

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-THIRD SESSION

Official Records



FIRST COMMITTEE, 1592nd
MEETING

Thursday, 31 October 1968,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 26:

Examination of the question of the reservation exclusively for peaceful purposes of the sea-bed and the ocean floor, and the subsoil thereof, underlying the high seas beyond the limits of present national jurisdiction, and the use of their resources in the interests of mankind: report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee to Study the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction (*continued*)

Page

1

Chairman: Mr. Piero VINCI (Italy).

AGENDA ITEM 26

Examination of the question of the reservation exclusively for peaceful purposes of the sea-bed and the ocean floor, and the subsoil thereof, underlying the high seas beyond the limits of present national jurisdiction, and the use of their resources in the interests of mankind: report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee to Study the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction (*continued*) (A/7230, A/C.1/973, A/C.1/L.425 and Add.1-3, L.426)

1. The CHAIRMAN: Before calling on the first speaker on my list for this morning, I wish to inform the Committee that Jamaica has decided to co-sponsor the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.425 and Add.1-3.

2. I also wish to inform the Committee that the names of sixty-four delegations are inscribed on the list of speakers to take part in the general debate. I think that if we try to follow our schedule and also try to be punctual, we should be in a position to close the general debate on Tuesday evening of next week, 4 November, or at the latest Wednesday morning, 6 November. That would enable us to conclude our consideration of item 26 on Thursday, 7 November.

3. Mr. MENDELEVICH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The First Committee has before it an interesting, and, I would say, exciting document—the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee to Study the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor [A/7230].

4. This document is a first attempt to generalize and to some extent co-ordinate the views of States Members of the United Nations on the military, political, legal, technical, economic and scientific aspects of the problem of explo-

ration and exploitation of the sea-bed and ocean floor—an entirely new international problem, taken up by the United Nations only one year ago. The *Ad Hoc* Committee's report is the outcome of intensive and purposeful work over three sessions, held in New York in March and June and at Rio de Janeiro in August of 1968. The report reflects both the complexity of the problems involved and the fact that a great many States are interested in finding a solution to them. It also presents a rather varied picture of the views held by different States on how these problems should be solved.

5. Let me say at once that this variety seems to me entirely natural. Given the broad spectrum of the international policies of States, deriving from the differences in their social systems, political régimes and geographical situation, to reach general agreement on any major international issue can never be an easy and simple matter. When the United Nations takes up an entirely new problem, such as that of the sea-bed and the ocean floor, swift agreement is altogether impossible. Moreover, undue haste might result in some States imposing their wishes and positions on other States or in the adoption of overly quick, ill-considered decisions which might have fatal effects on the entire development of international co-operation in the exploration and exploitation of the sea-bed and ocean floor. Obviously, neither is desirable or even to be tolerated.

6. Having made this point, my delegation also wishes to emphasize another: in the first year of United Nations activity in problems relating to the sea-bed and the ocean floor, in one year of the *Ad Hoc* Committee's activity in the matter, we have travelled some distance from ignorance to knowledge, even though it be incomplete and rudimentary knowledge. What is of particular importance is that this ground was covered in an atmosphere of co-operation and general desire to achieve results—an atmosphere which prevailed both in the *Ad Hoc* Committee and its two working groups, the Economic and Technical Working Group and the Legal Working Group. My delegation wishes to express its appreciation of the able and skilful conduct of the *Ad Hoc* Committee's work on the part of Mr. Amerasinghe of Ceylon and the equally authoritative and skilful conduct of the work of the Legal Working Group by Mr. Benites, the representatives of Ecuador, and of the Economic and Technical Working Group by Mr. Denorme, the representative of Belgium. This is praiseworthy, and inspires us with optimism.

7. In what areas can we say that progress has been made by the United Nations in studying the problems of the sea-bed and the ocean floor? What barely dawning prospects are there of mutual understanding? What areas remain completely obscure or have revealed differences of principle?

8. If we take a closer look at the situation, we shall readily arrive at some conclusions which I think no one would dispute.

9. First, everyone seems now to be agreed that the sea-bed and the ocean floor, which will no doubt offer an important field for human activity, must be used exclusively for peaceful purposes, although there is as yet no agreed opinion on the exact limits of the prohibition of using the sea-bed for military purposes and the precise types of military activity that such a prohibition should cover.

10. My delegation cannot but express satisfaction at the favourable reaction in the *Ad Hoc* Committee to the USSR proposal prohibiting the use of the sea-bed or the ocean floor for military purposes beyond the territorial waters of coastal States [*ibid.*, annex III].

11. In advancing this proposal, the Soviet Union starts from the premise that the entire sea-bed and the ocean floor, including the continental shelf, to the limits of the territorial waters of coastal States must be reserved exclusively for peaceful purposes. That will be safer, wiser and better for the cause of peace.

12. We not only proclaim our readiness to include our own continental shelf in the prohibited zone but, in co-operation with other socialist countries, we have been taking practical measures to that end. Let me cite, for example, the Declaration on the continental shelf of the Baltic Sea, issued by the Governments of the German Democratic Republic, the Polish People's Republic and the Soviet Union on 23 October 1968. Paragraph 3 of the Declaration states:

"The continental shelf of the Baltic Sea shall be used by all States exclusively for peaceful purposes".

13. It was natural, in our view, that the question of prohibiting the use of the sea-bed and the ocean floor for military purposes should have been included in the agenda of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, to be considered as a partial disarmament measure. This is the best way to proceed if we are to prevent the arms race from spreading to the sea-bed and the ocean floor.

