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/SR.97

97th Plenary meeting

Extract from the *Official Records of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, Volume IX (Summary Records, Plenary, General Committee, First, Second and Third Committees, as well as Documents of the Conference, Seventh and Resumed Seventh Session)*

the international sea-bed area and its resources; but if it was not adopted by consensus, that aspect would require careful consideration.

Mr. Shehab (Egypt), Vice-President, took the Chair.

25. Mr. JUNOD (Switzerland) said that the uniformity of general multilateral conventions was necessary in order to give full effect to such conventions and, for that reason alone, his delegation was not in favour of a general clause that would authorize States parties to formulate reservations to the future convention. A certain number of specific considerations regarding the future treaty might be added to that general observation. First, the convention would relate to the common heritage of mankind which belonged to all members of the international community and would be administered by common institutions; it was inconceivable that the provisions relating to that aspect could give rise to reservations. In the second place, the many guarantees relative to freedom of maritime communication and transit contained in the convention would be illusory if States could evade their obligations by entering reservations. Thirdly, the future convention would accord rights to certain categories of States, notably land-locked States and geographically disadvantaged States. It would be unfortunate if such rights could be challenged by entering reservations. The success of the future convention would depend then on its complete implementation. A general clause authorizing States parties to enter reservations would jeopardize such implementation, would create inequalities within the different categories of States parties and would be in opposition to the fundamental aims and objectives of the convention.

26. Mr. NAIR (Fiji) said his delegation fully endorsed the statements made by the representative of New Zealand and the observer for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands on the question of the self-governing territories in the Pacific region which, as his delegation had explained earlier, exercised full maritime jurisdiction over their waters in their own right. His delegation trusted that the Conference would agree to establish, in the final clauses of the convention, full protection for the rights and obligations of such territories that became parties to it.

27. Mr. BOUGUETAIA (Algeria) said that his delegation would speak later on the final clauses and merely wished to say at the present time that it fully supported the observations made at the 95th meeting by the representative of Iraq and at this meeting by the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic with respect to the transitional provisions. It was highly important for those provisions to be retained, but he felt that they should be supplemented by some clauses of a more general nature so that they would reflect more clearly the aspirations of the oppressed peoples of the world. He could not emphasize too strongly the need for the new convention to respect the principles of international law and to ensure that the rights and interests of all peoples without exception were protected.

28. Mr. ANDERSEN (Iceland) said that his delegation endorsed the proposals made by the Danish and New Zealand delegations that the European Economic Community and certain self-governing territories in the Pacific region should be allowed to become parties to the convention.

Mr. Marsit (Tunisia), Vice-President, took the Chair.

29. Mr. LALLAH (Mauritius) said he did not think there should be any dispute at the present stage as to whether transitional provisions should be included in the new convention. He fully supported the remarks made by the representative of Algeria to the effect that the convention should include a general provision to ensure that peoples and States that were now dismembered would enjoy the same rights under the convention as other States that had already achieved their independence. On the question of reservations, his delegation agreed with previous speakers who had said that it would be preferable not to permit reservations to the convention because of the undesirable consequences that were likely to ensue, and also because the formulation of reservations would introduce a note of disorder after the arduous efforts made in a decade of negotiation to bring order into the area with which the convention was to deal. If it was eventually decided that reservations would be permitted, the transitional provisions at least should be excluded from that rule.

30. Mr. LOVO-CASTELAR (El Salvador) supported the proposal by the representative of Ecuador for the inclusion, in the final clauses, of a safeguard clause to the effect that national legislation enacted prior to the adoption of the convention with respect to zones extending beyond 12 nautical miles should continue to be applied to the extent that it did not affect the rights and obligations of States in accordance with the convention.

The meeting rose at 5.10 p.m.

97th meeting

Thursday, 11 May 1978, at 11.30 a.m.

President: Mr. H. S. AMERASINGHE.

Tribute to the memory of Mr. Aldo Moro

1. The PRESIDENT said that he felt it was his duty to refer to the ghastly murder by members of the so-called Red Brigades of Mr. Aldo Moro, one of the most prominent political figures in Italy and a statesman of international standing who had been held in the highest esteem.

