

Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea

1973-1982

Concluded at Montego Bay, Jamaica on 10 December 1982

Document:-

A/CONF.62/C.3/SR.17

Summary records of meetings of the Third Committee 17th meeting

Extract from the *Official Records of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, Volume II (Summary Records of Meetings of the First, Second and Third Committees, Second Session)*

17th meeting

Tuesday, 27 August 1974, at 11 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. A. YANKOV (Bulgaria).

Preservation of the marine environment (*concluded*)*

[*Agenda item 12*]

1. Mr. TRESSELT (Norway) said that the purpose of his delegation's working paper (A/CONF.62/C.3/L.18) was to draw attention to the problem which arose when human activities disturbed the ecological balance of marine environments, not through pollution but by the introduction of living organisms not previously existing in the seas or by the transfer of a form of marine life to an area where the implications of its existence were unknown. The discovery in 1973 on the south coast of England of a new type of seaweed which appeared to have extraordinary properties of growth and unpredictable effects for existing marine life had lent urgency to the issue. The origins of that development seemed to have been accidental, but commercial enterprises had planned similar transfers of marine plant life in order to ensure the availability of raw material for the kelp-processing industry.
2. The effects of such interference with the natural balance of the marine environment were unpredictable and might be awesome. In the working paper, his delegation had formulated a tentative treaty provision as a means of focusing attention on the legal aspects of the subject, and thought that the Committee should consider the problem at the next session. The language used in the paper would of course permit the development of controlled undertakings in aquaculture and experimental research. On the other hand, if there was any uncertainty about the effects of interference with the natural state of the marine environment, the State concerned should consult with other interested States and the appropriate international organizations.
3. He wished to emphasize that the issue was separate from that of the pollution of the marine environment and that the introduction of new species through sewage or run-offs from land should be dealt with by the provisions for the prevention of pollution. His delegation's aim was to stimulate discussion on an important subject which might so far have been drowned in the more immediate worries about marine pollution. Its concern had already been reflected in the preparatory work of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction: the Maltese proposal (A/AC.138/SC.III/L.33) included a provision for the maintenance of the natural state of the marine environment.
4. Miss MARIANI (France) suggested that the three references to "species" in the working paper should be qualified by the adjectives "plant or animal".
5. Mr. GAMBOA (Chile) said that it had unfortunately been impossible to introduce the document concerning the establishment of regional bodies responsible for providing assistance in case of accidents resulting in pollution of the marine environment, to which he had referred at a previous meeting, in time for it to be discussed at the current session. It would however be circulated before the end of the current session¹ and could be discussed at the next session.

Scientific research (*concluded*)

[*Agenda item 13*]

6. Mr. WALKATE (Netherlands) noted that sponsors of the draft articles on marine scientific research (A/CONF.62/

C.3/L.19) came from all parts of the world, and represented both geographically disadvantaged States and geographically advantaged coastal States and both developing and developed countries. That fact showed that it was possible to find common ground even before embarking on further negotiations.

7. The definition appearing in article I had been taken from WG.3/Paper No. 4 of Sub-Committee III of the sea-bed Committee, a text which had been reintroduced with slight drafting changes as document CRP/Sc.Res./2. Exploration and exploitation had been excluded from the scope of the draft articles because the sponsors wished to secure an adequate régime for pure scientific research. Marine scientists should not be unduly restrained in their quest for knowledge; knowledge of the sea was no less vital for the future of mankind than knowledge of the land. In order to strike a balance between the interests of pure scientific research and the interests of States, the draft articles stated as a matter of principle the right of all States and appropriate international organizations to conduct marine scientific research on an equal basis. However, the exercise of that right by the State or organization conducting the research was subject to the conditions set forth in article 5 and in article 6, paragraph 1; the coastal State's interests justified its right to participate directly or indirectly in research projects. On the other hand, neighbouring geographically disadvantaged States had an equal interest in scientific research; article 6, paragraph 2, provided for their right to be offered the opportunity of participating in projects. The essence of pure science was the availability of the results of scientific research; thus, article 6, paragraph 3, imposed an obligation on the State or organization conducting the research to ensure the publication of the results. His delegation regretted that during the informal meetings on items 13 and 14 there had been no time for a full discussion of procedures for the settlement of disputes—a matter referred to in article 6, paragraph 5.
8. Article 8 dealt with international co-operation; the sponsors had taken as a basis the text agreed in the informal meetings on items 13 and 14. The issue of international co-operation should not be controversial.

