

# **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.71**

## **71<sup>st</sup> Plenary meeting**

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

# PLENARY MEETINGS

## 71st meeting

Monday, 2 August 1976, at 4.10 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. H. S. AMERASINGHE (Sri Lanka).

### Opening of the session

1. The PRESIDENT declared open the fifth session of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea.

### Minute of silence for prayer or meditation

*On the proposal of the President, the representatives observed a minute of silence.*

### Adoption of the agenda (A/CONF.62/47)

*The agenda was adopted.*

### Statement by the President of the Conference

2. The PRESIDENT said that the current session would be not only crucial but critical because, unless sufficient progress was made towards reaching agreement on a generally acceptable treaty, a great opportunity would be lost. He was certain that all members were aware of their responsibility to their Governments, to the international community and to mankind as a whole and would not fail in that responsibility.

### Expression of sympathy to the Government and people of China

3. The PRESIDENT, speaking on behalf of the Conference, expressed deep sympathy to the Government and people of China for their loss following the recent earthquake in Tang-chang. He was certain that the Chinese people, with their great spirit of solidarity as a nation, would manage to overcome the disaster. He would be grateful if the representative of China would convey the Conference's deep and sincere sympathy to his Government.
4. Mr. LIN Ching (China) expressed his delegation's thanks for the sympathy expressed by the President on behalf of the Conference on the occasion of the earthquake which had brought great loss to his people. However, with the sympathy and support of the people of the world and with the efforts of his own people, the difficulties could, he believed, be overcome and the devastated area reconstructed.

### Participation of Angola

5. The PRESIDENT welcomed the Government and delegation of Angola as a participant in the Conference and wished them every success in their mission.

### Organization of negotiations (A/CONF.62/L.12/Rev.1)

6. The PRESIDENT said that the Conference should, during the fifth session, try to reach agreement on the key issues

facing it, since that would simplify the attainment of final agreement on a treaty or convention. Although the best judges of the key issues were the Chairmen of the three Committees, he had felt that he should give his detached view on what those issues were, and he had done so in document A/CONF.62/L.12/Rev.1. In that document he had made it clear that his was not the final word on the subject and that it would be left to each Chairman and Committee to decide what the key issues were and to concentrate on them. Although certain issues had been categorized as key issues, that did not mean that other issues, which were of vital importance to some delegations, were not to be discussed. He would urge, however, that no time should be wasted at the current session on procedural discussions. The Conference should proceed immediately to negotiations.

7. A change was needed in the method of negotiation. In his view, if progress was to be made, it was essential to ensure that the negotiations took place in groups of a business-like size and that all participants in the Conference were-informed of the progress of negotiations and given a chance to participate in them. The subjects for negotiation should be determined by the Chairmen of the Committees in consultation with their Committees. The negotiations should be entrusted to smaller groups for discussion. Such groups should also be selected by the Chairmen in consultation with their Committees, but subject to the right of any other member State to participate in the negotiations. The principle of universal involvement of all States would then be ensured. Since the numbers involved in the negotiation procedure would be limited, the Chairman of each Committee should inform his Committee at regular intervals—for example, every other day—on the progress made in the negotiations so that those who had not participated in them could either express their views or decide to participate in the negotiations. As the President of the Conference, he would meet with the Chairmen of the three Committees almost every other day to ensure co-ordination of their work so that the Committees could move forward *pari passu*. It would also be necessary for the plenary to meet at short and regular intervals so that it could be kept informed of the progress made in the three Committees. By that means the unity of the question as a whole could be preserved, as the Conference was one body and not three.

8. Mr. AHMED (Egypt) said it had been agreed at the 21st meeting of the General Committee that the three Committees, rather than their Chairmen, would decide on the key issues and on the composition and proceedings of the negotiating groups.

9. The PRESIDENT said that, according to his statement, it would be the Chairmen of the three Committees, in consultation with their Committees, who would take the decisions.

10. Mr. AHMED (Egypt) said that a point of emphasis was at issue and that he would like the emphasis to be on the Committees rather than on the Chairmen.