14. The First Committee will also have to discuss the memorandum concerning urgent measures to stop the arms race and achieve disarmament¹ submitted to the current session of the General Assembly by the Soviet Union. This memorandum also contains our proposal on using the sea-bed beyond the limits of the territorial waters of coastal States exclusively for peaceful purposes. We trust that as a result of all these discussions, the Eighteen-Nation Committee will be able within a short time to draft a corresponding international agreement prohibiting the use of the sea-bed and the ocean floor for military purposes.

15. Secondly, it became plain in the course of the *Ad Hoc* Committee's work that there is a consensus among States that in the future the peaceful exploitation of the sea-bed and the ocean floor and of their mineral resources may become of considerable economic importance.

16. The *Ad Hoc* Committee's report contains what we regard as valuable considerations and conclusions of the experts of the States members of the Committee regarding the position and extent of mineral resources on the ocean floor, the present state and anticipated future development of the techniques used in the exploration and exploitation of those resources, the possible consequences of such exploitation for the economies of States and the probable effect of such activity on other modes of marine exploitation. The mere fact that, mainly by means of extrapolating the knowledge and experience acquired on land, the experts conclude that beyond the continental shelf there are to be found large and potentially valuable deposits of oil, gas, manganese, phosphates, metal ores and other useful minerals makes the utilization of the sea-bed and the ocean floor for peaceful purposes an attractive prospect.

17. The report also reflects an increasing understanding of the fact that to exploit mineral resources at great depths beyond the continental shelf will require sizable capital investment, in order to invent and perfect new techniques and organize new ways of production. Thus, whereas when the *Ad Hoc* Committee began its work, some delegations were inclined to view large-scale exploitation of the resources of the sea-bed and the ocean floor as an immediate possibility, towards the end it became, I believe, clear to everyone why even the most optimistic among the scientists think that such exploitation will not be possible for another ten and possibly fifteen or twenty years.

18. A great many efforts and a large investment of funds and of explorer energy and talent will be required before Neptune surrenders to mankind some of the treasures of his underwater caches. Even then, however, figuratively speaking, it will not be a matter of rolling up one's sleeves and plunging one's arms into the water to bring up handfuls of valuables. Even then the process of extracting useful materials from the ocean floor will be complicated, time-consuming, and expensive.

19. There is, moreover, some question whether exploitation of such resources may not to some extent harm the economies of the developing countries, which are the traditional suppliers of the corresponding commodities and minerals on the world markets. No one knows as yet whether it might not be wiser, for the purpose of ensuring employment for the population of those countries, creating a sound economic intra-structure, training qualified personnel and raising the well-being of their peoples, to invest capital in exploration and the establishment of large enterprises for processing the relevant types of raw materials on land, i.e., in the territory of these countries, rather than in the depths of the ocean or on the sea-bed. It may well be that answers to these questions, which are not known today, will not be known tomorrow either. States have too few practical data, knowledge, and experience for this purpose.

20. The *Ad Hoc* Committee states outright in its report: "Present knowledge of the mineral resources of the ocean appears to be more or less satisfactory only for a small part of the continental shelf. Knowledge of potential marine mineral resources at this stage is scant and depends in a large part on extrapolation of knowledge and experience gained on land" [A/7230, annex I, para. 7].

¹ Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-third Session, Annexes, agenda item 94, document A/7134.

21. Accordingly, the Committee and its Economic and Technical Working Group reached the conclusion that in the foreseeable future the efforts of States as regards the peaceful exploitation of the sea-bed and the ocean floor should be directed to large-scale scientific research and exploration with a view to accumulating additional knowledge on marine resources and their placement. The Committee also quite rightly pointed out the need to improve co-ordination of the activities of international organizations concerned with scientific exploration of the ocean floor and its resources, so that such exploration might be more effective and produce results useful for all States. As I understand it, the members of the *Ad Hoc* Committee agree that international efforts to study the world's oceans and the ocean floor can be successfully and effectively co-ordinated through the Inter-Governmental Oceanographic Commission of UNESCO.

22. Thirdly, as a result of the *Ad Hoc* Committee's work, States appear to have reached the unanimous conclusion that it would be useful to continue a comprehensive study of the legal aspects of the activities of States on the ocean floor. This is indeed important, since the rules of law applying to the sea-bed and the ocean floor should, as in any other medium, regulate the activities of States on a just basis and in the interests of all peoples.

23. Some States are in favour of working out and adopting, here and now, principles and rules of law which would promote the development of international co-operation in the peaceful uses of the sea-bed and the ocean floor.

24. We too believe that the elaboration of such legal principles should be undertaken; but it would be imprudent to take a simplistic approach to this task.

25. The Soviet Union holds that the legal problems relating to the activities of States on the sea-bed and the ocean floor should be solved. It does not want the law of the jungle to prevail there, or in any other sphere of human activity, and it believes that the rules of international law applicable to the activity of States on the sea-bed and the ocean floor must contribute to the development of friendly relations among States and strengthen international peace and security, and it notes with satisfaction that from the legal point of view, the sea-bed and the ocean floor are no longer a vacuum.