9. Mr. FITZ (Austria) said that as a land-locked country, Austria had participated in the formulation of the draft articles in document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.19 from the very beginning and believed that they merited close examination by the Committee. They represented the best attempt so far to reconcile the conflicting interests of the research States, the coastal States and the geographically disadvantaged States.

10. The draft articles respected the right to conduct pure scientific research beyond the territorial sea. The sponsors believed that that principle should be included in the convention not simply to accommodate the desires of the research States but to ensure the best conditions for scientific research. They were convinced that the right to conduct scientific research was vital for the economic progress of all mankind but that it ought not to be unlimited and unconditional. The right deserved to be safeguarded only if the research was of a purely scientific character. The coastal State was therefore entitled to monitor the conduct of research in the area where it had special rights and the sponsors relied on all the States concerned to ensure that pure scientific research was not used as a pretext for other activities. The monitoring function of the coastal State presup-

*Resumed from the 15th meeting.

¹Subsequently circulated as document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.21.

posed its close association with the research project. The research State must therefore notify the coastal State of proposed projects, and the coastal State had the right to participate in the project and have access to all data and samples.

11. The geographically disadvantaged States not only had the right to conduct scientific research but must also be notified of a project planned for the area in which a neighbouring coastal State had special rights. They were entitled to receive the same information as the coastal State and to be offered the opportunity to participate in the project.

12. The draft articles were not perfect but they did represent a sound basis for compromise: none of the sponsors, whether research States, coastal States or geographically disadvantaged States, had insisted on the complete satisfaction of their individual interests.

13. Mr. JAIN (India) said that the sponsors of the draft articles were not in fact a representative group: they were mainly the delegations of land-locked and research States; the delegations of coastal States were clearly under-represented. Indeed, the draft articles laid down principles concerning the coastal States which had been drafted without their participation.

14. He thought that the distinction made in article 1 between pure and applied research was not valid; surely the same sets of data could be used for commercial as well as for other purposes. The period of advance notification provided for in article 6, paragraph 1 (a), would ensure nothing more than the absolute freedom of scientific research. His delegation could accept article 6, paragraph 5, if the procedures for the settlement of disputes proved to be similar to those provided for in the United Nations Charter, but it could not accept that the coastal State should be required to submit to compulsory third party arbitration where scientific research in its economic zone was concerned.

15. He noted that several of the sponsors of the draft articles were members of the Group of 77, on whose behalf the representative of Colombia had introduced draft articles (A/CONF.62/C.3/L.13) setting forth positions opposed to those stated in the draft articles now under consideration.

16. He wished it to be shown in the records that his country had become a sponsor of the draft articles on the development and transfer of technology (A/CONF.62/C.3/L.12).

17. Mr. ZULETA TORRES (Colombia) said that the majority of the members of the Group of 77 had asked him to state that the draft articles referred to by the representative of India still reflected the consensus of the Group.

18. His own delegation could not see that the draft articles now under consideration shed any light on the problems of marine scientific research.

19. Mr. MBOTE (Kenya) agreed with the representative of India that the draft articles in document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.19 were not representative.

20. He challenged the sponsors to say how they proposed to give effect to the distinction which they claimed to be able to make between pure and applied research, for that was the very basis of their proposals. The sponsors should also specify what they meant by "the right to conduct marine scientific research" referred to in article 2.

21. The sponsors clearly supported the freedom of scientific research beyond the territorial sea. He asked them to explain how the land-locked countries, which were usually among the least developed countries, were to benefit from that freedom.

22. There was no mention of any arrangements under which coastal States allowing other States to carry out scientific research could enter into bilateral agreements with them. The Organization of African Unity in its Declaration of 1973 (A/CONF.62/33) had taken up a clear position on that point: the coastal State should allow the nationals of land-locked countries to share in the exploitation of resources on an equal

basis, in accordance with bilateral agreements. The sponsors appeared unwilling to admit that possibility even where only scientific research was concerned. He did not see how research could be undertaken in the various sea areas without bilateral agreements.

23. Mr. BOHTE (Yugoslavia) said that he regretted that the draft articles in document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.19, the sponsorship of which was very broadly based, had not been circulated earlier. His delegation had not yet been able to give them detailed consideration since they had only just been circulated. It would like to comment on them more fully at a later stage.