2. On the evening following the murder, he had issued a press release in which he had stated that, as a former President of the General Assembly of the United Nations and as the President of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, whose task was to establish a new legal order for the oceans and thereby usher in an era of international co-operation which would contribute substantially to the promotion of international peace and security and friendship and harmony between all nations and all peoples, he felt it was his duty to express his reaction to the murder of Mr. Aldo Moro. He had described the murder of Mr. Moro as an act of barbarism that could not possibly be accepted with resignation by any nation or people in the world, and he had expressed his most profound condolences to the family of the late Mr. Aldo Moro and to the Government and people of Italy.

The representatives observed a minute of silence in tribute to the memory of Mr. Aldo Moro.

3. Mr. VARVESI (Italy) thanked the President for his expression of condolences to Mr. Aldo Moro's family and to the Government of Italy. Mr. Aldo Moro had devoted his life to the legal principles underlying every civilized State; it was to be hoped that his sacrifice would at least serve to defend the civilization to which everyone present belonged.

4. The PRESIDENT said that, if there was no objection, he would request the secretariat to convey the Conference's deepest condolences to the Government of Italy for transmission to Mr. Aldo Moro's family.

It was so decided.

Organization of work

5. The PRESIDENT said that, in accordance with his memorandum (A/CONF.62/L.28), he had met the chairmen of the committees and the chairmen of the negotiating groups immediately before the current meeting in order to hear their reports on the state of the work in their respective bodies. As indicated in the memorandum, he would now summarize those reports.

6. The Chairman of negotiating group 1 had said that a package of compromise proposals had been submitted to the group and that he was hopeful that further progress would be made. In connexion with article 150 *bis*, a sub-group of technical experts on production control had submitted two reports, which had been found to be generally acceptable. Consideration had not yet been given to production control for minerals other than nickel. The major nickel-producing and nickel-importing countries had agreed on a formula which might prove acceptable to all producing and importing countries. The compromise formula for article 150 seemed to be acceptable, and the text for article 150 *bis* was close to acceptance. The group would nevertheless need more time in order to deal with other issues, in particular article 153.

7. Negotiating group 2 had concluded its work on the three items assigned to it. A compromise text on the first two items and a draft text on the third item would be available by the following day. Negotiations on the third item—the financial terms of contracts—had not been completely successful.

8. Negotiating group 3 would also need more time in order to complete its work, in particular on the size of the Council and the voting system.

9. In negotiating group 4, there had been few developments since the previous report. Its work had not been completed. The main difficulties were: first, how to deal with a situation in which a coastal State increased its fishing capacity to absorb the entire allowable catch; and second, the question of the definition of geographically disadvantaged States.

10. Negotiating group 5 had achieved good results; the proposals submitted had been the subject of a conditional consensus. The group would, however, require more time in order to complete negotiations and to have an opportunity to study the effect which its work would have on other provisions, in particular articles 296 and 297.

11. Negotiating group 6 had reached a deadlock and would require more time if it was to reach a solution. The question of revenue-sharing had hardly been discussed.

12. Negotiating group 7 also needed more time in order to achieve a satisfactory solution to the questions before it.

13. After the conclusion of the work of the negotiating groups, the committees would review the questions submitted to them by the various groups in preparation for a meeting of the plenary Conference, which would consider the situation as a whole and indicate what revisions or amendments should be made.

14. He wished to draw particular attention to paragraphs 5 and 9 of his memorandum. In paragraph 10, the date should be changed to "16 May". If the committees examined the situation thoroughly, the work of the plenary Conference would be made much simpler. Little time would be left for revision of the text but it would be helpful if, at the plenary meeting on 16 May, delegations would state very briefly what they considered acceptable or unacceptable.

15. Mr. ARIAS SCHREIBER (Peru) expressed his appreciation of the President's report on the negotiations. He assumed that the President's memorandum had been submitted as a proposal, and that it was for the Conference to decide how to organize its work. Presumably the General Committee had been unable to discuss that matter because of lack of time. His delegation would like to have some information on the work done by the Second Committee, which was considering a number of issues that had not yet been examined in depth. Some delegations had not had an opportunity to submit proposals on those issues, and it was not known whether there would be sufficient support for those proposals to warrant their possible incorporation in the text. His delegation would also like to know when those issues would be considered by the plenary Conference.

16. The PRESIDENT said that his memorandum represented a proposal; it had in no sense been approved by the plenary Conference. It was true that it had not been possible to arrange a meeting of the General Committee because of lack of time.