26. The principles and generally recognized rules of international law and the United Nations Charter extend even now to the sea-bed and the ocean floor and have a direct bearing on the activities of States in that area. Moreover, a number of international agreements that are now in effect, including the Convention on the High Seas² and the Convention on the Continental Shelf³ already to some extent regulate those activities. In particular, it is no accident that when legal aspects were discussed in the *Ad Hoc* Committee, many representatives drew attention to the importance of preserving the recognized freedoms of the high seas in working out the legal regulations to be applied to the exploration and exploitation of the sea-bed and the ocean floor.

27. It follows that the examination of the legal problems involved can and must take into account the applicable laws already in effect, rather than start from scratch.

28. This fact must to some extent govern the very nature of United Nations efforts to elaborate rules of law for the sea-bed and the ocean floor. A prime requirement is that in this work the United Nations must not ignore the rules of law which already apply, and should most certainly not contradict them, but should rather build on what has been done before.

29. Furthermore, a very thorough study is needed of the precise meaning of the word "limits" in the phrase "the sea-bed and the ocean floor beyond the limits of national jurisdiction".

30. The members of the *Ad Hoc* Committee know that this is a very complicated question and will certainly remember the discussions to which it gave rise and the divergent views it revealed. It is, however, an important question, and its study and the search for its solution must continue.

31. Another matter which deserves the closest and most scrupulous attention is this: in elaborating the rules of law applicable to the sea-bed and the ocean floor care must be taken not to impair in any way the legal rights of States and the recognized freedom of the high seas, and to ensure optimum conditions for further progress in the exploration of the ocean floor and its resources.

32. I would like to make one more point. At the twenty-second session of the General Assembly, when the United Nations first took up the question of the sea-bed and the ocean floor, then in the *Ad Hoc* Committee, and now during this discussion in the First Committee, some delegations have been putting forward proposals and views concerning the general direction of work on the legal problems involved and concerning the end goals which we find it difficult to accept.

33. I have in mind proposals regarding the establishment for the sea-bed and the ocean floor of an international régime of "common ownership of all mankind", to be administered by some supra-national organ either within or outside the United Nations. This is the interpretation sometimes given to the rather vague statement that the sea-bed and the ocean floor should be regarded in international law as the "property" or "heritage" of all mankind. Without going into the legal meaning of the concept "property of all mankind" and without casting doubt on the motives of those who advocate the establishment of a common ownership régime for the sea-bed and the ocean floor, I should like to explain frankly the doubts and misgivings to which this approach gives rise on our part.

34. Harmonious and outwardly attractive as the constructs and schemes of such common ownership may be, we feel that they fail to take into account the realities of contemporary life. These realities, which it is impossible and even dangerous to disregard, are that there coexist on our planet States with different social structures and different systems of ownership. The socialist countries have a system of national ownership, which forms the basis for

² United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 450 (1963), No. 6465.

³ *Ibid.*, vol. 499 (1964), No. 7302.

production in the interests of the working masses. The great majority of the developing countries are in the process of shaping their national economic structures, even while struggling to free their economies from the domination of the monopolies. At the same time, in the imperialist countries ownership is concentrated in the hands of these very monopolies, which are the standard bearers of colonialism and neo-colonialism.

35. To believe that, under these particular conditions, the creation of "common ownership of all mankind" can be in the true interests of all peoples is to cherish an illusion. Although the forms of administering such common ownership might be outwardly democratic and although the majority of States might be sincerely desirous of a just distribution of the benefits to be derived from this enterprise, the top command posts under such a system would inevitably be in the hands of the capitalist monopolies of a few imperialistic Powers. The entire system, despite the good intentions of its creators, would become one more instrument serving the predatory aims of the monopolies and their neo-colonialist policy.

36. We believe that the great majority of those present here represent States which cannot want this to happen; and it goes without saying that the socialist countries cannot agree to it.

37. The utopic notion of the common ownership of mankind, which can only lead to a new system of colonialist profit-making by the monopolies is not what we take to be the objective of defining the legal aspects relating to the sea-bed and the ocean floor. That objective is to work out rules of law which would promote the development of international co-operation by States, on an equal footing, in the exploration and exploitation of the ocean floor for the good of the peoples and protect the legal rights and interests of all States, with due regard for the needs of developing countries. Such rules of law should ensure that the sea-bed and the ocean floor are used exclusively for peaceful purposes.

38. This work will require painstaking effort and the collective experience of States, and it will, in all likelihood, also require a good deal of time.

39. I have attempted, on behalf of my delegation, to take stock of the first year of United Nations activity in international co-operation for the exploration and exploitation of the sea-bed and the ocean floor beyond the limits of national jurisdiction and to sum up what this first year has revealed. It seems to me that all this can be restated very simple: a useful work has been begun, and it should be continued.

40. But how should it be continued?

41. Some States are proposing that, after we have examined the *Ad Hoc* Committee's report, we should here and now establish a standing committee of the United Nations which would undertake a thorough study of questions relating to the international co-operation of States in the exploration and exploitation of the sea-bed and the ocean-floor from the legal, technical, scientific, technological and other points of view.

42. This proposal seems wise to us in principle. Without commenting now on any of the provisions of draft resolution A/C.1/L.425 and Add.1-3 submitted to the First Committee—especially as consultations on this text are still going on—my delegation would like to make it absolutely clear that it takes an understanding attitude towards the basic idea of the draft resolution—the proposal that a United Nations committee on the sea-bed and the ocean floor should be established on a permanent basis.

