania. We shall apprise our Government of the sincerity and depth of these feelings and we hope that we shall be able to continue in the spirit in which Ambassador Danieli would have wished. If there is any consolation in these very difficult times, our delegation and Government might feel emboldened to say that Mr. Danieli, like a good soldier, fell in the line of duty on the field of battle, and that he fell within these hallowed halls where we carry out the business of the United Nations.

25. Mr. HASHIM (Malaysia): On behalf of the Malaysian delegation I should like to express our gratitude to you, Mr. Chairman, and to all the speakers who expressed their deep sympathy and condolences on the death of our late ambassador, His Excellency Dato Mohamed Ismail bin Mohamed Yusof, Permanent Representative to the United Nations and High Commissioner to Canada. My delegation will convey the expressions of sympathy and condolences to the family of the late Dato Mohamed Ismail and to the Government and people of Malaysia.

26. I should also like to take this opportunity to express our sincere condolences to the delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania on its loss in the sudden death of His Excellency Ambassador Akili B. C. Danieli. We should like, through the delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania, to convey the deep grief and sorrow of the delegation of Malaysia, as well as of its Government and people, to the family of the late Ambassador Danieli and to the Government and people of the United Republic of Tanzania.

27. The CHAIRMAN: On behalf of the Committee, I thank the delegations of Malaysia and the United Republic of Tanzania for agreeing to convey to their respective Governments and to the families of our departed colleagues the expressions of sorrow by representatives who have spoken. It is truly poignant to think that when we turn our

eyes towards the seats of Malaysia and Tanzania in the United Nations we shall never again see the faces of our two friends and comrades.

AGENDA ITEM 32

Question of the reservation exclusively for peaceful purposes of the sea-bed and the ocean floor, and the subsoil thereof, underlying the high seas beyond the limits of present national jurisdiction, and the use of their resources in the interests of mankind: report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction (continued) (A/7622 and Corr.1, A/C.1/L.473)

28. Mr. ENGO (Cameroon): Mr. Chairman, as this is the first time that I take the floor in this Committee, I ask your indulgence for adding my voice in support of all the compliments which have been paid to you and the Bureau. If I do not give a fuller expression to our sense of appreciation and reassurance for the leadership which you have provided and continue to provide to this Committee, it is to your request for brevity that I respond. This Committee must be congratulated for choosing you.

29. Before turning to speak on the subject-matter before this Committee, my delegation wishes to share fully in the condolences which the representatives of Kenya, as well as others have offered on their own behalf to the families, Governments and peoples of Tanzania and Malaysia on the loss of the Permanent Representatives of these two countries with whom my country shares special bonds of fraternal friendship. It is a sad experience for us, representatives of young nations, to lose any of the few upon whom the task of national reconstruction and international co-operation depends. It is even more painful when those who depart are comparatively young. For each of us there is always also a reaffirmation of the great risks that we must face; yet our courage is and must be strong. The privilege of service during a time of maximum need for our recently emancipated nations is too challenging, too rewarding. We gladly continue to apply ourselves and to make our small and at times supreme sacrifices. The late ambassadors recognized this fact. We wish to join in the expressions of sorrow for the irreparable loss which Asia and Africa have suffered. I ask you, Mr. Chairman, to convey our condolences to the respective delegations.

Mr. Kolo (Nigeria), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

30. In welcoming the report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction—for convenience I shall hereafter refer to this merely as the Committee on the Sea-Bed—the Cameroon delegation wishes to express its deep appreciation to that Committee's Rapporteur and to its Chairman for the valuable introductory comments that they made here last Friday [1673rd meeting]. We are satisfied that the report [A/7622 and Corr.1] is a true reflection of the deliberations of the Committee. We have, on previous occasions, seized available opportunities to express our gratitude and felicitations to the various Chairmen, Vice-Chairmen and Rapporteurs of the main and Sub-Committees. We reiterate and reaffirm those sentiments now.

31. We cannot fail to note with some satisfaction the valuable report on international machinery that was submitted by the Secretary-General [ibid., annex III]. A serious document, it has succeeded in provoking the necessary thought and fruitful discussion out of which some meaningful results must eventually emerge.

32. The Committee's report refers to a recommendation [A/7622 and Corr.1, Part One, para. 19] that the Secretary-General be requested to prepare a complementary study touching upon the vital questions of the status, structure, functions and powers of the proposed international machinery. We endorse this recommendation and hope that the study will also recognize certain fundamental ideas which must assume, for this particular purpose, a character of qualified *jus cogens*. Among these are its international character; its separate legal personality; its jurisdiction over the uses of the area of the sea-bed beyond the limits of national jurisdiction; an exclusive power to regulate, co-ordinate, supervise and control all activities relating to the exploration and exploitation of the resources therein; the desirability for States to pursue their duty to co-operate with one another and with the régime, pursuant to the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, and in furtherance of the quest for peace; and finally, the deployment of benefits accruing therefrom to meet the pressing needs of the entire human family. In this spirit, special consideration must be given to the interests and needs of the developing countries in contemporary history.

