

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



FIRST COMMITTEE, 1855th
MEETING

Thursday, 16 December 1971,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 35 (concluded):

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 use of their resources in the interests of mankind, and convening of a conference on the law of the sea: report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction 1

Chairman: Mr. Milko TARABANOV (Bulgaria).

AGENDA ITEM 35 (concluded)

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 use of their resources in the interests of mankind, and convening of a conference on the law of the sea: report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction (A/8421, A/C.1/L.586/Rev.1, 598 and Add.1, 599 to 603)

1. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): The Committee will continue its consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/L.586/Rev.1 and the following amendments and subamendments: an amendment submitted by Sweden [A/C.1/L.599], two subamendments submitted by Jamaica [A/C.1/L.601] and another submitted by Cameroon [A/C.1/L.602], an amendment submitted by seven delegations [A/C.1/L.600] and another submitted by Japan [A/C.1/L.603]. I should also like to draw the attention of members of the Committee to the financial implications contained in document A/C.1/L.598 and Add.1.

2. Although we have held fairly lengthy consultations, it seems that we shall have to consider all the amendments before taking a decision.

3. Mr. RYDBECK (Sweden): I have asked to speak only to present a revised version of our amendment [A/C.1/L.599], namely, to add the words "including China" after the words "four members".

4. We wish to submit this revision in order to make clear our position—which I had thought was already crystal clear—that our amendment takes it as a matter of course that one of the four additional members will be the People's Republic of China. It has been argued, I know, that it is not customary in such cases to name specific countries—although, as a matter of fact, it has happened recently in one or two cases.

5. However, I would argue, first, that the situation of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations is a special one and has a special history; secondly, that one of the problems, for some delegations at least, seems to be that they feel that if they were to oppose the draft amendment submitted by the delegation of Cameroon it could be construed as a vote against China. Now, everybody here is in complete agreement, as far as I know, that the People's Republic of China should be seated in the sea-bed Committee, and that is the reason for my making this revision.

6. Mr. IRWIN (United States of America): I should like to make just a few comments concerning the membership of the Committee. First, we do understand that the People's Republic of China would like to join the sea-bed Committee. My delegation would welcome that addition to the Committee which is serving as the preparatory committee for the conference on the law of the sea. The United States would also hope a way can be found for Sweden to continue its membership in the sea-bed Committee. Those countries which have participated in prior meetings of the Committee are well aware of the constructive role taken by Sweden, which, as its representative said yesterday, has a great interest in the outcome of the conference on the law of the sea.

7. The United States would also welcome the addition to the Committee of Finland and Zambia.

8. My delegation would have favoured the Cameroon subamendment if it did not have the effect of keeping Sweden, Finland and Zambia out of the Committee. We believe the Swedish amendment would involve only a modest enlargement and would permit those three countries, as well as the People's Republic of China, to serve on the Committee.

9. Accordingly, we would be in favour of the Swedish amendment, and could not support either of the subamendments.

10. Mr. KRISHNADASAN (Zambia): I should like to support the proposal just made by the representative of Sweden to include additional words in the amendment. In doing so I should like to explain that, despite our statement yesterday withdrawing the self-same proposal, out of deference to the normally-accepted procedure, we think it all-important that those words be included, as stated by the representative of Sweden, in order to make the position crystal clear.

11. Equally, we should now like to consider ourselves as sponsors of the Swedish amendment.

12. Mr. GUERREIRO (Brazil): The sponsors of document A/C.1/L.586/Rev.1 would like to complete the indication of the date in the last two lines of operative paragraph 3. Where it says "March and August" it should read: "March-April and July-August". That is in line with what was done last year in a similar resolution, and it serves to indicate that, of course, the meetings of the Committee should not be confined to dates only in March or only in August. Of course, they may very well start, say, in March and go into April, or start in July and go into August. In fact, the document prepared by the Secretariat on the financial implications [A/C.1/L.598 and Add.1] already gives some indication of possible dates.

13. We do not want to put in precise dates, however; we prefer to leave that for future ascertainment, and to give flexibility to the text of the draft resolution by putting in "March-April and July-August".

14. Mr. ENGO (Cameroon): I take the floor in order to submit a revised version of the subamendment contained in document A/C.1/L.602. This has been necessitated, of course, by a change in the text of the original amendment proposed by the delegation of Sweden and now supported by our brother from Zambia.

15. The present subamendment reads: "In the new operative paragraph 3 replace the words 'four members' by the words 'one member'."

We should like to amend that to read: "...replace the words 'four members, including China,' by 'one member.'"