43. However, this organizational step—the establishment of a standing organ of the United Nations to replace a temporary one, which has completed its terms of reference—will not in itself ensure the success of further United Nations work on the problems of the sea-bed and the ocean floor. The guarantee of such success would be to set the right course for this new organ to follow. For obvious reasons, my delegation attaches great importance to the determination of such a course by the General Assembly.

44. We would wish the future United Nations committee on the sea-bed and the ocean floor to undertake a basis analysis and elaboration of the legal aspects of the problem in the interests of developing international co-operation in the exploration and peaceful uses of the sea-bed and the ocean-floor.

45. We would wish this committee to make a thorough and comprehensive study of the technical and economic aspects of collaboration among States in the exploration and exploitation of the sea-bed and the ocean floor.

46. We would wish this committee to pay such attention as may be needed to co-ordinating the activities of international organizations with regard to the scientific exploration of the sea-bed and the ocean floor.

47. We believe that the committee, in dealing with the legal, technical and economic problems of the peaceful uses of the sea-bed and the ocean floor, must not usurp the functions of other international organs, in particular, the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, which is the most appropriate organ for preparing an international agreement prohibiting military uses of the sea-bed and the ocean floor. Nor should the committee infringe on the Inter-Governmental Oceanographic Commission of UNESCO in regard to the scientific aspects of international co-operation in these matters.

48. Lastly, we would have the committee on the sea-bed and the ocean floor, in view of the great importance of its successful work, proceed on the basis of a consensus in taking its decisions. I must say that in this regard the *Ad Hoc* Committee has set an excellent example to its successor.

49. My delegation believes—indeed, it is convinced—that if it acts on such a basis the United Nations committee on the sea-bed and the ocean floor will be able to perform fruitful work, in the interests of all mankind—both the present and future generations.

50. The debate in the First Committee on the *Ad Hoc* Committee's report will have an important bearing on the

further development of international co-operation in this interesting and promising sphere. My delegation is prepared to make its contribution to a successful exchange of views and to the taking of appropriate decisions pursuing worthwhile goals, realistic in approach and yielding useful results.

51. The CHAIRMAN: Before giving the floor to the next speaker on my list, I wish to inform the Committee that Saudi Arabia has become a co-sponsor of the amendments submitted by Kuwait and Venezuela [A/C.1/L.426].

52. Mr. TSURUOKA (Japan): Mr. Chairman, it gives me great pleasure to associate myself with the previous speakers and offer to you the warmest congratulations of the Japanese delegation on your election as Chairman of this important First Committee, the political Committee. This is a great tribute to you personally and to your great country, with which my own enjoys such warm and friendly relations. We already have had more than ample evidence—to this I can testify personally—of your skill, your untiring patience, and your never-failing and charming courtesy in guiding the consultations on the organization of work to a successful conclusion, satisfactory to all members of the Committee. I am confident that our work will be most effective under your guidance.

53. I should also like to congratulate most warmly the other members of our Bureau, the Ambassador of El Salvador, Mr. Reynaldo Galindo Pohl, and the Ambassador of Dahomey, Mr. Maxime Léopold Zollner.

54. May I also take advantage of this opportunity to welcome the Under-Secretary-General, Mr. Kutakov, and to say a word of thanks in advance to Mr. Vellodi and the supporting staff of the Secretariat for the excellent work we know they will do.

55. We have before us the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee established by resolution 2340 (XXII) to study the peaceful uses of the sea-bed and the ocean floor beyond the limits of national jurisdiction [A/7230]. My delegation had the honour to serve as a member of that Committee which has had extremely complex and delicate tasks assigned to it by operative paragraph 2 of that resolution.

56. I should like at this point to express my delegation's very warm appreciation to the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, Mr. Amerasinghe of Ceylon, as well as to the Chairmen of the two Working Groups, Mr. Benites of Ecuador and Mr. Denorme of Belgium, for their invaluable labours. We also owe a debt of deep gratitude to the Rapporteur of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, Mr. Gauci of Malta, who so clearly presented to us at our 1588th meeting last Monday the report of the Committee.

57. The report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee is in effect the result of the study the Committee was able to make in the time available and in accordance with its terms of reference as laid down by the Assembly. The Committee's terms of reference have been interpreted as requiring it not to reach agreement but as Mr. Amerasinghe pointed out in his statement on 28 October [1588th meeting], to report to the General Assembly all suggestions; views and proposals made concerning the terms of reference.

58. However, during the course of the three sessions held by the Committee and especially the last one at Rio de Janeiro—and many warm thanks are due to the Government of Brazil for its generous hospitality—efforts were made to find generally acceptable principles which would guide all activities in the exploration, use and exploitation of the sea-bed and ocean floor and the subsoil thereof beyond the limits of national jurisdiction.

59. While this attempt was not altogether successful because of the limited time available, my delegation believes that at this stage the following principles as a minimum, I should think, might be accepted by the General Assembly.

60. First, the mineral resources of the sea-bed and the ocean floor should be utilized for the benefit of mankind, taking into account the special interests of developing countries, and, therefore, no State may claim or exercise sovereign rights over any portion of the sea-bed and ocean floor.

61. Second, since the principle of the freedom of the high seas has long been established in international society, the utilization of the sea-bed and ocean floor should not in any way infringe upon this principle. The status of the superjacent waters of the sea-bed and ocean floor should not be affected in any way whatsoever by such utilization. Therefore, the exploration and exploitation of the mineral resources of the sea-bed and ocean floor should not adversely affect the legitimate interests of other States in the superjacent waters, particularly their rights of fishing and navigation.