17. The Chairman of the Second Committee had reported that it had been considering, article by article, issues that were not included among the hard-core issues. It had reached article 55 and would be holding three meetings on that day and the following day. After that it would meet, like the First and Third Committees, to review the work done as a whole. On 16 May the plenary Conference would meet.

18. Mr. WARIOBA (United Republic of Tanzania) said that, in his opinion, paragraph 5 of the President's memorandum was ambiguous. He would like to know which specific issues would be treated as an exception to the proposed procedure.

19. It was apparent from the President's report that the negotiating groups still had much work to do. At the 94th plenary meeting, the President had given an assurance that revision of the informal composite negotiating text[1] would not begin until and unless the plenary Conference had had sufficient time to consider all the negotiations that had taken place. In the circumstances, it might be useful if the negotiating groups and committees were given sufficient time for a thorough consideration of the issues before them. If necessary, the remainder of the session should be devoted entirely to work in the negotiating groups or committees, which could be requested to submit the results of their discussions in a formal manner as the results of the current session. From their reports, the Conference would be able to see to what extent a compromise had been achieved and what remained to be done. It should not commit itself specifically to revising the informal composite negotiating text at the current session. By refraining from doing so, it would avoid laying itself open, as it had done in the past, to accusations by the press that it had not succeeded in producing a text on which a consensus had been reached. In the following week the Conference should decide if and when it would hold a further session.

20. The PRESIDENT said that it would be presumptuous of him to specify which issues might be treated as exceptions to the procedure proposed in paragraph 4 of document A/CONF.62/L.28. That was a matter for delegations themselves to decide.

[1] *Official Records of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea*, vol. VIII (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.78.V.4).

21. With regard to the suggestion that the committees and negotiating groups should be allowed more time, he had discussed the matter thoroughly with the chairmen of the committees and the chairmen of the negotiating groups; and it was in the light of their assessment of the progress made in their committees and groups that it had been decided that the plenary should meet on 16 May to consider the state of work in all committees.

22. He had indeed said that the main task at the current session was to revise the informal composite negotiating text; whether that task could be performed satisfactorily would depend on the progress made in the committees and negotiating groups.

23. With regard to the question whether and, if so, when there would be another session of the Conference, members should refer to paragraph 12 of document A/CONF.62/L.28.

24. Mr. YOLGA (Turkey) said that his delegation fully supported the procedure suggested by the President in paragraph 2 of document A/CONF.62/L.28.

25. With regard to paragraph 4 of that document, it was doubtful that, even with an extra two or three meetings, the Second Committee would be able to complete its work by the time suggested; that Committee should be allowed more time for its negotiations. Referring to the section sentence of paragraph 4, he said that he had already objected to the separation of issues into hard-core and other issues. In his delegation's opinion, the Conference would not be in a position to draft a new convention until all issues had been settled to the satisfaction of everyone.

26. At a previous meeting, his delegation had said that the question of the settlement of disputes could not be divided into several parts and examined in isolation under the various chapters of the convention. It therefore noted with satisfaction the suggestion in paragraph 6 of document A/CONF.62/L.28.

27. Turning to paragraph 9 ii, he said that there was no clear-cut majority of the Conference as a whole on any given provision or formula. These were groups of countries interested in various problems, and only within those groups was there a majority and a minority which clearly expressed their views on the various proposals put forward.

28. In conclusion, with reference to paragraph 11, he said that, in his delegation's opinion, the Conference was not, at the current stage of its work, in a position to revise the informal composite negotiating text.

Adoption of a convention dealing with all matters relating to the law of the sea, pursuant to paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 3067 (XXVIII) of 16 November 1973, and of the Final Act of the Conference (*continued*)

Preamble and final clauses (continued)

29. Mr. TEMPLETON (New Zealand), speaking on behalf of the delegations of Fiji, Papua New Guinea and Suriname as well as on behalf of his own delegation, formally introduced the proposal contained in document A/CONF.62/L.29. The proposed draft article embodied the existing provisions of articles 298 and 299 of the informal composite negotiating text and, in addition, would permit the territories listed in General Assembly resolution 3334 (XXIX), and which currently had observer status, to sign and ratify the convention or alternatively to accede to it. Paragraph 5 of the proposal would ensure that, as a contracting party, any of those territories would enjoy all the rights and undertake all the obligations of States which had become parties to the convention. Mr. Templeton advanced substantive arguments in favour of this proposal at the 95th meeting. He wished to make it clear that the proposal was not intended to be necessarily exclusive of proposals that other entities should also be given the right to become parties to the convention. Such proposals deserved to be considered on their merits. They were in no way invalidated by the proposal in document A/CONF.62/L.29, which did not purport to be the last word on the subject with which it dealt.