Therefore the subamendment we propose would make the Swedish text read:

"Decides to add to the membership of the Committee one member to be appointed by the Chairman of the First Committee in consultation with regional groups".

So, really, our amendment stands as it is, but in view of the fact that it was a subamendment to the Swedish amendment, we have to include the new words in order to bring it up to date.

16. While I have the floor, I should like to make a few additional comments. It is our understanding that the number of members on the sea-bed Committee is determined by the First Committee and the General Assembly. It has not been our understanding that we here in fact indirectly elect its members by mentioning specifically the names of the delegations that are going to be on that Committee. For this reason we are a bit surprised that the United States delegation has in fact indicated, in opposing the subamendment proposed by my delegation, the four countries it expects to see represented on that Committee.

17. As we said originally, we are very much opposed to any delegation in particular becoming a member of the sea-bed Committee—we have tried to encourage all delegations to send observers to that Committee—and we believe that the work of the Committee would be greatly enhanced if we did not increase the membership of that Committee every year. That is our position.

18. At this stage my delegation reserves its right to pronounce its views on any possible enlargement which would include countries in such a way as to aggravate the present unsatisfactory imbalance in that Committee. The African group has 41 Member States here; the Latin Americans have a certain number; the West, the East and the Latin Americans are exactly the same. If one looks at the composition and geographical balance of the sea-bed Committee at the moment, one will immediately observe that injustice does exist. We accepted that last year because it was a compromise and sacrifice which we thought was worth making in the interests of the greater ideal of success, an ideal which has not in fact been achieved.

19. I should like to add that in making our proposal we do not oppose the entry of any particular delegation into the sea-bed Committee; I should like to make that absolutely clear. I am sure that when the Chairman, pursuant to our proposal, does consult with the regional groups, it will be found that the particular delegation to be admitted to membership of the Committee will be one that meets with the full approval of all members of this Committee.

20. Mr. AMERASINGHE (Ceylon): The delegation of Ceylon, owing to its peculiar position in the sea-bed Committee, does not, as a matter of principle, participate in any vote regarding the size of the Committee, its enlargement or otherwise. But I believe it has been abundantly clear from the day we started the discussion of this item that if there is one question on which a consensus exists, it is in regard to the inclusion of the People's Republic of China in the Committee. That is not merely because of China's own desire to join the Committee but equally because of the desire of the members of this Committee to have China participate in the work of the Committee. Whatever form this amendment takes, I think it at least is clear that it is the general wish and consensus that China should be on the Committee.

21. I should like to point out one contradiction in regard to the wording of the revised amendment presented by the representative of Sweden. The amendment now reads:

"Decides to add to the membership of the Committee four members, including China, to be appointed by the Chairman of the First Committee in consultation with regional groups".

22. Mr. Chairman, if this Committee decides that the People's Republic of China should be added to the sea-bed Committee, there is no need for you as Chairman to appoint the Committee. Further, there is no need for you to act in consultation with the regional groups in appointing the People's Republic of China. The representative of Sweden stated that he brought in his amendment in order to save members the embarrassment of opposing the Cameroonian amendment for the inclusion of one member, because they would want the Committee to be enlarged by more than one, and, whereas they would be opposing it for that reason, their opposition to it might be wrongly construed as opposition to the inclusion of China. Of course the same argument could apply even to the Swedish amendment, because those who do not wish the sea-bed Committee to be increased by four would have to oppose it, and then their opposition would also be construed as

opposition to the inclusion of China. I do not wish to suggest amendments if they are to give the impression that I am supporting any particular amendment, but perhaps if we are to avoid this anomalous position the only way to do so is by saying:

“Decides to add to the membership of the Committee China and three other members to be appointed by the Chairman of the First Committee in consultation with regional groups”.

That would be the only way to avoid the anomaly.

23. Mr. SEATON (United Republic of Tanzania): As Tanzania is one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.586/Rev.1, my delegation does not intend to give a lengthy explanation of its vote. My delegation would, however, like to indicate that, although there are merits in the arguments that have been put forward against expansion of the sea-bed Committee, nevertheless the circumstances in which the Republic of Zambia is situated seem to my delegation to necessitate the inclusion of Zambia in the membership of the Committee. Therefore we would support any proposal, any arrangement, that would ensure the participation of Zambia and its inclusion in the membership of the Committee.

24. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon): I have only one brief comment to make, on the Swedish amendment contained in document A/C.1/L.599. In principle we support this amendment. I am not going into the variations of the wording that have been suggested by Mr. Amerasinghe of Ceylon, but he mentioned the fact that there was a desire on the part of the People's Republic of China to become a member of the sea-bed Committee, and the consensus here in the Committee is in that direction. I should like to add that the Asian group—and this is by way of acquainting the Committee with this development—has met and endorsed the membership of the People's Republic of China in the enlarged Committee on the sea-bed. I thought I would acquaint the Committee with this fact, because, in our opinion, whether it is decided in the Committee to mention explicitly the name of the People's Republic of China or not to do so, as suggested by some of our colleagues here, the fact remains that the Asian group has unanimously decided to support the seating of the People's Republic of China in the sea-bed Committee.

25. Mr. ARIAS SCHREIBER (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I think that we have all begun to be somewhat concerned over being involved in a debate which will be beneficial neither to the spirit of consensus in the Committee nor to the future development of our work.

26. The expansion of the sea-bed Committee from 42 to 86 members was the result of very lengthy and arduous negotiations, where we finally adopted a compromise, because there were factors at play that were of general interest, but since that time a new event has taken place, the entry of the People's Republic of China into the United Nations, and it is logical that such an important event be followed by that country's participation in the work of the expanded Committee. There was one way of doing this without any difficulties—by using the 86th seat, which thus far has been vacant. However, suggestions to that effect

were not accepted by the group to which that vacant seat was allocated. But, since everybody does agree that it is imperative that China participate in the preparatory work of the forthcoming conference on the law of the sea, there is a unanimous view that there be added one further member to the Committee. This solution, which seemed to be perfectly easy, has, however, been crossed by an initiative which, I am sorry to have to say, not only is not in the general interest but does a disservice to and opposes that general interest, since it creates a division among us over individual problems that were already foreseen and solved when the membership of the Committee was increased to 86.

27. Although we understand full well the interest of some delegations in participating or continuing to participate in the work of the expanded Committee, we feel, nevertheless, that they can participate in the same way as do some other nations—that is, as observers at meetings of the sea-bed Committee, and speaking in debates whenever they so wish, which does not significantly change their situation since in practice consensus is usually resorted to, not a voting procedure. On the other hand, the expansion of the Committee by adding further members may once again open the door to a painful and unpleasant controversy because of the difficulty of arriving at an agreement that will ensure equitable distribution of the extra seats among the different regional groups, and it may also lead to divisions within the regional groups themselves as to the choice of candidates.

28. We believe the disadvantages of such a step would far outweigh any advantages that might accrue to the Committee by taking it, there being no justification for it so far as the general interest is concerned. We therefore feel that if we wish to preserve the concept of consensus, we should agree to limiting the increase to the one State on whose candidacy there is unanimity. Since a proposal to that effect has been submitted by the delegation of Cameroon in the form of a subamendment, with the revision just announced by that delegation, to the original amendment submitted by Sweden and Zambia, we feel that if, instead of approving the admission of China to the Committee by acclamation, we are forced to take a vote, the first vote must be on the Cameroon subamendment, in accordance with the usual procedure.

29. Mr. FARHANG (Afghanistan): The delegation of Afghanistan wishes first to support whole-heartedly the revision proposed by the representative of Sweden which would include the People's Republic of China in the membership of the sea-bed Committee. We believe that the inclusion of the People's Republic of China is imperative and would be beneficial to the work of the Committee. Actually, we think that is part and parcel of the decision in principle taken by the General Assembly on the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. Furthermore, I should like to draw the Committee's attention to the fact that if this amendment is adopted three more members will be selected by the Chairman of the First Committee in consultation with the regional groups. We agree with this idea and shall vote in favour of it, but we should like to draw the attention of the Chairman of the Committee and the regional groups to the fact that, while emphasizing their right of selection, we feel

that the special and complex problems of the land-locked countries in regard to the sea should be taken into consideration.

30. Mr. RYDBECK (Sweden): I just want to inform the Committee that I accept the text proposed by the representative of Ceylon, which is of course more logical than the one I presented. The text will now read, "*Decides to add to the membership of the Committee China and three other members to be appointed by the Chairman . . .*" [A/C.1/L.599/Rev.1].

31. Mr. REBAGLIATTI (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Argentine delegation would also have preferred the problem of the expansion to be decided other than by a voting procedure. We understand very well the views of those representatives advocating a moderate increase in the membership, but unfortunately this is not the situation and we are now embarked on the procedure which precedes a vote. That being the case, my delegation feels it must explain its position on the various draft resolutions.