62. Third, the exploration, use and exploitation of the sea-bed and ocean floor should be carried on exclusively for peaceful purposes.

63. Fourth, there is also the need to agree, as soon as practicable, on an international arrangement to guarantee the orderly development of the mineral resources of the sea-bed and ocean floor.

64. In this connexion, I should like to point out that there is also a need to agree on a precise boundary for this area taking into account the existing rules of international law.

65. On the basis of generally agreed principles, such as those I have just mentioned, my delegation believes that the study commenced by the *Ad Hoc* Committee should be continued by the new permanent body that has been proposed, to the end that continued study, on a more permanent and definitive basis, may lead in due time, as they become practicable, to specific agreements on the many complex aspects of this broad new field of a great human endeavour.

66. The idea of a new permanent body, which is contained in the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.425 and Add.1-3, of which Japan is one of the original co-sponsors was brought about in the course of the three sessions of the *Ad Hoc* Committee. This draft resolution was introduced by Mr. Denorme of Belgium so eloquently and comprehensively [ibid.] that I have almost nothing to add, and I would express our deep appreciation to him.

67. We realized, in the course of our deliberations in the *Ad Hoc* Committee, the far-reaching political, economic, technical, as well as legal complexities and implications of the task to be accomplished. We felt, therefore, that continuation of the necessary studies of these matters might best be entrusted to a permanent body with wider terms of reference, taking full advantage of the experience acquired in that Committee. Its membership, in my delegation's view, reflected, on the basis of equitable geographic distribution, the widest range of interests relating to the exploration and exploitation of the mineral resources of the sea-bed and the ocean floor, namely, the interests of developed, developing, coastal and land-locked countries.

68. Concerning the military aspects of the sea-bed and the ocean floor beyond the limits of national jurisdiction, my delegation has made clear the position of Japan several times in the course of discussion in the *Ad Hoc* Committee, in particular at the 14th meeting of the Committee on 20 August 1968, during its last session. On that occasion the Japanese representative said:

"... Since this question is so vital for all nations, its examination should be made most carefully and step by step. In my delegation's view, it would be advisable that wherever this question may be considered, all nations concerned should be fully informed of the process and outcome of such consideration."

69. My delegation is fully aware that, as pointed out by the Report of the Economic and Technical Working Group of the *Ad Hoc* Committee [see A/7230, annex I, para. 10 (b)], knowledge concerning the mineral resources of the sea-bed and the ocean floor is not as yet sufficient. My delegation believes, therefore, that full and extensive surveys of these mineral resources should be continued and that further scientific research of the marine environment should be carried out. In the course of such surveys and research, close co-operation among the nations and co-ordination among relevant international organizations should be of course of great importance. It is in this spirit that my delegation favours a long-term programme of international co-operation as proposed by the Secretary-General [see E/4487 and Corr.1-6, part III, paras. 246-285], and gives the most careful consideration to the proposal in the draft resolution submitted by the United States concerning the International Decade of Ocean Exploration [see A/7320, annex III].

70. My delegation also welcomes the proposal submitted in the *Ad Hoc* Committee [ibid.]—which, we understand, will be submitted formally in the First Committee by the delegation of Iceland—on a study of means for minimizing the danger of pollution of the marine environment which might arise from the exploration and exploitation of the sea-bed and the ocean floor.⁴

71. It is only one year since the United Nations decided to embark upon exploratory studies in this new field which may well have great potential benefits for all mankind. It is undoubtedly much too early to say with any certainty, or in any definitive way, precisely what the nature of those benefits may be. But the work of the *Ad Hoc* Committee during the past year clearly demonstrates that the studies our Organization has initiated are distinctly worth while

and that they should be continued. It is also clear that our continuing studies of this subject must be thought of as long-range. We shall not be able to expect any very immediate or spectacular results. We must move ahead step by step. Progress, as it comes, may be slow, but it must be sure. It must be realistic and practical, and it must be such as to win the approval of the international community as a whole.

72. The necessity of international co-operation in this field is self-evident. Japan is one of the major fishing and shipping nations in the world and it carries out various activities in the field of oceanography. Therefore, we attach very great importance to the work that the United Nations and related agencies are undertaking with regard to the sea-bed and the ocean floor. As a member of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, as well as of other bodies, we have endeavoured to co-operate fully in their work and to make our contribution to the joint efforts. We earnestly desire to continue our full co-operation and to contribute all that we can to future progress in this field.

73. The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Japan for the tribute he paid to my country and for the equally friendly congratulations he extended to me and to all members of the Bureau.

74. The last speaker on my list is the representative of Saudi Arabia.

75. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): The *Ad Hoc* Committee should indeed be commended for its report on the study of the peaceful uses of the sea-bed and the ocean floor beyond the limits of national jurisdiction. Oceanography is still in its infancy. However, the science is opening wide avenues for the development of resources of the sea-bed and ocean floor.

76. I believe most of us sitting in this Committee are laymen, and we should not perhaps, think of ourselves as being experts or technicians, unless some delegations are bolstered by technical knowledge, having enlisted some men who really do the spadework on this item, but remain silent—and more honour to them, because after all, without them, very little indeed could be achieved.

77. However, we should try not to be demagogues on this question, because, as I said, this science is still in its infancy. Nevertheless, anyone who studies the report can come to certain inescapable conclusions as to the undercurrents that have played their role in the shaping of certain resolutions. Therefore, without presumption and without trying to deal with certain scientific aspects of the question, I think I can safely say that we are justified in making some constructive remarks.