30. Mr. AL-NIMER (Bahrain) thanked the secretariat for preparing document A/CONF.62/L.13.[2] He also thanked the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the statement he had made on that document at the beginning of the Conference's discussion on the preamble and final clauses at the 95th meeting.

31. He agreed with speakers who had said that it would be difficult to adopt a firm position on the final clauses until the definitive texts on the questions to be covered by the convention were known. Nevertheless, certain general principles could be discussed at the current stage.

32. Referring to final clause 1 in document A/CONF.62/L.13, he suggested that it would be useful to allow intergovernmental organizations to sign the convention; those organizations would then be able to harmonize their work on the subjects covered by the convention with that of States parties to the convention. He suggested that liberation movements, which had participated in the Conference as observers since the second session, should also be allowed to sign the convention. The Conference was preparing a universal instrument that was expected to remain in force for many years. It was quite possible that during the lifetime of the convention some of the liberation movements would become the governments of independent States. They should, therefore, be allowed to sign the instrument. In that connexion, attention should be given to the proposal submitted by the Arab group in document A/CONF.62/L.26.

33. Final clauses 2 and 3 in document A/CONF.62/L.13 did not give rise to any difficulties; the convention could not be implemented unless it was ratified and the text must include a clause on accession. Final clause 4 raised the question as to when should the convention enter into force. The convention would be universal in character and would embody new norms of international maritime law. It should, therefore, be ratified by a substantial number of States before coming into force.

34. The question of reservations, contained in final clause 7, was very important. There were a number of provisions, including those on the legal régime of the international area, exploration and exploitation of the international area and the common heritage of mankind, in respect of which reservations should not be admissible. On the other hand, there were provisions—which he was not in a position to list at the current time—in respect of which reservations should be admissible.

35. Mr. KOZYREV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation thought it was indeed useful to hold an exchange of views on the preamble to the future convention. At the current stage of the Conference's work, however, such an exchange of views could only be of a preliminary and general nature. The formulations to be included in the preamble should not go beyond the framework of the objectives set for the Conference, and should not touch upon matters that would give rise to lengthy discussions. The authors of the draft preamble and final clauses included in the informal composite negotiating text had, it seemed, been guided precisely by those considerations. Any attempt to discuss alternative drafts referring to controversial political problems of various kinds might create new difficulties in the work of the Conference and prevent it from being concluded as soon as possible. His delegation would be prepared to support the draft preamble as contained in the informal composite negotiating text. That text included provisions which

[2] *Ibid.*, vol. VI (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.77.V.2).

were regularly used in conventions codifying norms of international law. The advantage of the informal composite negotiating text was that it was concise and clear. If the Conference had more time, it could of course prepare a more comprehensive preamble; but there did not seem to be any need for it to do so. Provisions of a general nature concerning questions of the law of the sea, which might have been included in the preamble, were already contained in the Declaration of Principles Governing the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor, and the Subsoil Thereof, beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction,[3] to which reference was made in the draft preamble in the informal composite negotiating text.

36. Mr. AL ATTRACHE (Syria) said that his delegation fully supported the proposal submitted by Fiji, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea and Suriname in document A/CONF.62/L.29. That proposal supplemented the 20-Power proposal contained in document A/CONF.62/L.26.

37. Mr. ROSENNE (Israel) said that his delegation wished to associate itself with the expressions of sympathy addressed to the delegation of Italy in connexion with the national tragedy provoked by unbridled terrorism.

38. At the 95th meeting, he had mentioned a number of aspects which, in his delegation's view, would be relevant to the decisions on certain proposals then before the Conference regarding the participation of certain groupings of States, or entities which at the time were not fully independent States, as contracting parties to the convention. At that stage, there had been two such requests before the Conference, one submitted with regard to the European Economic Community and one advanced by the representative of New Zealand on behalf of certain Trust Territories in the Pacific.