11. The PRESIDENT said that the emphasis was of course on the Committees.

12. Mr. TUNCEL (Turkey) said that the President had introduced some new elements into the organization of negotiations which had not been mentioned at the 21st meeting of the General Committee. Those new elements were important because the Conference was faced, at its current session, with crucial and critical issues upon which its failure or success would depend. If efforts continued to be made to force delegations to accept positions already decided upon without their agreement, his delegation would find it impossible to participate in the work of the Conference. Thus the objective of the Conference could not be achieved because a convention ultimately agreed upon under such circumstances would be a regional and not a universal convention. He agreed with the representative of Egypt that a collective effort should be made rather than entrusting certain initiatives to the Chairmen of the Committees. It was not for the Chairmen to decide on questions of sovereignty; the members themselves should take such decisions. The President's proposal was that the Chairmen of the Committees should organize negotiating groups. However, as the representative of Egypt had stated, it was for the Committees themselves to take on that task. Similarly, the President had proposed that the Chairmen of the Committees should decide on the key issues to be discussed. In his own view, that task should also be entrusted to the Committees. Although he had further ideas on procedure, he had for the present merely drawn attention to the new elements introduced by the President, since national interests were involved.

13. The PRESIDENT said that he had not stated that the Chairmen of the Committees should have the power to take decisions for the Committees. However, he had to entrust the initiative to the Chairmen if any semblance of order was to be maintained in their work. The Chairmen should act in close consultation with their Committees.

14. Mr. PINTO (Sri Lanka) said that his delegation fully endorsed the President's appraisal in document A/CONF.62/L.12/Rev.1 of the principal issues to be negotiated in each Committee and of the critical nature of the present stage of the Conference. His delegation wished to comment on the methods by which negotiations might be conducted during the current session. For nearly a decade the Conference had been groping towards a satisfactory technique for dealing with the multiplicity of issues before it that was likely to result in general agreement within a reasonable time. In the past, efforts had been made to negotiate substantive issues among all members of the Committee. That method had proved unsatisfactory. Since then, matters had been referred to working groups representing all interest groups. However, that had not proved satisfactory either. Subsequently, very small groups had been formed and individual texts had been submitted, but the secrecy involved had rendered such work suspect. Other techniques had been tried with a similar lack of success, and, clearly, the synthesis of elements needed to achieve general acceptability and avoid continued rejection of the final product was not yet complete.

15. The President's new proposals carried the method used in Geneva a step further, and his delegation fully supported that method, in the belief that it would bring the Conference closer to the goal of fusing efficiency and universality of consultation. However, his delegation wished to add a further refinement for the consideration of those who would be conducting the negotiations. Complex negotiations could only be carried out within a limited time span by a small number of persons. The same applied to the drafting of texts embodying agreements. In the past, informed selection of participants by an officer of the Conference, such as the Chairman of a Committee, had often proved acceptable, particularly where wide consultations had preceded and supplemented the work of the group. Given a minimum of trust and forbearance on the part of members, such a system had led to the production of working texts without recourse to the formal selection of a working group. In general, that device had not worked badly

and had resulted in some progress. However, the work of such groups had not met with enthusiastic acceptance but rather with suspicion and the resistance to it was corrosive and destructive. The need was, therefore, to preserve the efficiency of the small group while eschewing secrecy. In his delegation's view, therefore, the answer lay in carefully arranged public sittings of small groups. In other words, the group should meet regularly in the formally convened presence of the full membership of the Conference. Such a technique came closest to representing the current synthesis of the Conference's experience of multilateral negotiations. The elements of personal selection of participants and the ultimate personal role of the convener of the group, smallness and efficiency of the group and rejection of secrecy were combined in what might be called "the arena method". The membership, in whom the true power lay, would be meeting to witness the debate and resolution of issues by a group which it was not formally committed to recognize nor the results of whose work it would be committed to accept. However, the new relationship of the negotiator to the membership and the possibility of any member participating at any time should eliminate the phenomenon of rejection of the product.

16. He had described such a method to some of his associates at the Conference, and they had not rejected it out of hand. He did not feel that it was an impractical suggestion; it should give rise to new ways to communicate opposition to ideas and a new restraint without sacrificing either candour or clarity. He believed that the "arena" method was the method of the future and carried the democratization of international relationships a step further. As a logical extension of the Conference's collective experience, his delegation believed that the new method should be tried and developed for the future.

17. The PRESIDENT stated that some changes had been made in the original text of his note (A/CONF.62/L.12). Paragraphs 15 and 16 had been amended to bring out the result of the consultations between the Chairmen of the three Committees.