32. In view of the fact that draft resolution A/C.1/L.586/Rev.1, of which my delegation is a sponsor, does not provide for an expansion, it is obvious that the sponsors of that draft resolution will not necessarily have to vote against the amendment or the subamendments but are at liberty to vote as they see fit in each specific case. In the general debate [1851st meeting] my delegation made it clear that it favours the inclusion of the People's Republic of China in the sea-bed Committee and, as a number of other speakers have pointed out, this is the almost unanimous view of the Committee. Therefore, it is consistent with that view that we shall vote for the subamendment presented by Cameroon. However, in view of reasons previously adduced by us, that we understand the situation and the developments which may take place if the Committee is expanded, my delegation will support the Swedish amendment if it is put to the vote.

33. With regard to the members of the sea-bed Committee to be nominated by the Chairman of the First Committee, my delegation wishes to state that it is our understanding that one of the three members will be a member of the group of Latin American States.

34. Concerning the amendments on the site of the future meetings of the sea-bed Committee, since we are a sponsor of the draft resolution which calls for both sessions to be held in Geneva, we shall have to vote against the amendment in document A/C.1/L.600, which calls for them to be held in New York, and shall be unable to support the amendment in document A/C.1/L.603, which calls for one of the sessions to be held in Geneva and the other in New York.

35. Mr. BEESLEY (Canada): I should like to explain my delegation's position on the proposal before us concerning the expansion of the Committee and touching upon its composition.

36. My delegation's position of principle is that we should not be attempting to settle this question by a vote. We think any such process can have undesirable consequences

of the sort referred to by other speakers. Our preference would therefore be to attempt to solve the problem by negotiation. We understand that some such efforts have been made and have proved unsuccessful for the reasons that have been explained.

37. Our second basic position of principle is that we believe that the Committee is already at an optimum size—some say perhaps larger than optimum size—and we would have preferred no increase in the size of the Committee. However, since we last met and since the lengthy, protracted and difficult negotiations of last year when, precisely because of the kinds of problems we have heard about today, we had to increase the size of the Committee substantially, an event of major importance has occurred, namely, the entry of the People's Republic of China into the United Nations, an event which we welcome and applaud.

38. In the light of this development and consistent with it, we therefore would support any proposal which would have the effect of enabling the People's Republic of China to become a member of the Committee. It is our belief that for many reasons, which hardly need explanation, it is very desirable for the People's Republic of China to be a member of the Committee. Obviously that is the one question on which there is a consensus in this Committee. Normally, as I have said, we would not have liked to see the Committee expanded, but we would certainly support its expansion by one member, since there appears to be no other way of resolving that particular problem.

39. At the same time, we are aware that the Swedish amendment, in setting forth the addition of four members, would include the People's Republic of China. At least that is the intention reflected in the amendment. In addition, it would presumably have the effect of enabling Sweden to retain its present membership and of enabling Finland and Zambia to be added to the Committee. Our position is similar to that of the representative of Cameroon in that we do not like to see such issues decided on the basis of naming delegations. The reason is simple. I am sure no Member of the United Nations wishes to be taken as opposing any other Member on the question of membership of any Committee, let alone one as important as this one. In any event, we would welcome the continued membership of Sweden and the addition of Zambia and Finland. For this reason, we would be prepared to support the Swedish amendment.

40. However, we believe that it is of overriding importance that we not produce a situation whereby the People's Republic of China could be excluded. It is quite conceivable, in our view, that the two amendments might fail. In our view, that would be most unfortunate.

41. For this reason, we shall vote in favour of the amendment of Cameroon, if it is put to the vote, and we shall vote in favour of the amendment of Sweden, if it is put to the vote.

42. Mr. STATHATOS (Greece): My delegation has always held the view that all Member States with a legitimate interest in being represented in the sea-bed Committee should be offered the possibility of becoming full-fledged

members of the Committee. The Swedish amendment constitutes a step in that direction. My delegation, in keeping with its basic thinking, will vote in favour of the Swedish amendment, which now ensures beyond any doubt that one of the four additional seats will be reserved for the People's Republic of China. My delegation regrets that it will not be in a position to support the subamendments.