33. Previous speakers have attempted to outline the areas of agreement and disagreement on the issues involved in the historic task with which our generation is currently seized. The synthesis provided by the report gives some guidance in this respect. It does not and cannot, however, fully explain the divergence of views on the legal, economic and political philosophies which underlie the facts contained in it. I wish, therefore, to state with maximum clarity the ideas of my delegation, not merely for the purpose of the record, but in the hope of providing further food for thought.

34. My delegation attaches considerable importance to the subject-matter of peace in general, and consequently to the exceptionally vital question of the peaceful uses of the sea-bed and ocean floor. From time immemorial man has explored the forests, climbed the mountains and ruthlessly exploited the resources of the earth to such an extent that dense forests have crumbled and disappeared, yielding place to desolation and desert. The area under discussion here was for centuries cut off from mankind by the frightening vastness of the oceans above it. It was not until comparatively recently that oceanography, as such, became a subject of curiosity and interest to scientists and technologists. We are now called upon to consider the implication of its emergence at a time when the not inconsiderable and incalculable advantages to mankind of the resources of the oceans is becoming more and more obvious. Science and technology continue to open new vistas of knowledge, offering man a larger reservoir of resources to meet many of his needs.

35. We believe that our generation is particularly fortunate. A quarter of a century ago, scientists and sociologists exposed the grimness of the plight of man whose numbers

increased at a rate which was out of balance with his ability to produce sufficient resources to maintain his welfare. We were told that the rate of population increase, enhanced by the life-preserving discoveries of medical science, would eventually reach disastrous proportions if an effort was not made to increase food production to meet the challenge. Others have pointed to the fact of man's limited available resources on the land. In the meantime, young countries emerged as the sun began to set on colonialism and kindred institutions. Their drive for national and continental development, as well as for social and economic justice, presented new problems, further increasing the danger of new forms of domination from without.

36. Our generation has been quick to realize its problems. We have declared meaningful peace and well-being to be the main aspiration of man today. Realistically, we have declared our intention to work for the principles and purposes enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, determined "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war". We have generated the spirit which launched the programmes of the United Nations development decades. We have also recognized, through our laws and within our universal thought, the duty of States to co-operate with the United Nations, as well as with one another to achieve their ends. Although far from satisfactory or effective, international co-operation is becoming an accepted institution.

37. The needs of the so-called developing world pose the greatest challenge to this Organization in particular, and to all mankind in general. Recognizing from the lessons of history, contemporary and ancient, that under-development is the most fertile breeding ground for avaricious ambition and conspiracy—two effective agents for breaches of the peace—we have, at least verbally, declared our determination to work together for the welfare of these young countries.

38. The big problem has been the source of human and material resources to meet the programmes involved. In the nature of things, the developed world has been called upon to bear a substantial part of the burden. From year to year we have been told of their difficulties in the light of their respective domestic and other declared priorities. We cannot always pass judgement on the arguments presented. Suffice it to say that it has been impossible, upon solicitation, to receive the substantial contributions necessary to meet realistically the problems of the developing world; this despite the fact that the resources of these young nations have given unreciprocated sustenance to the booming industries and economies of the so-called developed countries.

39. The great potential of the seas, the sea-bed and the ocean floor, revealed to us by science and technology, should kindle new hopes and new aspirations in modern international society. The area of the sea-bed and the ocean floor is so vast, it is larger than the land area available to man for his activities. It is fortunate, we believe, that, in the process and with the spread of imperialism, no nation embarked on the colonization of this vast area. It may therefore prove to be a blessing to mankind as a whole at a time when the need for new resources for production is most pressing. That this area shall not be the subject of

acquisition and appropriation by any nation is a fact that no one here seems to dispute. The accepted use of the expression “beyond the limits of national jurisdiction” is in itself an acknowledgement of this criterion.

40. A strong case clearly exists for establishing an international machinery most suited to respond to the needs of this age. This case is based partly on the expressed aspirations of our generation, partly on a realistic look at the forces most provocative to breaches of international peace, partly on the concept of universal justice, and partly on the very potentials of the marine environment—potentials in the economic, political and military fields.

41. President Lyndon B. Johnson of the United States of America recognized this when he declared: “We must be careful to avoid a race to grab and to hold the lands under the high seas.” He upheld the concept of an area—that is, the sea-bed and the ocean floor and the sub-soil thereof—preserved as a “legacy for all human beings”. We do not believe that President Johnson meant, nor did the mandate of General Assembly resolution 2467 A (XXIII) intend, that emphasis was merely to be placed on “seeking ways to promote exploration and exploitation of the sea-bed resources”—to quote from the statement of Ambassador Phillips of the United States of America at the Committee’s plenary meeting on August 29, 1969 [see A/C.138/SR.10]

42. In trying to avoid the discouragement, delay and prevention of the exploration and exploitation of these resources, which the learned representative of the United States decried, we must recognize that it is far more urgent for us to work out meaningful arrangements which will ensure that, when activities or operations commence, the overriding consideration must be the benefit of mankind as a whole, with due regard of course to the needs and interests of the members of the human family which are, at present, most vulnerable to breaches of international peace.

43. The facts of the arms race and belligerency in the contemporary world are also part of that case. Any existence or contemplation of treaties, either to prohibit the emplacement of nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction, or to ban military activities in the area, are only a part of the general conditions conducive to the promotion of the peaceful exploration and exploitation of the area for the benefit of mankind. The delay that we must avoid is not in the commencement of activities but in the setting up of an international machinery which will enjoy full jurisdiction over the area, exercising, on behalf of all mankind without discrimination, the right to control, regulate, co-ordinate and supervise all activities therein.