24. The CHAIRMAN explained that that document had not been distributed earlier because of the Secretariat's heavy workload.

25. Mr. RASOLONDRAIBE (Madagascar) announced that his delegation wished to become a sponsor of document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.12.

26. Turning to document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.19, he said that his delegation opposed the régime of notification laid down in article 6, paragraph 1 (a). However, the most important aspect of the draft was the coastal State's right to participate directly or indirectly in research projects (article 6, paragraph 1 (d)). Under that article, the developing countries would have the right to take part in the research operations organized by a limited number of technologically advanced countries. Nevertheless, his delegation believed that in the 200-mile economic zone the situation should be reversed: the developing coastal States must promote organized scientific research and it would be for them to invite others to take part in it.

27. For his delegation, there was no question of embodying in the future convention the assumption that the technologically under-developed countries should remain so. His delegation had very serious reservations on the draft articles in document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.19 and it urged other delegations to consider their position on them.

28. Mr. MOLTENI (Argentina) endorsed the views expressed by the representatives of India, Kenya and Yugoslavia.

29. Although document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.13 had been submitted by the delegation of Colombia alone, the ideas in it were shared by many developing countries which considered that marine scientific research required the prior agreement of the coastal State concerned.

30. His delegation did not agree with article 6, paragraph 2, of document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.19, which provided for special rights for the land-locked and geographically disadvantaged countries in the economic zone. But the country that exercised the rights in that zone was the coastal State; the only way that other States could take part in marine scientific research there would be by participating in such activities as the coastal State itself promoted.

31. He reserved his delegation's right to return to the matter at the next session of the Conference.

32. Mr. HUSSAIN (Pakistan) supported the views of the representatives of Colombia and India concerning document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.19.

33. His delegation was opposed to the views expressed in that document, particularly in articles 1, 6 and 7, and believed that any marine scientific research activity in the area beyond the territorial sea should be carried out only with the explicit consent of the coastal State concerned. Moreover, the question of the jurisdiction and rights of the coastal and land-locked States in the economic zone had still to be decided by the Second Committee.

34. His delegation would favour a régime of consent as proposed in A/CONF.62/C.3/L.13, and it reserved the right to return to the matter at the next session of the Conference.

35. Mr. FITZ (Austria), replying to the criticisms of document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.19 voiced by the representative of

Kenya and others, explained that the sponsors did not claim to represent all geographical and special interest groups. Nevertheless, a sizable number of States had endorsed the views expressed in that document.

36. He agreed with the representative of Kenya that it was indeed very difficult to define pure scientific research, and the sponsors had not approached the matter light-heartedly. However, clear-cut concepts were not always possible in international relations. The States concerned must try to reach agreement on whether a given project fell under the heading of pure or applied science. If they could not agree, they should have recourse to the machinery laid down in article 6, paragraph 5, of the document.

37. Mr. YU (Singapore) welcomed the view of the Netherlands and Austrian representatives that document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.19, of which his delegation was a sponsor, was a sincere attempt to find a common approach that would take account not only of the position of coastal and research states but also of the land-locked and geographically disadvantaged countries, particularly those without facilities for marine scientific research.

38. His delegation was increasingly concerned at the trend of the Committee's discussions, which had been conducted almost exclusively between coastal and research States; the interests of the land-locked and geographically disadvantaged States in marine scientific research and its applicability to them seemed to have been ignored. It also regretted the implicit assumption made by some delegations that the land-locked and geographically disadvantaged States would be for ever unable to conduct marine scientific research or utilize its results. Moreover, his delegation was sorry that specific mention had been made of certain sponsors of document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.19.

39. In that connexion he recalled that the first note to document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.13 made it clear that the members of the Group of 77 would not be bound by its provisions and their final position was not committed by it. Since its country's interests were by no means sufficiently reflected in that document which, in fact, took account of only one viewpoint, his delegation had felt itself duty-bound to join in sponsoring document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.19, which was not a negotiating paper reflecting the bargaining position of the sponsors, but a realistic attempt to lay the foundation for a common position accommodating the rights and interests of all States.

40. Mr. RUHAIM (Libyan Arab Republic) supported the views expressed by the representatives of India, Kenya and others regarding document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.19.