39. In the case of the European Economic Community, it had repeatedly been explained that the members of that grouping of States had transferred some of their national competences to the Community, and that it was therefore essential that engagements with regard to matters in various fields examined by the Conference should be undertaken by the Community.

40. The question of certain Trust Territories in the Pacific had been similarly dealt with in a letter dated 3 May 1978 from the New Zealand delegation (A/CONF.62/64) and in the statement by the representative of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands at the 95th meeting.

41. His delegation had accordingly been led to state its position with regard to the participation in the convention, as a contracting party, of a body other than one of the States or groups of States participating fully and as of right in the Conference. The essential criterion governing participation as a contracting party was constitutional and legislative competence, recognized internationally by other States, to take the necessary measures, including formal administrative, legal and judicial measures, to guarantee the fulfilment at the international and internal levels of all the interlocking obligations which the future convention would impose on its contracting parties. Furthermore, that constitutional and legislative competence had to be matched by the capacity to bear international responsibility for the consequences of any breach of the convention duly attributable to the contracting party concerned.

42. The transparent proposal by 20 States members of the League of Arab States (A/CONF.62/L.26) drew attention to another aspect, namely whether participation of national liberation movements as contracting parties to the convention and whether their inclusion in the quorum for bringing the convention into force under article 300 of the informal composite negotiating text had any rhyme or reason in the light of the convention's substantive provisions. It would be both illogical and unwise for the Conference to permit such movements to become parties to the convention when they were not in a position to undertake the duties, bear the responsibilities or benefit from the rights of a contracting party. How could national liberation movements, for example, undertake the responsible and delicate duties imposed upon States in article 105 or comply with the basic requirements detailed in articles 214 to 223 of the informal composite negotiating text, to give but two illustrations?

43. A provision permitting national liberation movements to accede to the convention would produce a further lack of clarity and stability at the international level, and also in national legislatures which would be called upon to consider ratification of the convention.

44. The proposal in question was not designed to meet anything needed to give substance to international rights and international duties set forth in the informal composite negotiating text. It was a purely political move and quite irrelevant to the work of the Conference. It would be a grave and completely unwarranted departure from all established international practice if bodies were permitted to participate as contracting parties in a convention, which were incapable of fulfiling their obligations under it or bearing any international responsibility for its breach. For all those reasons, his delegation believed that it should be rejected out of hand. He reserved the right to revert to the subject should the need arise.

45. Mr. HERRERA CÁCERES (Honduras) said that his delegation thought that the extent of permissible reservations could be clarified only when the definitive text of the convention became known. For the moment, it was extremely difficult to distinguish between articles which were essential to the convention and those on which reservations could be permitted. If, of course, the final text were adopted by consensus, the matter would not arise. If, on the other hand, it were adopted by a majority vote, the States forming part of the minority would be unable to become contracting parties to the convention, unless there was the possibility of entering reservations.

46. The most that could be done, for the moment, was to decide what reservations would destroy the convention's integrity and thus be impermissible. The inclusion in the preamble of an explanation of the motives and purposes of the convention would indicate which articles were essential and would, more generally, give an indication of the appropriate interpretation of the operative parts.

47. His delegation thus considered that the preamble should refer to the following purposes of the convention: the transformation of the traditional economic order of maritime space by a new economic order that would respond to the claims of the developing States; the fact that the new order was based upon equity; the fact that the sea-bed and ocean floor were the common heritage of mankind; the necessity to preserve the marine environment; and the fact that disputes should be settled peacefully and that the terms of the convention should be fulfilled in good faith.

48. His delegation had serious doubts concerning the placement of the final paragraph of the preamble in the negotiating text, since the reference to customary international law might be a source of prejudice. The provision in question would find a more appropriate place in the final clauses of the convention at the moment of determining also the relationship between the convention and other sources of the law of the sea such as, for example, the Geneva Conventions and the unilateral acts of States.

49. With respect to the suggestion that a clause should be included to cover the situation of the European Economic Community, his delegation took the view that since, to some extent, that Community had competence in certain parts of the convention, it would necessarily have to be a contracting party to the convention in that respect.

[3] General Assembly resolution 2749 (XXV).

50. The Portugese proposal regarding periodic conferences on international ocean affairs (A/CONF.62/L.23) required careful attention by the Conference, in conjunction with articles 152 and 153, and might well be included in the final clauses.