44. The revolt of youth in our times—even if some may consider the form of the expression of its concern to be ill advised—appears to me to be an attempt to ensure that the activities of the adults of today do not unduly ruin youth’s future prospects for survival. Like youth, the international community has a stake in the future of the area of the sea-bed and ocean floor.

45. If we are to avoid *faits accomplis*, which may well hamper the realization of our aspirations, we must immediately

(a) Prohibit any form of activities in the area, pending the incorporation of an effective international machinery. States are still free to operate, in the meantime, over areas within their own national jurisdiction;

(b) Establish the machinery that will exercise, respectively, jurisdiction and control over the area and activities therein.

46. Another aspect of the case relates to what we mentioned earlier. Considering the limited sources of revenue and other resources to meet the demands of the programmes envisaged under the Second United Nations Development Decade, especially those relating to the urgent needs of the developing countries, it is clear that the area of the sea-bed provides perhaps the greatest and most reliable source of the essential materials for development and peace. With such machinery it would be possible to provide an appropriate and equitable application of the benefits to be derived to the long-term needs of the entire human community.

47. Is it not a strange paradox that a generation whose enterprise brought about the successful conquest of space, which has at its command the means of eradicating disease, ignorance, poverty and the like, which has full knowledge and experience of these dangers and also of warfare—is it not a paradox that this generation is the slowest in history to take effective steps to enhance the general well-being of man?

48. Nationalism is an outdated phenomenon. It led to the destruction of nations, empires and kingdoms, and, in practically every case in history, it was caused by a failure of rulers or leaders to recognize the course of history and the only remedy for man’s survival. Selfish policies emerged from selfish individuals within nations. Is it not true that the fall of nations and empires throughout history was occasioned not by conquest from without, but by factors of short-sightedness and illusion from within?

49. As the age of science and technology opens before us, providing new hope and new challenges in the areas of outer space and the sea-bed and ocean floor, let us not allow a great opportunity to elude us. Let us realize our declared determination not only “to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which . . . has brought untold sorrow to mankind” but also “to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom”. Here lies an answer to the frightening tremors caused by war; here lies the means to establish the true dignity of man; here lies an opportunity to strengthen the international machinery for effecting the desirable promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples and of all nations, large and small. The status, structure, functions and powers of the proposed machinery must be guided by those factors.

50. The nature of the general debate here makes it undesirable to indulge in detailed analysis of the various aspects of the economic and legal problems involved in the consideration of this item. As a member of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction, my delegation will have further opportunity to participate fully in this

historic effort. We have so far outlined, in general terms, our view of the nature of the problems facing this generation, as well as the shape the international machinery should take.

51. We consider most important the reservation of the sea-bed exclusively for peaceful purposes and the principle that the area and its resources are the common heritage of all mankind. Out of these flow various consequences, *inter alia*, the creation of an international machinery to hold this heritage in trust for all mankind; the prohibition of acquisition of territory or any rights inconsistent with this, and the role of international law and the rule of law in the area, to ensure the attainment of declared international objectives and even to accelerate economic and social growth in the world.

52. We wish to conclude with a brief reference to certain other fundamental ideas which we consider to be of the utmost importance: first, we are of the view that it is in the common interest of all that the exploration, conservation, exploitation and use of the sea-bed and its resources shall be pursued in a manner that respects other legitimate rights and the interests of nations generally and of those adjoining the area.

53. Second, recognizing the threat to the marine environment presented by pollution and other hazards which could or might result from such activities, steps must be taken to prevent marine pollution and such other hazards harmful to living and other resources of the sea-bed and coastal regions.

54. Third, we encourage and strongly support the organization of long-range training programmes which will enable the young developing countries not only to participate effectively in, but also to contribute to, the task assigned to the international machinery. That will also help build knowledge and experience which would strengthen and make more meaningful the achievement of independence and freedom by the people of those nations.

55. Fourth, all nations shall be entitled to participate on an equal footing in the machinery itself.

56. Fifth, recognizing that, at the initial stages, only certain developed countries will have the resources necessary for investment and exploitation, we are of the view that their participation should be controlled so as not to prejudice the entry of other nations as they attain such capabilities. We encourage participation, however, by all who are able, and we endorse the principle of a fair return for investors and adequate remuneration to concerns engaged in operations. However, these should be established by procedures and principles worked out in advance and equally applicable to all.

57. Sixth, the survival of the United Nations should be borne in mind. We feel that a certain percentage of the revenue derived must be allocated to increase the resources of the United Nations.

58. Seventh, we share the view that different criteria should be established for research on the one hand and actual exploration and exploitation on the other. The

former is of such importance that it should not be unduly restricted.

59. Finally, special care must be taken to ensure that operations and other activities in connexion with the sea-bed do not result in disrupting national economic and social efforts, especially those of the developing nations. They should, in fact, complement rather than disrupt them. In this sphere, international trade and practices should be regulated in such a way that this will be ensured. Indeed, we must not allow the effects of actions and activities in this new area to defeat, directly or indirectly, those great aspirations and human ideals to which we have declared our dedication.