18. Mr. ZIDI (Tunisia) said that the question of organization of work and procedure was critical at the present stage of the Conference. He agreed with the representatives of Egypt and Turkey and regretted that he did not share the view of the representative of Sri Lanka. The Committees must find their own methods of work that were generally acceptable to all. If the Committees were entitled to modify and improve their methods of work, progress could be made. His delegation was concerned that so little progress had been made, particularly in the First Committee. He hoped that a new impetus could be gained by giving the Committees greater responsibility, so that generally acceptable results could be achieved.

19. The PRESIDENT stressed again that he hoped the Conference could avoid long procedural discussions, as negotiations were now the most vital task before the current session of the Conference. He, as President of the Conference, could only make suggestions which the Committees were free to accept or reject, just as they must, of course, also decide on their own methods of procedure.

20. Mr. LIN Ching (China) said, with regard to the procedure to be adopted at the current session of the Conference, that he agreed in principle that priority should be given to consultations on certain important matters of substance. The President had submitted a list of suggested key issues, and many delegations had made their own observations revealing what they felt were the important matters. The full list of key issues should now be decided through discussions in the various Committees, as there were still numerous differences of principle with regard to many of the major issues. Those differences were, in his view, related to the struggle against maritime hegemonism and the need to

safeguard State sovereignty and security. He noted that the numerous third world countries had repeatedly submitted just and reasonable propositions only to face obstruction by the super-Powers. The rights and interests of the land-locked and geographically disadvantaged States also required a just solution on the basis of negotiations on an equal footing. Such major problems should, in his view, be included in the list of key issues which must coincide with the interests of the developing countries for the Conference to make genuine progress.

21. Furthermore, all countries, especially the smaller delegations of the developing countries, should be entitled to participate in discussions on all issues on the basis of equality. Such discussions should be held in the Committees, as the important issues of substance were complicated and involved numerous contradictory positions. He hoped that a time-table could be established for consultations and that sufficient time would be left for consultations among groups of related interests.

22. With regard to the preamble and final clauses, he agreed that the matter should not be discussed in haste at the opening stages of the Conference. It might be possible to give an *ad hoc* group responsibility for undertaking an initial study on the matter, and, at the appropriate time, States could express their views in the plenary, before the preparation of a draft text for submission to the plenary for discussion.

23. The Conference had reached an important stage in its deliberations and must take into account, in its efforts to draw up a new convention, the widespread demand to combat super-Power hegemonism so as to give due prominence to the interests of the numerous third world and other small countries. His delegation would stand together with the developing countries and all countries which cherished their independence and sovereignty to work together for positive results at the current session.

24. Mr. ZEGERS (Chile) said that he could not understand the reason for the difficulties which appeared to have arisen with regard to the proposals made by the President in his note, all of which had been prepared in accordance with a mandate given to the President by the Conference at its fourth session. At the 21st meeting of the General Committee, the President had stated that the Conference had now entered an advanced stage, and he had proposed, and the General Committee had agreed, that: first, the Committee should decide on certain basic questions or "key issues" as the most appropriate subjects for negotiations; secondly, the negotiations should be carried out in operative groups set up by the Committees with all participants in the Committees kept informed of the progress of negotiations; thirdly, the negotiation process could be expected to take up three to four weeks; and fourthly, it should be co-ordinated by the General Committee or the Conference itself. Some delegations seemed to be claiming that the officers of the Conference had prepared a package which the Conference must now accept. His delegation could not share those concerns and had full confidence that the officers had neither exceeded nor fallen short of their mandate. It was obvious, for instance, that the Chairmen of the Committees would propose members of the working groups only in consultation with delegations.

25. He was confident that there was a consensus on the matter and reminded the Conference that work by consensus required elasticity and efforts on the part of all sides to avoid problems, which in any case often turned out to be artificial. He suggested that the Conference should not lose time on the matter but should move on to the next item on its agenda.

26. Mr. WARIOBA (United Republic of Tanzania) asked for clarification on the status of the President's note in the light of the present discussion. Was it to be considered a working paper of the Committees or a paper of the Conference for the guidance of the Committees?

27. The PRESIDENT assured the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania that his note had merely been intended as a guide to Committees and that they might do with it what they wished.