43. Mr. ENGO (Cameroon): In view of the present situation, I should like to change the subamendment of my delegation as follows: all the words after the word "Committee" and before the word "to" should be deleted and replaced by the words "one member". As I have said before, we do not oppose the membership of any particular delegation. In fact, we are hopeful that satisfactory arrangements will be reached within the respective regional groups. After all, last year such an agreement was reached, for example, in the Western group, whereby Sweden did find the opportunity to participate in the Committee. We sincerely hope that some satisfactory arrangements will be reached in the respective regional groups to meet with this exigency. We, for our part, have found reason to change our attitude towards the over-all principle of enlarging the Committee. That is the issue here: should we or should we not enlarge the Committee? Of course, all Members of the United Nations are interested in the work of the sea-bed Committee. We note this from the larger numbers present, from the demand for its reports and from the fact that delegations have been sending observers. We are all interested. But the question is: can the Committee work efficiently if it is enlarged? My experience has been—and I think it is also the experience of the majority of the members here—that the larger the Committee, the less efficient it is.

44. Mr. ADUKO (Ivory Coast) (*interpretation from French*): The delegation of the Ivory Coast agrees with the almost unanimous view of the Committee that China should be a member of the sea-bed Committee. With 87 members the sea-bed Committee will be well constituted. The members of that Committee have thus been chosen according to geographical areas and they are supposed to know and understand the interests of their area as well as serving the welfare of mankind. The First Committee should trust the sea-bed Committee. In the interests of effectiveness, however, we do not think that it would be wise to add additional members to the Committee. While my delegation is in favour of adding China to the Committee, it is not in a position to support the Swedish amendment. We shall, therefore, vote in favour of the subamendment of Cameroon.

45. Mr. RANGANATHAN (India): My delegation would fully associate itself with the stand taken by the representative of the Cameroon on the principal question of the expansion of the sea-bed Committee. My delegation, of course, welcomes the interest shown in the participation in the work of the sea-bed Committee of the delegation of China, and we are very happy that this is the unanimous wish of the First Committee.

46. In the interest of accommodating the views of the Swedish delegation and the Zambian delegation, my delegation will vote for the latest proposal of the Swedish delegation, which emanated from the suggestion made by the Chairman of the sea-bed Committee.

47. Mr. BAVAND (Iran): As a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/L.586/Rev.1, my delegation welcomes wholeheartedly the admission of the People's Republic of China to the sea-bed Committee. However, with regard to the further enlargement of the membership of that Committee, my delegation has a flexible view. My delegation is inclined to support and vote in favour of the Swedish amendment, particularly in the light of the revision of that amendment.

48. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): There being no other speakers, we shall now vote on the draft resolution and on the amendments and subamendments.

49. Mr. OGISO (Japan): I wish to speak about the conduct of the voting at this stage. The sponsors of the amendment submitted by Afghanistan and other countries [A/C.1/L.600] had indicated to my delegation that, if the Japanese amendment [A/C.1/L.603] were adopted, they would not press for a vote on their own amendment. In order to avoid a misunderstanding, may I indicate that they did not say they would withdraw their amendment at this moment. However, if the Japanese amendment were adopted, they would not press for the vote on their own amendment.

50. Therefore, in order to simplify the procedure, my delegation would like to ask for priority in voting to be given to the Japanese amendment over the joint amendment contained in document A/C.1/L.600. I would also like to make it clear that the request of my delegation for priority is only in relation to the amendment contained in document A/C.1/L.600, and not to the other amendments.

51. Mr. RUIZ MORALES (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Spanish delegation wishes to support the Canadian view in favour of the admission of China to the sea-bed Committee. But we really see no reason to oppose the admission of three other countries which have expressed a legitimate desire to participate in our work. For that reason, we are also in favour of the revised amendment submitted by Sweden and Zambia, which will provide for China's participating in the work of the sea-bed Committee.

52. Finally, my delegation would like to express its preference that the matter be settled by negotiation, without having to resort to votes.

53. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): We shall now proceed to the explanations of vote before the vote.

54. Mr. VELLA (Malta): My explanation of vote is with regard to the draft resolution as a whole. Very often, the United Nations indulges in words of praise, in its draft resolutions, that are sometimes not entirely justified. In many cases my delegation has accepted this pleasant practice. However, we cannot accept without protest the words "with satisfaction the encouraging", in connexion with the word "progress" in operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/L.586/Rev.1.

55. Progress in the Committee on the peaceful uses of the sea-bed has in fact been small. But what is much more serious is the fact that the Committee's prospects of accomplishing much useful work in the coming year are far

from good, since a number of countries are not yet convinced of the need to engage in serious negotiations with regard to problems of ocean space. Until the need for serious negotiations is universally recognized, there will be no serious progress, but only procedural manoeuvres. Thus, the words of praise and encouragement contained in the draft resolution before us are seriously misleading, both in regard to those countries not represented on the sea-bed Committee and to informed public opinion.