60. Mr. GAUCI (Malta): Since I have not had the opportunity to refer to this matter before, please allow me briefly, Mr. Chairman, to express, with heartfelt sympathy, our feelings for the people of Yugoslavia and Tunisia concerning the recent disasters from which their countries have suffered. It is perhaps symbolic of our closeness to the peoples of these two countries that Malta itself felt, though in a much smaller way, the ravages of the same natural disasters.

61. We also share the sympathy which you, Sir, expressed so well to the delegations of Tanzania and Malaysia concerning the sad news we heard today. I consider myself privileged to have been associated in a common cause with these outstanding personalities, whom we shall never forget.

62. Two years have elapsed since the delegation of Malta submitted the item before us to the General Assembly¹ with a plea for urgent action. At that time, my delegation, *inter alia*, sought a declaration that the sea-bed and ocean floor beyond the limits of national jurisdiction are a common heritage of mankind, and suggested the early elaboration of principles for the exploration, conservation, use and exploitation of this area, principles which would form the basis of an international treaty or treaties to be negotiated with all deliberate speed.

63. These objectives are, unfortunately, still far from being realized. However, the report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction [A/7622 and Corr.1] provides us with an opportunity to evaluate the progress made so far and to determine whether this progress has kept pace with the needs of a rapidly developing situation. It also provides us with a valuable indication of priorities for our future work.

64. A representative international forum now exists where the question can be considered as a whole, and where different or alternative approaches to stated objectives can receive careful analysis. Many of the products of the Committee's work, particularly the studies prepared by the Secretariat, are of great interest and have served an important educational function. Concepts have been clarified, though not yet precisely defined, options have been narrowed, and some areas of agreement have emerged.

¹ Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-second Session, Annexes, agenda item 92, document A/6695.

65. On the economic side, the existence beyond the geological continental shelf of potentially vast resources on and under the sea-bed, ridiculed outside these halls by some respected spokesmen two years ago, is being confirmed almost daily by actual exploration, and technology for the exploitation of these resources is advancing with giant strides.

66. It may perhaps be useful to recall the areas of agreement or rather, to use the words of the Committee's report, the common denominators reached and reproduced in the report. In the first place, the Committee accepted that there is an area of the sea-bed and ocean floor which lies beyond the limits of national jurisdiction. Secondly, there is agreement that this area shall not be subject to national appropriation, and that no State shall exercise or claim sovereignty or sovereign rights over any part of it. Thirdly, it is accepted that there exist principles and norms of international law which apply to the sea-bed beyond national jurisdiction, although, of course, there is no agreement on the extent of their application or on whether they apply to exploration and exploitation activities. Fourthly, all are agreed that the area should be reserved for peaceful purposes. Fifthly, there is agreement on the need to establish an international régime and on the use of the resources of the area for the benefit of mankind, irrespective of the geographical situation of States, taking into account the special needs and interests of developing countries.

67. Other common denominators are that freedom of scientific research shall be assured to all without discrimination; that States shall promote international co-operation in this field; and that there shall be no interference with fundamental scientific research carried out with the intention of open publication. Finally, all concur in the concept of reasonable regard for the interests of all States, non-infringement of the freedoms of the high seas, non-interference in the exercise of these freedoms, and the need for the adoption of appropriate safeguards against the dangers of ocean pollution.

68. As regards the peaceful uses of the sea-bed, not only has there been agreement on this principle, but there has also been action in the form of a draft treaty which constitutes a useful first step in a long and difficult process.

69. These are, undoubtedly, all positive elements which reflect the interest of the international community in the sea-bed and ocean floor beyond national jurisdiction. Hopefully, what we have achieved so far represents the dawn of an international consensus on the utilization of more than half our planet for the benefit of all.

70. Nevertheless, the value of the progress achieved is somewhat diminished by the reservations and conflicting interpretations mentioned in the report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction, concerning several of the common denominators I have just enumerated. Furthermore, serious consideration of the basic underlying problems which constitute an obstacle to our progress has not yielded definitive results.

71. These problems bear restating. They are as follows. First, what basic concept should govern the exploration,

use and exploitation of the sea-bed beyond national jurisdiction: the traditional concept of the freedom of the seas, or the new concept of common heritage? Whatever the answer, and our own position is well known, from the elucidation of basic concepts it should be possible to proceed to a generally acceptable declaration of principles. Secondly, what are the requirements for an equitable régime for the sea-bed beyond national jurisdiction which will promote the peaceful development of the area; preserve, as far as possible, the integrity of the environment; result in significant benefit to all countries, particularly poor countries; and, at the same time, not have unacceptable consequences for present or potential, military or economic, power positions? A careful analysis of this problem should enable us to identify with greater precision the type of international régime we must construct, the form of international machinery required, and the minimum parameters of competence and authority of such international machinery.

72. Of particular importance in the examination of questions of régime and machinery is the careful consideration of the problem of how, in view of the often conflicting interests of States, to ensure their impartiality, and how to ensure the effectiveness of the machinery in responding to the divergent needs of Member States and in coping with the novel problems with which it will be faced. The wider the powers and responsibilities allotted to any international machinery, the more crucial it becomes to ensure, as far as is humanly possible, both efficiency of action and a decision-making process that truly takes into account the interests of all. In this search, precedents already established within the United Nations system are not necessarily always entirely relevant.