28. Mr. WARIOBA (United Republic of Tanzania) said that he agreed in principle with the suggestion that the Conference should move on to a serious stage of negotiation and should focus its attention on the major issues. A weakness of the Conference, which had often been pointed out, was the reluctance of delegations to negotiate seriously on major issues. He hoped that that stage had now been reached where such discussion would be possible. Furthermore, he supported in principle the identification of the principal issues of the Conference. He was not in full agreement with the list as it was stated in the President's note but was confident that future consultations could solve the problem. His only serious reservations with regard to the President's paper were that the issues were not formulated in the proper manner, with the proper priorities or with the proper emphasis. He also had some reservations with regard to certain categorical statements of assessment, especially in paragraphs 19 through 21. Since the paper was simply a guide to Committees, his delegation would express its views on the matter in the Committee discussion stage. Otherwise, his delegation could accept the paper and felt that there had been sufficient negotiation to identify the major issues. It agreed that another procedural debate would indeed be a waste of time.

29. Mr. TARCICI (Yemen) expressed his appreciation of the President's note and indicated his general agreement with the President's choices of the key issues facing the Conference. He felt, however, that certain additions could be made to paragraph 11 (vii), dealing with straits used for international navigation, where the President had cited articles 16, 33, 37 and 43 of part II—prepared by the Chairman of the Second Committee—of the informal single negotiating text. Other articles which were equally important and formed the basis on which delegates should express their views when discussing key issues were articles 17 to 21 and articles 28 to 31.

30. Mr. KOZYREV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation was in general agreement with the procedure for the work of the Conference suggested by the President in his note. The list of important matters would, of course, have to be further specified in the organizational sessions of the Committees. It was important, however, that the procedure proposed should not include a radical re-examination of any portion of the single negotiating text prepared by the Chairmen of the Committees at the close of the fourth session of the Conference. His delegation generally supported suggestions that progress should be sought by working out mutually acceptable formulations on those questions on which no agreement had as yet been reached.

31. While in general agreement that the formulation of a list of key issues was important for the work of Committees, his delegation felt that it was necessary to study the question of the form the Committees' work should take in the present final stages of preparing the convention. His delegation favoured the participation of the Chairmen and other officers of the Committees in the final stage of preparing a convention which would be a mutually acceptable international document. The same procedure should be followed in the plenary, where the President of the Conference and the Committee Chairmen could doubtless contribute authoritatively to working out mutually acceptable compromise solutions. His delegation favoured the strictest observance of the principles of consensus and "package" negotiation. Those principles applied equally to the elaboration of the final clauses and of the preamble. His delegation welcomed the work of the Secretariat in preparing alternative texts for those portions of the convention (A/CONF.62/L.13). The document in question could be examined at the appropriate time in the plenary after

completion of the study of the draft articles in part IV of the single negotiating text (see A/CONF.62/WP.9/Rev.1)<sup>1</sup> dealing with dispute settlement procedures with regard to interpretation and application of the convention.

32. After the many years of negotiation, the impatience of delegations to achieve concrete results was understandable; that would follow if all delegations showed goodwill, realism and readiness to seek mutually agreeable solutions. Of special importance in that connexion were negotiations between groups. It must not be forgotten that no group, regardless of its size, could of its own accord work out mutually acceptable solutions to the matters before the Conference; nor could such solutions be reached in confrontations of one group with another. The great task before the Conference lay in working out a universal convention which would satisfy the interests of all countries and make a valuable contribution to the development of fruitful co-operation between Governments and the establishment of peace and security on the seas and thereby on earth. The Soviet delegation assured all other delegations of its co-operation in efforts to achieve those goals.

33. Mr. VILLAGRÁN KRAMER (Guatemala) said that the problem of how to organize negotiations at the fifth session was closely related to the time factor involved. The impression conveyed by the 21st meeting of the General Committee had been that most delegations wished to make rapid progress so that a final draft of parts I to III of the convention could be ready by the end of August or the beginning of September. However, his delegation would support any proposal, such as the "arena" method of negotiations proposed by the representative of Sri Lanka, to speed up the work of the Conference, only if all delegations were actually able to take part in such negotiations. If, within a Committee, three groups held meetings simultaneously to discuss key issues, some delegations might be unable to participate in all discussions of key issues. Each Chairman should, therefore, in consultation with his Committee, discuss the possibility of applying the "arena" method, but, while bearing in mind the tight schedule imposed on negotiations, should ensure that all key issues were settled with the participation of all delegations.