41. His delegation could not accept the notification system, but it insisted on prior consent by the coastal State concerned, without which no marine scientific research could be carried out in the area under national jurisdiction.

42. With respect to article 6 of the document, his country could not agree, for security reasons, to the publication of marine scientific research without the explicit consent of the coastal State concerned. As far as article 7 was concerned, as a member of the Group of 77, his country felt that marine scientific research in the international area should be conducted by the International Authority.

43. Mr. LEROTHOLI (Lesotho) pointed out that the first note to document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.13 read: "The delegate of Colombia, as the Chairman of the Group of 77, while presenting this document, would like to point out that it represents the consensus of the Group of 77 of the Third Committee, without committing the final position of members of the Group." Moreover, the explanatory note preceding the draft articles in document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.19 read as follows: "These draft articles do not necessarily represent the final position of the sponsors on individual articles or on the draft as a whole. Sponsorship does not prejudice their position on previous or future draft proposals."

44. His delegation was absolutely loyal to the Group of 77 and would not seek to subject document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.13 to ridicule. However, that document paid very little attention to the interests of the land-locked and geographically disadvantaged States, which had been included only as an afterthought in paragraph 4. It was therefore surprising that some delegations considered it improper for those States to embody their ideas in another document.

45. Some delegations had argued that since the Second Committee had not yet come to any decision regarding the rights of the land-locked and geographically disadvantaged States, the matter should not be considered by the Third Committee. There was a serious misunderstanding there: no economic zone had yet been created for any country, and the members of the Third Committee could still express their views on how matters should be arranged in that zone. He reserved his delegation's right to speak again on the matter if necessary.

46. Mr. GOLLEY-MORGAN (Sierra Leone) announced that his delegation had joined the sponsors of document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.12.

47. He reserved his delegation's right to comment on document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.19 at a later date.

48. Mr. COLLINS (Liberia) thanked the Singapore representative for having given the reasons for his delegation's sponsorship of document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.19. That paper had met with a great deal of resistance from members of the Group of 77. His delegation had noted, however, that the draft articles did not necessarily represent the final position of the sponsors. He agreed with the remarks made by the representatives of the Netherlands and Austria and supported the position of the representative of Lesotho.

49. Mr. ZULETA TORRES (Colombia) informed the Committee that the proposals referred to in paragraph 4 of document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.13 would be circulated for the Committee's information if it so desired.

Statements by the Chairmen of the informal meetings

50. Mr. VALLARTA (Mexico), Chairman of the informal meetings on item 12 (Preservation of the marine environment) said that documents A/CONF.62/C.3/L.14 and 15 were self-explanatory.

51. Mr. METTERNICH (Federal Republic of Germany), Chairman of the informal meetings on items 13 and 14 (Scientific research and Development and transfer of technology), introducing the note on the activities of those informal meetings (A/CONF.62/C.3/L.16) and the annex containing relevant texts (A/CONF.62/C.3/L.17) said that those documents, as Conference Room Papers Nos. 41 and 42, had been discussed at the informal meeting on 22 August 1974 and had subsequently been modified in the light of the suggestions made at that meeting. They endeavoured to convey a concise, factual, and non-controversial picture of the work done at those meetings. There had been lively discussions both at the informal meetings and in the open-ended drafting and consultation group. The interest shown in the items was keen, as could be seen from the number of proposals submitted. It had been clear from the outset that the work should be directed towards agreeing on a common text or, if that was impossible, to consolidating texts into clear-cut alternatives. One problem was that many of the points under consideration had not been discussed in the sea-bed Committee. The meetings had, however, succeeded in drafting common texts on general principles and on international co-operation, including publication of scientific data. On the crucial points "right to conduct marine scientific research" and "consent, participation and obligations of coastal States", various alternative approaches had been consolidated. On other points, the proposals introduced had been recorded and would be discussed in greater depth at a later stage. The informal meetings had therefore created a basis

of work on marine scientific research which would certainly prove very useful at the next session of the Conference.

52. Owing to lack of time, the informal meetings had not been able to consider the development and transfer of technology and no proposals had been introduced. Since texts had been submitted to the Committee in the meantime, the matter would have to be taken up at the next session, but without losing sight of the momentum gained in the work on scientific research.