73. Finally, we must decide upon the extent of the area to which the international régime we hope to construct will apply. This is a point on which I should like to make a few observations to clarify the draft resolution submitted last Friday. It would not be appropriate for me to review the substantive aspects of the question of the limits of the sea-bed area subject to national jurisdiction, since this might divert attention from subjects of more immediate interest. My present concern is to emphasize again, as we repeatedly have done at the meetings of the Sea-Bed Committee that it is becoming very urgent to commence serious consideration of the question of establishing clear, precise and internationally acceptable limits to the area of the sea-bed beyond national jurisdiction if we wish to preserve this area and its resources from encroachments that are clearly inconsistent with the interests of all mankind.

74. We do not have much time to take action because the practice of an increasing number of States in extending their jurisdiction, in the form of licensing of exploration activities, at great and increasing distance from their coasts, is rapidly diminishing the effective options available to us at the United Nations. The action taken by those States is understandable since they are only responding to multiple pressures to which no coastal country, including mine, can remain indefinitely indifferent if vital national interests are to be protected.

75. The immediate reason for those extensions of national jurisdiction to which I have referred is oil. Oil-bearing

formations beyond the geological continental shelf have been reported in the Mediterranean, in the Gulf of Mexico, in the Atlantic west of Rockall. Furthermore, as a recent report emphasizes, it is widely felt that “political and economic considerations dictate that the exploration and production effort be more widely dispersed” and that therefore attention should be given to developing off-shore oil-bearing areas, even at some distance from the coast. This shift in emphasis is gradually transforming the picture of what used to be called “oil politics”. The beginnings of a major economic change which may in future have far-reaching political implications can already be discerned, for instance, in the Far East as a result of discoveries in the Gulf of Chihli, in the Yellow Sea and in the Sea of Japan.

76. Technology is becoming available to exploit oil discoveries at depths considerably in excess of the 200-metre depth mentioned in the 1958 Convention on the Continental Shelf.² Thus the research department of a major stock exchange firm reports that “underwater research vessels in their second- and third-generation forms are becoming commercial submersibles rather than just research tools, and the more recent ones have been specifically designed to be essential elements in underwater oil production systems . . . at depths beyond 1,000 feet”. Indeed the 13 October issue of the *Oil and Gas Journal* informs us that a prototype subsea drilling and production system capable of exploiting oil at depths in excess of 1,000 feet will enter into operation early next year. The system will use subsea completions with wellheads clustered in templates on the ocean floor with the possibility of drilling as many as 36 or as few as four wells in each template.

77. I do not believe it is necessary for me to multiply quotations to prove the existence of hydrocarbons in commercial quantities beyond the geological continental shelf, or the rapid advance of technology not only in the field of off-shore oil exploitation but in a whole range of subsea activities. Nor do I need to convince you that political considerations may sometimes be weightier than considerations of cost when the decisions are taken to exploit the resources of the sea-bed at great distances from the coast or at considerable depth.

78. The trends which I have just outlined were already apparent two years ago when we suggested that the General Assembly appeal to Member States to refrain from further extending their claims to jurisdiction over the sea-bed and ocean floor until a decision, generally acceptable to the international community, was reached on a clear definition of the submarine areas over which a coastal State or an island may exercise sovereign rights for the purpose of exploration and resource exploitation. Our effort then did not lead to any positive results for a number of reasons, not least being the difficulty in drafting a formulation that would take fully into account the fact that while some States had shown great restraint in extending their jurisdictional claims over the sea-bed, others have shown much less restraint. On the other hand, a simple invitation to Member States not to extend their sovereignty over the sea-bed beyond national jurisdiction, or not to exploit its resources, would have no meaning in the present state of international law, where any coastal State can attempt to make a legal

case for extending its jurisdiction over the sea-bed, perhaps even to the median lines between continents.

79. At the March session of the Legal Sub-Committee of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed, my delegation therefore abandoned its previous approach and suggested instead that, while the General Assembly cannot define the legal continental shelf, it could proclaim with authority the minimum limits of the area which is without question beyond national jurisdiction. Such a proclamation, if supported by a sufficient majority, would, we believe, as we stated at that time, carry sufficient moral weight to constitute an effective limitation to claims of sovereignty by States pending precise definition of the legal continental shelf. At the same time this would give a basis of realism to the discussion of the basic concepts and of an eventual régime and machinery.

80. In this connexion we submitted a draft resolution, contained in document A/AC.138/11, for the consideration of the Sub-Committee. We have not yet pressed for a decision on the draft in order to give Governments ample time to study our proposal. We are open to suggestion on the text of the draft resolution; in fact, we are aware that certain parts of it may need revision in order to become generally acceptable. Should there be interest, we are prepared to pursue the proposal at this session of the General Assembly.

81. Whatever may be the fate of the proposal we made last March, it is abundantly clear that there is need to arrive at a clear legal determination of the limits of the area of the sea-bed subject to national jurisdiction. Customary international law is inconclusive on the subject and it is undisputed that the 1958 Convention on the Continental Shelf does not precisely define its outer limits. It is for those reasons and because of a variety of pressures which are impelling States to extend their jurisdiction over the sea-bed that we have submitted the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.473.