78. The oceans and seas, as we all know, constitute the larger surface of our globe. If the fertility of the human species is not checked, I am told, by the turn of our present century the population of the world will more than double. One hundred years hence there will be no elbow room for man on earth, even in the rural areas. There is hardly elbow room for us in the big cities today. In almost every country people are leaving the rural areas and flocking to the city lights, being burnt there like the moth around the flame.

⁴ Subsequently circulated as document A/C.1/L.431.

Human beings seem to be breeding like rabbits. The fecundity of *Homo sapiens* makes it incumbent upon us to address ourselves with dispatch to this item.

79. Not very long ago, historically speaking, Malthus warned people, at a time, when, I believe, the population of the whole earth—and I am referring to his studies on population—did not exceed 500 million. Since that time the population has risen to over 3,000 million. Indeed, the increase is following the pattern of geometric progression, and the decrease, in spite of wars and famines, is following the pattern of arithmetic retrogression. People die singly, but a couple breeds with such speed that within a 100-year period a progenitor and his spouse may have a minimum of 3,000 descendants—so I have been told by demographers.

80. Of course, man gives rein to his imagination when it comes to ways and means of producing more food for the world population. Sometimes we wonder—and I am not taking poetic licence—whether scientists in the future could siphon some of the ocean water through the technology of outer space, maybe to the moon which is arid, and whether possibly, if that water is siphoned to the moon, the moon may become habitable.

81. It may sound ridiculous today, but the Arabs spoke years ago of the magic carpet, and they were called romantics. A thousand years ago they spoke of the magic carpet that transports people from one continent to the other. Even as far back as the nineteenth century, Tennyson in his "Locksley Hall" spoke of argosies of the air, and he was called a poet.

82. It is quite possible that through technology we may in the future retrieve some of the land covered by the ocean, but I do not think it will be in our lifetime. However, we should note the fact that when technology is used for peace wonders become realities.

83. Some years ago when the United Nations General Assembly was meeting in Paris I was privileged to read two authors who struck me with their findings and jolted me and many of my colleagues into the awareness that a time may come when perhaps famine will overtake many people in various continents. Those two authors, William Vogt and Fairfield Osborn, wrote separately about the ecology of the earth and how man was tampering with the atmosphere and his environment. I was struck by the statistics which they gave—also separately and independently of one another—showing that it took two and one half acres of arable land, pasture land and forests per person to maintain the standard of living in the United States as it was about seventeen or eighteen years ago.

84. Let us assume that because of technology the same needs of man—the amount of food, paper, fibre such as cotton, and other needs—require only two acres per person; but the population in the world today, as I have said, is multiplying so fast that maybe man will have to extract from one acre his needs to maintain a decent standard of living. But then there is always a limit.

85. When rabbits were imported into Australia they became predatory, and the Australians had to find some way of reducing the rabbit population. They did it by

various means. They began by shooting them. But the rabbits multiplied faster than the hunters could shoot them. Then they imported some animals that were predatory to the rabbits. I am not sure—and I am open to correction on this—but I still think the rabbit population is a problem to the Australians.

86. One may laugh at comparing man to rabbits, but after all, rabbits are creatures like we are.

87. What shall we do about over-population? Become cannibals? Maybe cannibalism had a reason. People did not have proteins and they began to feed on one another at some stage in prehistoric times. I believe that cannibalism still exists in some places, and we should not laugh it off. It is a serious matter. Instead of cannibalism, man unwittingly did something about reducing the population through conflicts, through war. But that was not enough. We find that in the aftermath of every war population increases with a vengeance. The soldiers come back pent up and they get married and procreate.

88. At one time some people thought that it was by the will of God or the Creator that we had epidemics, although God had nothing to do with epidemics. I think it was the law of nature that microbes and bacteria, as was discovered by the great Pasteur, did at one time eliminate a good number of the population—to wit, the plague of 1665 in Europe and other parts of the world. Hence, we say war and pestilence reduce population. That is not so now, unless, of course, the politicians grow mad and one day engage the world in a nuclear war, which would mean the suicide of mankind. Then there would be no problem. Hence, this report is very timely and it should help to solve, I would hope, a lot of the problems that will arise over the next fifty or one hundred years from the multiplication of the population. Let us hope that there will be controls, because even the ocean bed and the sea-floor cannot yield enough to feed the increasing population of the world. It is not only a question of space; it is also a question of proteins. We know that we get our proteins from meat. A cow or a sheep needs a certain amount of land to graze upon or a certain acreage is needed on which its feed is raised. As I have said, there is a limit to the resources of land. That is why we should turn seriously to the resources of the sea-bed and the ocean floor. We know very well that protein is an organic substance. Petroleum researchers promise us that they may be able to produce edible proteins from oil.

89. That would be a great step forward, but at present most of us—when we talk of proteins from the sea—are thinking of fish. What a predatory creature man is. He talks of humanity; he kills vertebrates like cows and sheep and even eats rats and serpents as delicacies or in time of famine. And, as if that were not enough, he preys on the creatures of the sea. We are told that fish meal could lend itself to flour. Again our scientists are capable of meeting the task of deodorizing the smell of the fish meal making it acceptable to the human palate as bread. They can flavour it with all kinds of things. In my younger days vanilla came from Madagascar and other areas, and I remember that ice cream used to have specks. Now all the vanilla is synthetic. So man is very resourceful and he may yet be able to make bread out of fish meal, a bread rich in proteins. He can

perhaps do something to mill dried seaweed; that may also be a source of protein, chlorophyll and other material containing protein.