56. For these reasons my delegation will not participate in the vote.

57. Mr. KRISHNADASAN (Zambia): In sponsoring the Swedish amendment, we had no intention whatsoever, as is quite obvious, of thinking in terms of excluding the People's Republic of China. The unanimous opinion here is that that country should be included. If I may add just one thing more—and all representatives are well aware of this—it is the People's Republic of China which is in fact perhaps the most concerned State with regard to Zambia's land-locked position. It is common knowledge that it is China which is helping to build the railway line from the port of Dar-es-Salaam to Zambia, and thereby to keep us alive.

58. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): Before starting the process of voting, may I indicate where we stand on the documents before us. First of all, we have draft resolution A/C.1/L.586/Rev.1. A change has been suggested by the representative of Brazil, to replace the words "March and August 1972" by the words "March-April and July-August 1972".

59. Secondly, Sweden and Zambia have submitted an amendment [A/C.1/L.599/Rev.1] proposing the addition of a new paragraph 3, reading as follows:

"Decides to add to the membership of the Committee China and three other members to be appointed by the Chairman of the First Committee in consultation with regional groups".

60. Cameroon has submitted a subamendment [A/C.1/L.602/Rev.1] to this text, to replace the words "China and three other members" by the words "one member".

61. Jamaica has also submitted a subamendment [A/C.1/L.601] proposing the addition of the words "under-represented" after the word "with".

62. We then come to the amendment submitted by Afghanistan and other countries [A/C.1/L.600], to replace, in operative paragraph 3, the word "Geneva" by the words "New York".

63. Finally, Japan has submitted an amendment, which is contained in document A/C.1/L.603, whereby, in operative paragraph 3, the words "New York at" would be inserted before the word "Geneva" and the word "respectively" would be added at the end of the paragraph.

64. We shall begin by voting on amendment [A/C.1/L.599/Rev.1], and the subamendments thereto. The first subamendment to be voted on will be that of Cameroon, since it is the farthest removed from the original text,

which in this case is the Swedish amendment. Then we shall deal with the subamendment of Jamaica. After the subamendments have been voted on, we shall vote on the amendment of Sweden.

65. If anyone wishes to speak on this specific point of the voting procedure, I shall call on him to do so.

66. The representative of Japan has requested priority for his amendment to the draft resolution. We shall vote on the question of priority when we take up the amendments to what is now operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution.

67. Are there any comments regarding this procedure?

68. Mr. AMERASINGHE (Ceylon): I have no objection to what you have suggested, Mr. Chairman. I thought we might dispose of the question of venue first, but I have absolutely no objection to your procedure. In other words, I should have preferred the Committee to vote on the amendment to the existing provisions of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.586/Rev.1 in regard to the determination of the venue of the meetings, and then proceed to the new elements of the draft resolution which have been introduced by the amendment of Sweden and the subamendment of Cameroon.

69. However, as I have already indicated, I have no objection to the procedure suggested by you, Mr. Chairman.

70. Mr. GEGHMAN (Yemen): On a point of clarification, Mr. Chairman: in voting on the amendment introduced by Sweden, shall we vote on this amendment with the text suggested by Ceylon, that is, "Decides to add to the membership of the Committee China and three other members to be appointed by the Chairman of the First Committee . . .?"

71. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I shall reply to the two observations made, beginning with that of the representative of Ceylon. I should be quite ready to proceed as he prefers, but, as I said, I was suggesting the order of the paragraphs as they appear in the draft resolution, which, I think, would be the most orderly way of doing it, because we deal with each paragraph and then immediately go on to the next. I have nothing against voting as the representative of Ceylon suggested, but I think that the way I outlined is a better way and it should create no difficulties.

72. In reply to the question put by the representative of Yemen, the suggestion put by the representative of Ceylon was accepted as a revision to the Swedish proposal and so we shall vote on the following paragraph:

"Decides to add to the membership of the Committee China and three other members to be appointed by the Chairman of the First Committee in consultation with regional groups".

73. We shall now proceed to the vote, beginning, if there is no objection, with the subamendment of Cameroon [A/C.1/L.602/Rev.1]. A roll-call vote has been requested on the subamendment.

A vote was taken by roll call.

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

In favour: Nicaragua, Nigeria, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Spain, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Barbados, Brazil, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, Ghana, Indonesia, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kuwait, Malaysia, Morocco.

Against: Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Romania, Sudan, Sweden, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Yemen, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Burundi, Denmark, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Guyana, Ireland, Italy, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Malta, Mauritania.

Abstaining: Poland, Portugal, Rwanda, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Congo, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Madagascar, Mexico, Mongolia.