82. This draft resolution is neither a substitute for the proclamation by the General Assembly of minimum limits of the sea-bed beyond national jurisdiction, nor is it intended to constitute a request for the revision of the 1958 Convention on the Continental Shelf. My Government is aware that the question of legal determination of the limits of the area of the sea-bed beyond national jurisdiction is delicate and complex, and has political implications which cannot be ignored. Were my Government to avail itself of its rights under article 13, paragraph 1, of the 1958 Convention, an already confused situation might become dangerously chaotic.

83. The main purpose of our draft resolution is merely to elicit information sufficient to enable us to make a determination as to whether there exists, or may exist, a basis for constructive results to emerge from a request under article 13, paragraph 1, of the 1958 Convention on the Continental Shelf. Even if it were found that such a basis exists, it would be highly optimistic to expect that any conference could be held for some years to come. The draft resolution which we have submitted is not intended to commit Governments to any action beyond merely informing the Secretary-General of what they conceive to be the

² United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 499 (1964), No. 7302.

present state of international law with regard to the limits of the sea-bed beyond national jurisdiction and accepting that some day in the future it might be useful to convene a conference mainly for the purpose of clarifying those limits.

84. The preambular paragraphs do not, I am sure, require detailed explanation since they only relate facts on which I believe all representatives on the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed appear to be agreed, that is, that international law is not clear on the limits of the area over which a coastal State exercises sovereign rights, that developing technology is making the entire sea-bed progressively accessible and exploitable, that there exists an area of the sea-bed which lies beyond national jurisdiction and that it is necessary to preserve this area from encroachment inconsistent with the common interest of mankind.

85. The main operative paragraph is also clear and simple: it merely requests the Secretary-General to ascertain the views of Member States on the extent of the area of the sea-bed beyond national jurisdiction and on the feasibility of convening a conference to review the 1958 Convention on the Continental Shelf, particularly with the object of arriving at a clear and internationally acceptable definition of the limits of the area over which coastal States exercise sovereign rights for the purpose of exploration and natural resources exploitation. The two requests are related and both appear important to us.

86. It might be feared that the first request might encourage States to maximize their claims over the sea-bed, thus making future negotiations more difficult. This of course is a possibility. On the other hand, if we cannot obtain an updated compendium of the views of States in this field—and such views in some cases have changed considerably in recent years—any realistic future negotiations are entirely impossible. It is, in our opinion, most important to obtain a realistic over-all view of present international opinion in order to be able, next year, to consider whether the basis exists or does not exist for steps to be taken to convene a conference at some date to be agreed upon which has a chance to reach a constructive result.

87. The second part of the main operative paragraph may raise some questions in representatives' minds. In the first place, it may be wondered why we have suggested that the Secretary-General be requested to ascertain the views of all Member States rather than only the views of the signatories of the 1958 Convention on the question of convening a conference to revise this Convention. We do not have very strong views on this point. We believe, however, that in view of article 13, paragraph 2, and article 14 of the Continental Shelf Convention, it would be more appropriate were consultations extended to all Member States even in this preliminary stage. Furthermore, it would certainly be useful if the views of all Member States were available to us next year.

88. In the second place, my delegation would draw your attention to the word "particularly" in operative paragraph 1 of document A/C.1/L.473. While the main purpose of any conference to review the 1958 Continental Shelf Convention should, in our view, be the elaboration of a

clear definition of the limits of the area subject to limited national jurisdiction, we do not wish to exclude the possibility that it may be found advisable to take this opportunity to discuss the revision of some articles of the present convention. For instance, article 5, paragraphs 1 and 8, could be brought into greater harmony, and it might be found useful to adopt a more specific provision with regard to marine pollution to replace the present article 5, paragraph 7.

89. While we trust, Mr. Chairman, that our present comments will be favourably received by this Committee, we remain at your disposal for any additional explanations which may be considered necessary. We hope, in any case, that the objective of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.473 will be considered useful. To us it seems clear that the area must be defined if the régime is to have direct relevance and if an international machinery is to have a clear indication as to where its rights apply. Comparisons with outer space do not, in our view, have much relevance since such exploitation possibilities that may be held to exist do not have the same imminence as in the case of ocean floor resources.

90. I can think of no better way to conclude than by quoting President Nixon, then a presidential candidate, who said on 13 October 1968:

"The fifties were the start of the outer space age; the seventies will be the start of the inner space age that will be unmatched in history for challenge to man's ingenuity, benefits for the people of the world and the sense of wonder that many have feared is lost in the modern age."

91. The benefits, however, will be limited to the few and will be more than matched by the dangers if we fail to take, or even delay too long, the first timid steps towards the creation of a legal order for the sea-bed.

92. Mr. KHANACHET (Kuwait) (*translated from French*): The subject of our debate is still a new one in our Organization, scarcely two years old. Yet this infant prodigy has caused such a stir and aroused so much interest that it can well enter into successful competition with the most important subjects that have thus far engaged the attention of the international community.

93. There is, in fact, no need to be surprised that this subject has produced so much interest, since the interests involved are indeed considerable. They are the resources upon which the future of mankind might depend and, more specifically, the future of the developing countries which, for their part, need all the means that can be made available to them to promote their economic and social development, the development they so sorely need to ensure a better life for their future generations.