90. Therefore, even if the United Nations has done nothing up to now except to initiate these questions, I think it is a happy start and augurs well for humanity; it gives us a breathing spell until we know how to regulate our fecundity as *Homo sapiens* and to solve the population problem.

91. But it saddens me indeed to find that we quarrel here in the international community about the various aspects of the report; this is reflected in the report. This morning I heard my good friend Mr. Mendelevich talk about monopolies and imperialism and no doubt somebody else will talk about *étatisme* as being a State monopoly. I have heard such things said time and again in this and the other Committees of the General Assembly during the past twenty-three years. We seem to inject politics based on narrow national interest even when we are deliberating on scientific subjects, on items such as this which may solve a lot of the serious problems related to human survival.

92. I do not blame my colleagues who are wary, because it seems that there is as yet no goodwill among the Members of this Organization. Each one is looking to see what others may do, feeling that he may be pounced on or taken advantage of. If we start on the basis of the premise that we should define very clearly from the outset who has jurisdiction over certain areas of the sea-bed and the ocean floor, and then go on to mention that we are dealing with this question mostly in connexion with areas that are beyond the limits of national jurisdiction, I become suspicious. If we are talking about the territorial waters or the beds or floors of the territorial waters, it is understandable. But when we become suspicious of one another before we have made sufficient headway on the question of the sea-bed or the ocean floor beyond the limits of national jurisdiction, it means that we are going to stab one another in the back. This is really serious. We have not yet made any headway. As I said, oceanography is a science which is still in its infancy—and yet we manifest suspicion of one another.

93. We do not have to belong to the same ideology. It is not a question of a clash of ideologies here. This reminds me of the pugnacity of man and his selfishness as an individual, which is reflected in nations. You know very well, Sir, that before the advent of the ideology of communism in Europe, where you come from, for generations people used to cut one another's throats because of suspicion. They belonged to the same family and to the same continent. But this is very serious. Should we continue in this spirit even when we are dealing with subjects that should only be within the circumference of the application of science for the benefit of mankind? I do not want to elaborate on this; I hope my suggestions will be taken in good faith.

94. Having said what I had to say, I believe that one can draw certain conclusions from the report and cannot evade looking into certain aspects of the item before us—the legal aspects, for example having to do with international law. I think that this can be worked out by our international law

experts; this comes within the purview of the Sixth Committee. I do not want to waste time on the subject of how legislation on the international level can be devised to define the interests of mankind—the common interests of mankind, not of one nation; and again I say, in the areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction.

95. One of the most serious aspects that has been discussed in the report is the question of pollution. Man is his own worst enemy. We know how the atmosphere of cities is polluted; I do not have to make a dissertation on pollution and how to cope with it. Governments are seriously concerned nowadays with this question, especially the question of pollution in big cities. We inhale not God's air, but man's fouled air. One has to go a hundred miles out of New York City to inhale the Creator's—or nature's, if somebody here is an atheist—good air. Now we are learning; Governments are trying to do something about this by enlisting scientific knowledge and technicians. The industry of pollution—how to deal with it—is becoming an important industry in this host country and, I believe, in many other countries.

96. But we are talking about the sea; and I read in the report about the radio-active material that may be dumped into the sea. Once in a while we read about radioactivity that may cause cancer. If the fish we eat are affected by radio-active material, do we have any assurance that we may not be contaminated ourselves? Most of the radio-active material now is not for reactors, but for arms. I do not know where that material is being dumped—Saudi Arabia is not a nuclear Power—but it must be dumped somewhere. I am told that reactors for peaceful uses are multiplying. One thing we should make sure of is that radio-active material is not dumped into the sea.

97. Speaking about pollution—and I am talking now as a layman—we hear about tankers that sometimes have mishaps or split up on the shores, on the littoral of certain countries and the water of the whole coastal area is contaminated by oil. This is something that we should deal with. We should see to it that the shipowners themselves are made responsible for any such mishaps and should compensate the countries on the littoral for the expense of clearing this kind of pollution.

98. Then there is something which may sound far-fetched, but it is possible. Should we not purge ourselves as human beings from using all kinds of methods to kill one another—and not necessarily by bombs, but sometimes even by attrition? Has the report taken into account that it is within the capacity of a State to send submarines to spray the water with certain material that would kill the fish life all through the area of the littoral so that the people would not be able to fish? Nothing is said about that. Those who think of such matters need not have an evil mind—I hope that I am not considered evil, but something tells me that it is possible to kill fish life. I remember that when I was a child in the Mediterranean some fishermen used dynamite in order to fish, to such a degree that the people were pressured by other fishermen who said: "For heaven's sake, let them use nets because they are killing the fish on the littoral." Why is there nothing in this report with regard to safeguards against the extermination of marine life in the littoral areas from which nations derive some of their livelihood? Something should be done about that.

99. I am a layman, but I am thinking aloud with my colleagues about certain discrepancies in the report. Far-fetched they may be now—but perhaps not in the future.

100. Then, something could be done unintentionally to kill the sea-weed or the sea vegetable life which is necessary for maintaining, if I may say so, the ecology of the oceans or the seas, the balance between animal life and vegetable life—and I am speaking of marine life and marine vegetation. I think that these things should be highlighted when the Committee thoroughly discusses the points I am adducing.