34. Regarding the possibility of confrontation between groups of countries, he said that the Group of 77 felt it could not avoid confrontation with the developed countries on certain points which were vital to the development of the third world. Concessions could be, and had been, made, and the coastal States, which had arduously defended the 200-mile economic zone, had none the less from the start shown a willingness to make concessions. However, there was a limit to the efforts they could make, and, therefore, while they were able to make further concessions, a framework must be found so that any confrontation of interests would prove to be fruitful and useful to all delegations.

35. Mr. ARIAS SCHREIBER (Peru) said that it had been understood at the 21st meeting of the General Committee that the contents of document A/CONF.62/L.12/Rev.1 were designed to act as a guideline only and were not binding. It was for the Committees to determine what were the key issues and to agree on the specific negotiating machinery. The plenary meeting should not, therefore, adopt decisions on the contents of that document but should simply note the President's suggestions and leave it to the Committees to decide which questions needed special negotiating machinery. At most, the plenary should decide whether there was agreement on the two main proposals made by the President, namely, those regarding what meaning the fifth session should attach to the paragraphs under consideration and what negotiations were needed to complete the work of

the session. Under the rules of procedure, the General Committee had to co-operate with the President in organizing the work of the Conference, whereas the Committees organized their own work. It was, therefore, inconceivable that the Chairmen should replace their Committees or that alternative machinery to that proposed in the rules of procedure should be adopted.

36. Mr. VALENCIA-RODRÍGUEZ (Ecuador) said that his delegation agreed that document A/CONF.62/L.12/Rev.1 should serve as a starting point for discussions, but not as an exhaustive list of key issues. Indeed, from the territorialist standpoint, a number of key issues had been omitted from that document though they were vital to a number of States and must therefore be dealt with by each Committee independently. Delegations were completely free to call for discussion on any point in any body of the Conference. While certain issues were not a common denominator of the Conference, they could not be overlooked. There was a large group of States which, by virtue of declarations made over a period of many years, possessed a body of important rights which must be kept in force. The rights which they possessed in a 200-mile territorial sea constituted a vital element that was inextricably linked to national sovereignty. Another case in point was article 53 of part II of the negotiating text (see A/CONF.62/WP.8/Rev.1).<sup>1</sup> It was, therefore, more logical to find a way of taking those issues into account and arriving at agreements which involved mutual concessions and ensured mutual protection of States.

37. Clearly, the Conference must adopt a course of action for the present session, but that did not mean that negotiations would come to an end simply because time had run out. There must be no undue pressure to adopt instruments that were not acceptable to all delegations. Adoption of a final document would depend on real progress being made in negotiations and on the will of each delegation to make concessions and to consider the positions of other delegations. Only after such authentic negotiations had taken place would the Conference be able to determine whether it could adopt a final document or determine a future course of action for the Conference. In the meantime, the single negotiating texts were unofficial, and all countries were free to make amendments to them. There could be no assumption at the present stage that indicative votes or majority views were sacrosanct, since all chapters of the future convention were still under negotiation.

38. The PRESIDENT said that there had been no suggestion in his document regarding indicative or majority votes or restrictions on the freedom of delegations to propose amendments to the single negotiating texts.

39. Mr. STAVKOPOULOS (Greece) said that the plenary meeting was undoing the progress achieved by the 21st meeting of the General Committee. It was now being said that the President could not take decisions but could only consult Committees, and the States remained free, if they so wished, to start the negotiating process all over again. If that were done, the seven weeks of the present session would be completely wasted. He therefore proposed that the matter should be referred back to the General Committee in order that a procedure for work in the Committees could be determined which would lead to genuine progress.

40. Mr. OXMAN (United States of America) said that the Chairman of the First Committee, in paragraph 38 of his introductory note to the revised single negotiating text, had stated, with regard to article 63 of the text, that provisional application was a general matter and should therefore be discussed by the plenary of the Conference. He wished to know whether that meant that the President would consult with the Chairmen of the three Committees and arrange for appropriate negotiations to be carried out regarding provisional application. Some general aspects of provisional application would obviously concern consideration of the final clauses in the plenary, while others would concern the work of the Committees.