94. The Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor has held three sessions in 1969. We have heard several comments on what the Committee has been able to achieve under its mandate. Opinions may differ, but mine is that this Committee made a considerable effort and that the results achieved, modest though they may be, are of extreme importance. It is for this reason that I deem it my duty to pay a tribute at this meeting to the

Committee and to its two Sub-Committees, to their respective Chairmen and other officers, for the constant and untiring work they performed to bring to a successful conclusion the hard task entrusted to them during the three sessions of the Committee.

95. I need not mention here, Mr. Amerasinghe, Chairman of the Committee, nor the members of his Bureau personally. Even less do I have to mention the two Chairmen of the two Sub-Committees. I respect and esteem them personally and even more for the devoted work they have accomplished.

96. I think I should set out briefly what the Committee has achieved at these last sessions. This stocktaking is necessary because, before going on, we should know what point we have reached, what we have done and what remains to be done.

97. From the debates that have taken place a certainty has emerged, the conviction that there is in the world an area beyond the limits of national jurisdiction over the sea-bed and ocean floor, an area which has to be defined and limited and the resources of which should be exploited for the benefit of mankind as a whole, taking into account the special interests and special needs of the developing countries. This certainty I have referred to is an observation of fact. The area is there but its boundaries have to be delimited.

98. Many opinions have been expressed on this subject and my delegation is well aware that there are several trends in the world concerning the delimitation of these borders. There is a convention which governs the continental shelf³ and there are rules of international law that govern territorial waters and adjacent waters. However, there are as yet no precise limits or rules for defining the line that separates the area beyond the limits of national jurisdiction from that within national jurisdiction.

99. In the opinion of my delegation—and I believe we agree in this respect with the opinion expressed a short while ago by the delegation of Malta when it presented its draft resolution—the necessary steps have to be taken so that the competent organ may define the limits of that area. My delegation wishes to prejudge nothing as far as that point of view is concerned but it feels it should make a number of comments.

100. The Geneva Conventions⁴ are 10 years old. Of course, in international annals, 10 years is not a long life for a treaty; on the contrary, if these Conventions were to lapse in the near future they might be regarded as having had an early death. My delegation has no intention of bringing that about. It would have no such evil intentions about treaties to which it is not even a party. It is our duty, however, to say that the rules and concepts that governed the preparation of those Conventions 10 years ago no longer apply. The political realities of today are not those of 10 years ago and it is therefore absolutely essential that the instruments

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ Convention on the Territorial Sea and Contiguous Zone, Convention on the High Seas, Convention on Fishing and Conservation of the Living Resources of the High Seas, Convention on the Continental Shelf, concluded at Geneva, on 29 April 1958.

which govern one of the aspects of international life and law should be reconsidered in terms of present-day realities, taking into account the great changes that have taken place in the field of technology.

101. The Geneva Conventions laid down certain rules for the delimitation of the continental shelf, including that of exploitability. At the time of the adoption of the Convention that concept might be acceptable, since logically it could not exceed certain limits and infringe on interests which we now consider to be those of mankind as a whole. But, since then, the possibilities of exploitation have so much increased that exploration and even exploitation are possible at depths which 10 years ago were quite inconceivable, for, even with the greatest of efforts the boldest explorers would not have dreamed of prospecting or exploring at depths of between 5,000 and 8,000 metres. Accordingly, to push the limits of national jurisdiction to these depths and to think in terms of maintaining this criterion would be tantamount to pushing the limits of national jurisdiction to infinity and would probably result in conflicts which I prefer not to mention.

102. But, instead of speaking of conflicts, let us speak of the least dangerous possibility of all, and say that median lines would at least be established within which only the Powers having the necessary financial and technical resources would be in a position to engage in exploitation, in their own exclusive interests, of the resources of the sea-bed and ocean floor.

103. Once this area has been defined, it would become the duty of the international community to consider means for exploiting the resources of the area for the benefit of mankind as a whole, bearing in mind the special interests and needs of the developing countries. We affirm this need because we are convinced that this area of the sea-bed and the ocean floor, as well as all its resources, is the common heritage of all mankind. This concept has led to much controversy.

104. Some delegations have regarded this concept as an abstraction, devoid of any content, and as a heresy as far as international law is concerned. My delegation does not subscribe to that view. It feels that if this concept has no legal content at present, nothing need prevent us from giving it such a content. It believes this is no heresy inasmuch as the history of international law provides a number of examples bearing out our own point of view that such law is in gestation, in a constant state of evolution as new and special cases and circumstances arise in international relations for which appropriate new rules must be provided.

105. This principle or concept, which in my delegation's view forms the backbone of the entire system that should in future govern the exploitation and exploration of the sea-bed and ocean floor, should guide us in the setting aside of the sea-bed and ocean floor for peaceful purposes as well as for the exploration of their resources for the benefit of mankind as a whole.

106. To do this, it is essential that an international legal régime be set up to govern the zone and give mankind the necessary guarantees against any possible abuses, whose

only victims would be the developing countries. In speaking of such a régime, I must mention a few concepts which would constitute a firm guarantee that the interests of the developing countries would be respected and the abuses to which I have referred would be prevented.