101. I could talk more about pollution, but I think that I must deal with other aspects, notably the military aspects, of the report. Again I am talking in terms of the military uses of the sea-bed and the ocean floor beyond the limits of national jurisdiction. We should have concrete proposals, or at least suggestions, relative to the military aspects of this item: how to make sure that the areas beyond national jurisdiction will not become the hot-beds of future wars. Paragraph 45 of the report, I am glad to see, indicates that some members have drawn the attention of the international community to the necessity of exerting efforts to arrest the trend towards the future use of the sea-bed and ocean floor for military purposes.

102. We have been told that this question was on the agenda of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament. I do not know why we still call it the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament; it has only seventeen members. However, we call it the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, and I will go by that usage. It is true that the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament has been laboriously engaged in dealing with the intricate problems of general disarmament by States that possess destructive armaments to such an extent that, as I said, it is within their capacity, if they err or if their politicians go berserk, to bring an end to man on this globe.

103. With all due respect to the progress achieved by the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, I must say that that progress has been quite slow. The Committee can boast only of the treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, a treaty that was worked out, primarily, by an inner club, with the exclusion of two other major nuclear Powers, namely France and mainland China. The majority of the non-nuclear Powers were pushed around when they asked that the treaty not be finalized before they had a chance to pronounce themselves constructively on its various provisions. The Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States in Geneva was held too late because of the obstacles that were put in its way.

104. I am not so sure that the protagonists of the treaty on non-proliferation would incorporate into the treaty the suggestions and proposals made in Geneva by the non-nuclear Powers, either by revising the treaty or by adding a protocol to it. How do we know, then, if we do not now make it clear to the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, that they will not commit the same mistake when they come to deal with the military aspects of this item now under discussion? We are duty-bound in this Committee to make sure that the military aspects of this item will not be discussed exclusively by the Eighteen-

Nation Committee on Disarmament. We should indicate our views here, so that they may be dealt with seriously before any future agreement or convention is worked out by the Eighteen-Nation Committee. We should avoid past mistakes. After all, the protagonists in the Eighteen-Nation Committee—I will name them: the United States of America and the Soviet Union—have a population less than that of the subcontinent of India, and a little more than half that of China, and, I would say, less than one quarter of the population of the continent of Asia; I am not going to work out mathematically the ratio between their population and that of Latin America and Africa. We salute them on their technological know-how. But we cannot yield to them our fate as human beings, and every individual, in accordance with the Charter, is endowed with the same worth and dignity as the politicians of those two major Powers.

105. I say “politicians”, because we witness every day what is going on in the world, and we may become the victims of any agreement that they may make, either separately or under the aegis of the United Nations. We weak Powers, if we do not raise our voices, might just as well call ourselves clients of either one of those super-Powers, or false witnesses for what they do. It is really tragic how they take things into their own hands and then come and ask us to put our OK on it, so to speak. I use an American term; I do not know what the Russian term for “OK” is.

106. It is high time, when we deal with the military aspects of this question, that the small nations be consulted before hand. The Eighteen-Nation Committee has no monopoly on knowledge. On certain technology, perhaps, yes, but it has no monopoly on wisdom. It has no monopoly on wisdom, it has no monopoly on civilization. And let us not be dazzled by technology. It is alienating man from man; man is being subordinated to the machine. Let us not—we Africans and Asians and Latin Americans and smaller European Powers—be taken in by the theory that those people are superior to us. We have to be consulted here in the United Nations, and if we do nothing but raise our voices, this will be enough to make them realize that we should be consulted. We should be consulted as human beings, as brothers, as people belonging to various civilizations that are much older than theirs. I say this with all due respect to the Soviet Union and this country, the host country. But this country is only 200 years old. As individuals, they are wonderful, but their policies are supercilious. We have seen how supercilious they can be. We saw it when the colonial Powers of yore exercised power. I witnessed them in Western Europe when they were at their zenith. You had to say, “Yes, Sir; you are right”, because they had the power. Of course, the Soviet Union is a more mature country. It goes back in its history to Rurik, in the ninth or tenth century—I stand to be corrected on that—before the Romanovs came. They have suffered just as many of us have, and I hope that through their sufferings they have learned that they cannot play the wanton with our wishes, even if we do not happen to be technologically highly developed nations.

107. I had to make these remarks because if we do not put the brakes on the trend we might just as well yield to all decisions that are taken in the Eighteen-Nation Committee

on Disarmament and come here and put our seals on their decisions. No, Sir, we will not do that. At least my country did not authorize me to vote for a treaty about which we were not consulted. I think that one could go on and on about this subject.

108. I must thank my illustrious friend from Belgium who contributed immeasurably to co-ordinating the work of the Committee, as well as the many unnamed in the report who no doubt did the spade-work and whose praises should be sung—although in their modesty they are not known to us individually.

109. I see that the hands of the clock point to one o'clock. I must thank you Mr. Chairman, for your indul-

gence, and the Members of the Committee for having listened to me. I hope that in the end we shall come to an understanding with those Powers which are really the protagonists in technology as well as in armament, and I hope that we will pave the way for a more reasonable understanding between us, trusting that we will usher in the real brotherhood of man.

110. The CHAIRMAN: Before adjourning, I wish first to inform the Committee that Dahomey, Mauritius and Southern Yemen have added the names of their delegations as co-sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.425 and Add.1-3. Therefore, altogether the co-sponsors at this stage number forty-six.

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.