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea*, vol. V (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.76.V.8).

41. The PRESIDENT, replying to the question raised by the representative of the United States, said that provisional application would form part of the final clauses.

42. Summing up the debate on document A/CONF.62/L.12/Rev.1, he suggested that, if there were no objections, the Committees would decide: first, whether they wanted to focus their negotiations on key issues, using document A/CONF.62/L.12/Rev.1 as a guide; secondly, if so, what were the main issues; thirdly, the order in which those issues should be taken up; and fourthly, the way in which such negotiations were to be conducted in order to achieve speedy progress and universal involvement of delegations. In so doing, the Committees should note the position of small delegations and organize their work accordingly.

*It was so decided.*

43. The PRESIDENT said that it had been decided in the General Committee that the general debate on the preambular and final clauses should be broken up into two parts to deal, first, with the purely formal aspects of the draft and, secondly, with more substantive matters such as entry into force, reservations and denunciations. It had been urged that the discussion of substantive matters should only take place when delegations had a clearer idea of the outcome of negotiations on parts I, II and III of the negotiating text.

44. The text of part IV, on the settlement of disputes, had the same status as parts I to III had had before they had formed the subject of negotiation and had thereafter been revised. He therefore suggested that informal negotiations should be held on the informal single negotiating text contained in document A/CONF.62/WP.9/Rev.1 so that it could be revised and raised to the same status as parts I, II and III of the revised single negotiating text.

*It was so decided.*

45. The PRESIDENT suggested that the same arrangements

regarding informal group meetings should be followed as for the previous session.

*It was so decided.*

#### Organization of the Conference and membership of subsidiary organs

46. The PRESIDENT stated that, in accordance with the agreements already reached, during the present session Ireland would replace Belgium as a member of the General Committee and Thailand would replace Bangladesh as a member of the Drafting Committee.

*It was so decided.*

47. The PRESIDENT informed the plenary that the General Committee had decided to endorse his recommendation that Mr. J. Evensen (Norway) should be designated as the Vice-President who would replace him during his absence from New York from 5 to 23 August. He commended the proposal to the plenary.

*It was so decided.*

#### Addition to the list of non-governmental organizations

48. The PRESIDENT suggested that, if there were no objections, two non-governmental organizations in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council, the Baptist World Alliance and the World Conference on Religion and Peace, should be invited to attend the Conference as observers.

*It was so decided.*

*The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.*

## 72nd meeting

Tuesday, 7 September 1976, at 10.50 a.m.

*Chairman: Mr. H. S. AMERASINGHE (Sri Lanka).*

#### Organization of work

1. The PRESIDENT said that the Conference was now entering the last week of its fifth session and that he was sorry he could not report any real progress in the work of the three Committees. The new arrangements which had had to be made by the First Committee in the workshop in order to expedite matters had apparently not produced the expected results. That was very unfortunate, and it was unquestionably time for the First Committee to give serious thought to the possibility of changing its working procedures. The Chairman of the First Committee had informed him in that connexion that he had intended to supplement the existing procedure by setting up a new group consisting of 26 delegations—13 representing industrialized countries and 13 representing developing countries. In the absence of any further information, that project required no comment.

2. In addition, the Second Committee had set up three negotiating groups to study the key issues. The first was dealing with the status of the exclusive economic zone, including the rights and obligations of third States with respect to coastal States, the second with the question of the

right of access to and from the sea and freedom of transit for land-locked States, and the third with the question of the definition of the outer limit of the continental margin and participation in the benefits of exploitation of the continental shelf beyond the 200-mile limit. A number of small groups had also been set up. The delegations comprising them were divided into three categories, the two first consisting of delegations which held opposing views, while the third consisted of countries which had found a middle ground. The Chairman of the Second Committee now planned to set up two additional groups, the first to study the problem of straits used for international navigation and the second the problem of the delimitation of the exclusive economic zone and of the continental shelf. None of the three Chairmen intended at the present stage to produce a new revised version of the single negotiating text.

3. The Third Committee had focused its efforts on the questions of pollution and marine scientific research. It now intended to turn to the question of the transfer of technology. Some progress seemed to have been made in that area, but there were still many obstacles to overcome.