51. Mr. OXMAN (United States of America) said that his delegation had listened with great attention to the suggestions made regarding final clauses. While noting that certain matters such as reservations remained to be considered, it had found various points made with respect to the matters under discussion quite illuminating. He felt therefore that many delegations, like his own, would wish to study them more carefully and consult more closely with those concerned.

52. In that connexion, his delegation believed it would be a mistake to confuse support for national liberation movements and the desire to hear their views, on the one hand, with the question of their international legal capacity to become parties to a convention on the law of the sea, on the other hand. There was no precedent for the latter step and such proposals, if pressed, might well complicate efforts to resolve other issues and secure a widely ratified convention.

53. In his delegation's view, the existing text of the preamble and final clauses was the proper foundation for further consideration of those matters and no basis existed for amending the draft text at the current session.

54. Mr. KOVALEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to the possible participation of national liberation movements in the convention, said that, in keeping with its well-known position, the delegation of the USSR would support the right of the Palestine Liberation Organization to participate in and sign the convention. His country would continue to uphold the inalienable right of the Palestine people to establish its own State.

55. Mr. ATEIGA (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that his delegation endorsed the four-Power proposal in A/CONF.62/L.29 and the supplementary 20-Power proposal in A/CONF.62/L.26. Both those proposals were based on political and legal considerations, and other conferences had adopted similar provisions.

56. People under colonial domination had a rightful share in the common heritage of mankind, and there could be no doubt that the national liberation movements had fulfilled their obligations under other international instruments.

57. His delegation thought that the preamble should be based on universal concepts such as: the need to update the peaceful use of the seas and oceans, and to protect them; the relationship between the convention and the new international economic order; the common heritage of mankind, including both developing and developed countries; and the development of the international law of the sea.

58. Mr. MARSIT (Tunisia) said that it had been stated by some delegations that the preamble and final clauses as they appeared in the negotiating text were acceptable. For the moment, he would only say that his delegation considered that they needed amending, particularly the preamble.

59. The Conference had decided at Caracas to authorize the nationa liberation movements to participate as observers in the Conference. It was only logical, therefore, that they should be permitted to become contracting parties.

60. As for the question of the admission of the European Economic Community as a contracting party, his delegation would examine the matter in all objectivity.

61. Mr. TARCIC (Yemen) said that his delegation endorsed the 20-Power proposal concerning the accession of the national liberation movements to the convention.

62. With respect to the question of reservations, there could be no doubt that the future convention would be the most important treaty of the twentieth century and it was therefore essential that limited reservations should be permitted in order to ensure the maximum number of contracting parties. If limited reservations were not permitted, countries whose vital interests were not respected in the convention would be unable to become contracting parties. As an example he mentioned the question of the passage of warships through straits, in respect of which the provisions of the convention might conflict with those of other international instruments.

63. Mr. ARIAS SCHREIBER (Peru) said that the preamble and final clauses as they appeared in the negotiating text were unsatisfactory, since they were much too weak. According to proposals which had been submitted by various delegations, including his own, the preamble would express the realities of the situation in which the Conference had been convened and the principles on which it was based; it would also explain the developments that had occurred since the First and Second United Nations Conferences on the Law of the Sea.

64. The principles on which the Conference was based were of interest to all States, and historical facts were historical facts; he was therefore unable to understand why any delegation should object to them being mentioned. What were the arguments against doing so?

65. Mr. EL-IBRASHI (Egypt) said his delegation reserved the right to reply to the statement made by the representative of Israel opposing the 20-Power proposal.

The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.

98th meeting

Monday, 15 May 1978, at 11.05 a.m.

President: Mr. H. S. AMERASINGHE.

Adoption of a convention dealing with all matters relating to the law of the sea, pursuant to paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 3067 (XXVIII) of 16 November 1973, and of the Final Act of the Conference (*continued*)

Preamble and final clauses (concluded)

1. Mr. MONNIER (Switzerland) said his delegation believed that the preamble should be as short as possible. It should set forth the general outline of the future convention and indicate the main purposes of the provisions contained therein. There was no need for it to be proportionally as long as the future convention, as suggested by the Peruvian representative at an earlier meeting.

2. His delegation was unable to support the proposal to delete the reference in the last preambular paragraph of the