107. I have spoken of the principle according to which the area beyond the limits of national jurisdiction of the sea-bed and the ocean floor is the common heritage of mankind. And as a corollary to that principle I should like to add that this area cannot be appropriated by any State by any means whatsoever, and that no State can claim any sovereignty or any sovereign rights over the whole or any part of that area. At the same time, I must refer to what I have said already about what should form part of the international régime, namely, that the exploration and exploitation of the resources of the area would be carried out in accordance with the international régime to be set up and for the benefit of mankind as a whole and of the developing countries in particular.

108. In this connexion, I should like to quote the following paragraph from the Informal Drafting Group's report under item 4 dealing with the use of the resources of the sea-bed and the ocean floor for the benefit of mankind as a whole:

"The exploration, use and exploitation (of the resources) of this area and its subsoil shall be carried out for the benefit of mankind as a whole, irrespective of the geographical location of States, and for the promotion of economic development, taking into account the special interests and needs of the developing countries." [A/7622 and Corr.1, Part Two, annex, para. 20.]

This concept was incorporated in the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly last year.

109. Now I come to what, in the opinion of my delegation, is in essence the corollary to the international legal régime that should regulate the resources of the sea-bed and govern the area itself. This is the international machinery provided for in resolution 2467 C (XXIII) adopted last year by the General Assembly and dealt with in a special study undertaken by the Secretary-General at the request of the Assembly [A/7622 and Corr.1, annex II].

110. That machinery will, within the context of the international régime, be the main component, the king-pin as it were, which, once it has the necessary powers, will ensure that the exploration and exploitation of the resources of the sea-bed and ocean floor are carried out for the benefit of mankind as a whole.

111. During its last session, the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed, having studied the report of the Secretary-General—an excellent report regarding which my delegation had occasion to express its view and to say how much it appreciated the work done—felt that that report was incomplete and required further study, which would be undertaken by the Secretary-General and should be a study in depth on the status, structure, powers and functions of the international machinery contemplated.

112. My delegation, as well as others, felt that this further study was essential and that the conclusions should be made available to the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed as soon as possible; time is passing, and it is necessary to promote the setting up of this machinery and the exploitation and development of the resources of the sea-bed, so that these may be placed at the disposal of the developing countries, which are so sorely in need of them.

113. As for the status of that international machinery, my delegation feels that it should be an autonomous body, universal in character, which would co-operate closely with the United Nations family. Such a body should be a duly recognized juridical entity so that it might carry out its tasks with the necessary authority. That status should be granted to it internationally, for in the absence of such recognition it would be impossible for it to make progress and do useful work.

114. With regard to the structure of that international machinery, my delegation has already said that we visualize it as consisting of a governing board, whose members would be elected in such a way as to ensure that it had universality of character and equitable geographical distribution and represented all political, economic and social systems. Such a board would be responsible for planning, organizing, directing and controlling all the operations having to do with the exploration and exploitation of the resources of the sea-bed and ocean floor. The board would perform its functions under a mandate conferred upon it at the appropriate time by the proper organ which, at the present instance, might be the General Assembly of the United Nations. That board would be responsible either to the General Assembly of the United Nations or, if in due course a deliberative organ was formed for the sea-bed and ocean floor, to such a constituent organ, which would then have the necessary powers to control the activities of the machinery itself.

115. As regards the powers and the functions involved, my delegation feels that these are of two kinds: the first would concern regulation, and the machinery would be empowered to organize, control, administer and co-ordinate all activities with respect to the sea-bed and the ocean floor. It would take all the necessary steps to prevent pollution and any other hazards that might adversely affect the marine environment and might be empowered to undertake independently any operational activities on the sea-bed, but it might also act under contract or in association with private or Government bodies or joint enterprises, provided that such bodies had the necessary technical skills and other facilities enabling it to engage in operational activities on the sea-bed.

116. The machinery will have the necessary powers to ensure that the profits and income derived from the exploitation of the resources of the seas are distributed equitably among all peoples, taking into account the special needs and interests of the developing countries.

117. It would also be the duty of the international machinery to regulate the production of the resources of the sea-bed and the ocean floor so as to prevent fluctuations in the prices of raw materials which might affect the

development of countries whose economies depend on the production of a specific raw material. It should help to organize training programmes designed to provide the developing countries with the necessary technical personnel, capable of taking part in the exploration and use of the resources of the sea-bed and the ocean floor.

118. Finally, the machinery should ensure that the income from the exploitation of the resources of the sea-bed and the ocean floor is distributed equitably among all countries, without discrimination, with particular attention to landlocked countries and the special needs and interests of the developing countries. In order to discharge its functions—as I have said—the international machinery should be given the

powers and authority it will need for the successful performance of its arduous task.

119. I apologize for taking the Committee's time, but I felt it was my duty to expand on certain points of particular interest to my and other delegations. Consultations are under way with a view to giving concrete form to the ideas expressed here and we hope that these negotiations will soon come to a close and that in a few days—or as quickly as possible—we will be able to submit the necessary draft resolution to the Committee together with whatever other reference documents the groups now in consultation should decide to draw to the Committee's attention.

The meeting rose at 5.25 p.m.