53. Mr. SENNING (Sweden) supported the suggestion made by the representative of Italy at a previous meeting that the conference room papers on item 12, which had been introduced but not considered at the informal meetings, should be circulated as an addendum to document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.14. It would be very helpful to delegations when seeking the advice of experts before the next session to have all the pending texts collected together in one document. The appendix might be entitled "Conference room papers containing proposals or amendments informally introduced but not yet considered by the drafting and negotiating group of the informal meetings on item 12".

54. The chairman said that in the absence of any objection he would take it that the Committee wished such an appendix to be circulated.

It was so decided.

55. Mr. JAIN (India) suggested that it would be helpful if studies could be made by competent international organizations on two matters of crucial importance which the Committee had not had time to discuss fully at the current session. First, if the Committee agreed, the Chairman might request the representative of the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization (IMCO) to prepare a study defining the precise areas under the jurisdiction of coastal States where those States had fishery or other economic interests, so that that protection could be focused on them and navigation in other areas remain unhampered. Secondly, many developing countries had expressed misgivings during the informal discussions as to their ability to comply with an absolute obligation to monitor pollution control and many delegations had suggested that a proportion of the sums spent by a country on pollution-producing activities should be devoted to pollution control. He wondered if the representative of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) could prepare a study on that matter for submission at the next session.

56. Mr. MENSAH (Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization) said that IMCO would be able to collect the required information and make it available to the next session of the Conference.

57. Mr. KOVALEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation was unable to support the request for the study by IMCO because the Committee was asking that organization to study the possible implications of measures upon which full agreement had not been reached.

58. Mr. SIMMS (United Kingdom) said that his delegation also had reservations about that proposal, which he was not sure fell within the competence of IMCO. It could be included in the agenda of the forthcoming meeting of the Marine Environment Protection Committee of IMCO but he felt that at least one other specialized agency—the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations—was also concerned.

59. Mr. LEROTHOLI (Lesotho) reminded the Committee that even the question of the territorial sea had not yet been defined by the Conference and the request to IMCO seemed also to include the new concept of an area beyond that zone over which the coastal State might have some jurisdiction. While the proposal might be a useful one at the appropriate moment, he considered it premature pending some decision on those issues.

60. Mr. JAIN (India) said that the proposal had been intended not only to protect the interests of the coastal State but also to help international navigation. However, since it had met with opposition, he would withdraw it.

61. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to comment on the second study proposed by the Indian representative.

62. Mr. AHMED (United Nations Environment Programme) said he understood that the Indian representative would like UNEP to make a study on the comparative costs of the environment component of projects which might cause marine pollution. Speaking as a legal, not a technical, expert, he said that it would be difficult for UNEP to prepare specific proposals or figures, since costs differed from area to area and from country to country and it would be necessary to have information on the current and future economic development plans of the different countries. He assumed that the Indian representative was concerned about the capacity of developing countries to assume obligations to monitor pollution and wished to gain some idea of the cost to individual developing countries.

63. He suggested that the best solution would be for UNEP to be asked to submit to the next session of the Conference a detailed explanation of its Global Environmental Monitoring System (GEMS). Delegations would then be able to ascertain what was expected of their Governments under the system and to discuss whether joint or individual obligations could be accepted or whether their countries would co-operate with international organizations.

64. Mr. JAIN (India) said that the type of study suggested by the UNEP representative would be extremely useful and he would be prepared to modify his suggestion accordingly. He would welcome the views of other representatives.

65. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should request UNEP to submit for consideration by the Committee at the next session of the Conference a detailed study on the Global Environmental Monitoring System, containing an account of how the system worked and all the relevant implications.

It was so agreed.

Consideration of the statement of activities of the Committee

66. Mr. HASSAN (Sudan), Rapporteur, introduced the draft statement of activities of the Committee (A/CONF.62/C.3/L.20) and drew attention to the following correction: in section V, paragraph 10, the word "alternates" should read "alternatives".

67. As agreed by the Committee, in accordance with the General Committee's recommendation, the document was a brief and concise account of the Committee's activities. In that connexion he drew attention to the explanatory note in paragraph 1, and to paragraph 4.

68. In accordance with the General Committee's recommendations on brevity of reports, the notes on the informal meetings—referred to in paragraph 10—had been issued in the series under the symbol A/CONF.62/C.3/L. . . . The only annex to the report would therefore be a list of the formal proposals presented to the Committee at the current session.