The subamendment was rejected by 34 votes to 29, with 33 abstentions.

74. We come now to the subamendment contained in document A/C.1/L.601, proposed by Jamaica. May I inquire whether the Jamaican delegation wishes to maintain its subamendment?

75. Mr. BONNICK (Jamaica): This question comes as a surprise to me, because I had indicated to no one that we were withdrawing the subamendment. Indeed, my delegation insists on this subamendment and asks for a roll-call vote on it in view of some of the tactics that have been employed against my delegation, in particular, with respect to this subamendment.

76. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): A roll-call vote had already been requested by the representative of Cameroon on this subamendment, and we shall therefore proceed accordingly.

A vote was taken by roll call.

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

In favour: Nigeria, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Yemen, Barbados, Brazil, Cameroon, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Fiji, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mexico, Nicaragua.

Against: Poland, Rwanda, Senegal, Spain, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet

Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, New Zealand.

Abstaining: Norway, Portugal, Romania, Somalia, South Africa, Sudan, Turkey, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bolivia, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Haiti, Honduras, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Japan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Liberia, Malta, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal.

The subamendment was adopted by 27 votes to 26, with 43 abstentions.

77. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): We shall now vote on amendment A/C.1/L.599/Rev.1, as just modified.

The amendment was adopted by 87 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

78. We shall now proceed to vote on the other amendments. The first amendment submitted is A/C.1/L.600, which would replace the word "Geneva" by the words "New York"; there is also the amendment contained in document A/C.1/L.603, for which, although it was submitted later, the Japanese delegation has requested priority. If I have correctly understood the representative of Japan, the sponsors of the other amendment would be willing to allow the Japanese amendment to be given priority.

79. Mr. OGISO (Japan): It is the understanding of my delegation that the sponsors of the amendment contained in document A/C.1/L.600 are agreeable to priority being given to the Japanese amendment and its being voted on first. I take this occasion to request a roll-call vote on the Japanese amendment.

80. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): We shall proceed accordingly. I shall now call upon representatives who wish to speak in explanation of their votes before the vote.

81. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): I must note with regret that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.586/Rev.1 have been unable to accept the amendment submitted by Afghanistan, Bolivia, Liberia, Nepal, Paraguay, Singapore and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic [A/C.1/L.600]. As our delegation has already pointed out, that proposal was aimed at achieving significant savings in the expenditure involved in holding two sessions of the sea-bed Committee in Geneva.

82. We share the view of the sponsors of this amendment that the holding of two sessions of the Committee in Geneva would create considerable difficulties for many countries, especially small ones, as was mentioned yesterday by the representative of Singapore.

83. We also regret that the sponsors of the draft resolution have been unable or have thought it impossible to accept even the compromise proposal which was made yesterday by the representative of Japan and on which we are to vote now. In our opinion, the adoption of the Japanese proposal, which is a compromise, would enable the United Nations to save at least \$200,000 and would, at least to some extent, take account of the wishes and the difficulties of a number of delegations in connexion with the holding of two sessions of the Committee in Geneva.

84. Although its position of principle as expressed at the previous meeting remains unchanged, the Soviet delegation will vote in favour of the compromise proposal made by Japan.

85. Mr. PINTO (Ceylon): I wish to make a very brief statement regarding our vote on the amendment submitted by the representative of Japan.

86. My delegation has consistently supported the view that the sea-bed Committee should hold all its meetings at Geneva. Consequently we were and remain in favour of holding both sessions there, for reasons we explained at length last year. Questions of principle are involved, touching on both political and financial matters.

87. The representative of the Soviet Union has pointed out that there might be a saving to the Organization of something in the region of \$200,000 if the Japanese amendment is adopted. I should like to go on record as pointing out that as far as my own delegation is concerned it is three times as expensive for us to come to New York and work here as it is to travel to Geneva and work there. Nevertheless, in view of the fact that several members have expressed the desire to hold one session in New York and one session at Geneva, we shall not oppose the Japanese amendment.

88. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): The Committee will now vote on the Japanese amendment [A/C.1/L.603]. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll call.

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

In favour: Singapore, South Africa, Thailand, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America, Venezuela, Afghanistan, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Congo, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Finland, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Japan, Laos, Lebanon, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal.

Against: Senegal, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Yemen, Australia, Brazil, Chile, Cuba, Ecuador, Ethiopia, France, Guyana, Iceland, Jamaica, Kenya, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Mauritania, Morocco, Netherlands, Nigeria, Peru, Rwanda.