69. The CHAIRMAN said that, in accordance with the procedure agreed on by the General Committee, no formal approval of the draft statement was needed, but comments by members of the Committee could be recorded.

70. Mr. DAHMOUCHE (Algeria) said that the wording of the second sentence of paragraph 11, in particular the word "recommends", seemed to imply a doubt as to whether the Committee would in fact hold another session.

71. Mr. LEROTHOLI (Lesotho) suggested that all that was needed was an expression of the Committee's intention to con-

tinue its work and to complete the task assigned to it under its terms of reference.

72. He also asked for an explanation of the reason for including the quotation in paragraph 5.

73. Mr. HASSAN (Sudan), Rapporteur, referring to the comment of the Algerian representative, said that he would modify the wording of paragraph 11 to make the position clear.

74. With regard to the point raised by the representative of Lesotho, he said that the quotation in paragraph 5 of the understanding reached in the sea-bed Committee was taken from the note to the Conference's decision on the allocation of items (A/CONF.62/29), which was referred to in paragraph 4 of the draft statement of the Committee's activities. The understanding had been reached as the result of arduous and painstaking negotiations and had been accepted in its entirety by all the Committees.

75. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the last paragraph of the note at the end of document A/CONF.62/29: "It is therefore recommended that the same understanding should be carried forward in respect of the Main Committees of the Conference, preliminary to the adoption of the pertinent final provisions of the Conference." If there were no further comments, he would assume that all members of the Committee were satisfied with the explanation.

Concluding Statement by the Chairman

76. The CHAIRMAN said that, with the end of the session approaching, he would not attempt to appraise the substance of the Committee's work; nor would he attempt to commit members of the Committee to any conclusions. He wished to make a kind of personal summing up and to express his views mainly on the Committee's future work.

77. In the first place, he felt that the procedural arrangements adopted had proved correct and efficient and should be followed at the next session. That would mean holding informal and formal meetings on item 12 and on items 13 and 14—though procedures could be improved at the next session in the light of the progress made.

78. In the limited time available—11 and 10 informal meetings respectively on item 12 and items 13 and 14, and only 17 formal meetings—good progress had been made. At the next session the Committee should start work immediately on items 12 and 13 and 14, where it had left off, without any general debate.

79. He had been gratified at the businesslike approach and the co-operation and mutual understanding which had been shown, all of which had been important in the negotiation process. There had been a growing desire and readiness for

mutual accommodation which he was confident would continue at the next session. The Committee had advanced in its endeavour to prepare the main elements of an "umbrella" treaty, but serious work would now be needed to prepare the draft articles which would form the body of the draft convention.

80. However, there were several important problems still outstanding. In his own opinion, the main problem on which the Committee had to concentrate was the scope and extent of coastal State jurisdiction and the rights and duties of other States, in respect of both marine pollution control and scientific research.

81. There seemed to be general agreement on the method of work for consideration of questions relating to standards, jurisdiction and enforcement (see A/CONF.62/C.3/L.14). That augured well for future discussions.

82. On the preservation of the marine environment, some progress had been made in formulating States' obligations and rights to exploit their own resources, but there were still alternatives on some of those issues. There were also many other important issues. At its next session the Committee would have to consider very carefully the distinction between standard-setting and enforcement measures.

83. Regarding scientific research, some texts had been agreed upon at informal meetings on general principles and on global co-operation, as set forth in document A/CONF.62/C.3/L.17. There were many problems outstanding for the next session; there were a number of alternative texts indicating possible areas of agreement, and also some informal texts which had not yet been fully studied.

84. With regard to the development, acquisition and transfer of technology, only two working papers had been submitted so far, namely documents A/CONF.62/C.3/L.8 and 12, the latter containing most of the elements of the former. On that subject, which was less controversial than others, the Committee should concentrate on preparing draft articles.

85. There was much work to be done before the next session. The papers produced at the current session and all the relevant papers submitted to the sea-bed Committee must be studied, so that members would be prepared for a new stage of negotiations, before and during the next session.

86. Mr. SANDERS (Guyana) asked that the Chairman's statement should be reported in detail in the summary record.

It was so decided.

After an exchange of courtesies, the Chairman declared that the Third Committee had completed its work for the session.

The meeting rose at 2.05 p.m.