Abstaining: Somalia, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Algeria, Argentina, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Ceylon, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Liberia, Malaysia, Philippines, Romania.

The amendment was adopted by 37 votes to 27, with 32 abstentions.

89. Since the Committee has just adopted the Japanese amendment and since amendment A/C.1/L.600 is incompatible with that amendment, the Committee will not vote on A/C.1/L.600. The Committee will vote on draft resolution A/C.1/L.586/Rev.1. We shall vote first on the paragraph of the draft resolution as amended, which will become paragraph 4 of the draft resolution.

90. Mr. MATSEIKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translation from Russian*): I should like to make a comment with regard to paragraph 4, which contains the words "March-April" and "July-August 1972". Our understanding is that this paragraph provides for the holding of two sessions of five weeks' duration each. Such is our understanding of this paragraph and we should like to have it in the records.

91. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): With regard to the matter raised by the representative of Ukraine, the representative of Brazil wishes to explain that with respect to the duration of the sessions mentioned in paragraph 4 of the draft resolution when speaking on behalf of the sponsors he had indicated that two five-week sessions had been envisaged. We have therefore agreed that there is no change in the duration of the sessions. It is only a question of meeting in one month and of having the session go into the next month, and of selecting which period of five weeks of the two months is going to be used for each session.

92. The Committee will now vote on paragraph 4, as amended by amendment A/C.1/L.603.

The paragraph was adopted by 77 votes to 1, with 12 abstentions.

93. We shall now vote on the draft resolution as a whole. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll call.

Nepal, having been chosen by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian

Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco.

Against: None.

The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 97 votes to none.

94. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes after the voting.

95. Mr. YANGO (Philippines): As indicated by the Ambassador of Lebanon, the chairman of the group of Asian countries for the month of December, this group, of which the Philippines is a member, welcomes and supports the participation of the People's Republic of China in the sea-bed Committee.

96. I wish to say also that my delegation does not oppose the participation of any Member State in the work of that Committee, but we strongly feel that such participation should be within the context of equitable geographical distribution or representation of the regional groups. We feel also that problems of participation should be resolved within the respective regional groups.

97. Furthermore, we take note of the fact that any Member State is welcome to participate as an observer in the work of the Committee.

98. My delegation abstained on the Japanese amendment. We could not vote against that amendment, even though we were a sponsor of the draft resolution, because we felt that it offered a compromise solution.

99. Mr. KABBAJ (Morocco) (*interpretation from French*): I should like to explain the vote of my delegation on the subamendment of Cameroon as well as on the amendment of Sweden and Zambia.

100. While it voted in favour of the subamendment of Cameroon, my delegation would like to stress that it in no way wished to prevent friendly and brotherly countries from being members of the Committee; it was simply a matter of principle, as we considered that there was no real need to expand the membership of the Committee for reasons that have been given in the First Committee.

101. The participation of China, which we are happy to welcome, is a result of the exceptional event which happened this year and which had to be sanctioned.

102. It was taking into account the interest of other States in the work of the sea-bed Committee and the contribution they could make to it that we voted in favour of the amendment of Sweden and Zambia.

103. Mr. BONNICK (Jamaica): Owing to the lateness of the hour, I shall be very brief. I should like to point out, for the information of the delegations represented here, that the purpose of our amendment was to give due consideration to the principle of maintaining an equitable balance among the different regional groups.

104. The result of the vote, however, should not be construed as an attempt to keep any Member from being on the sea-bed Committee, and I am sure that in the negotiations which will be undertaken by the Chairman some accommodation can be reached with the different regional groups. But there is a fundamental principle here, which has to be maintained, that is, that the developed countries cannot keep on expecting that each time there is a problem within their own regional group it must be at the expense of the developing countries. That is a fundamental principle we wish to see preserved.

105. It was for that reason that we insisted on a vote on our amendment.

106. Mr. WILLIAMS (United Kingdom): My delegation voted against the subamendment proposed by the representative of Cameroon because, while we favour the entry of the People's Republic of China into the sea-bed Committee, we also favour making a provision for the two or three other delegations, which, in the consultations preceding this debate and during this debate, expressed a keen desire to participate in the work of that Committee.

107. We voted against the subamendment proposed by the representative of Jamaica because we regarded it as introducing a rather inexact and subjective criterion.

108. We voted in favour of the amendment proposed by the representative of Sweden, as amended, because, in our view, with or without the subamendment proposed by the representative of Jamaica it is designed to accommodate the two or three delegations to which I have referred and to facilitate their participation in our work.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.