

and social situation in the region and adopted the resolution at the beginning of its work indicated how seriously it viewed the problem. His delegation did not interpret operative paragraph 6 as indicating that the Soviet Union or any country agreed to change the terms of the bilateral agreements it had concluded with the countries of the region. His delegation also assumed that the cost of implementing the resolution would be met, not from the regular budgets of the United Nations and the specialized agencies, but through voluntary contributions, as was specified in paragraphs 18 and 19 of the note by the Secretary-General (A/9178). Operative paragraphs 3, 15 and 17 of the draft resolution referred to the need to co-ordinate the provision of assistance to the countries in the Sudano-Sahelian region, and in particular to the role in that co-ordination of the United Nations Secretariat and other organizations of the United Nations system. The Soviet Union's position of principle was that the countries receiving assistance had a sovereign right to decide on the aims, nature and direction of assistance, the selection of projects and the co-ordination of assistance programmes. The provision of assistance to any country with the participation of the United Nations Secretariat or other organizations in the United Nations system should not serve as a pretext for interference in the internal affairs of the country or violation of its sovereign rights. The Permanent Inter-State Committee on Drought Control in the Sahel, consisting of representatives of the countries of the region, could play a leading role in co-ordinating assistance programmes.

16. The needs of the countries affected were so great that they could not be met through any resources avail-

able to the United Nations or the specialized agencies, including the various voluntary funds. Accordingly, his delegation, like those of the German Democratic Republic, Guinea and Iraq, drew attention to the proposal of the USSR, which had already been submitted at the twenty-seventh session (2040th plenary meeting) by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR, Mr. Gromyko, for a reduction of the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent and the utilization of part of the funds thus saved for assistance to developing countries. The proposal provided for use of part of those funds primarily for assistance to those countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America which, as a result of serious natural disasters, found it difficult to implement urgent economic and social development projects. A decision by the General Assembly at its current session would not only alleviate the difficulties of the countries of the Sudano-Sahelian region, but would provide an ideal solution to the problems of assisting the economic development of the developing countries.

17. Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta) said that in view of the reference by the representative of the Soviet Union to voluntary contributions, he wished to state that it was the understanding of the sponsors of the draft resolution that Member States, which had unanimously adopted it, should be prepared to make available to the Secretary-General the resources necessary for implementation of the activities it referred to. There should be no deviation from the letter or the spirit of the text.

*The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.*

## 1534th meeting

Friday, 12 October 1973, at 3.20 p.m.

*Chairman:* Mr. Zewde GABRE-SELLASSIE (Ethiopia).

A/C.2/SR.1534

### *Organization of the Committee's work (continued)\** (A/C.2/L.1289)

#### AGENDA ITEM 46

#### **Review and appraisal of the objectives and policies of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade (A/9003 and Corr.1, chap. III; A/C.2/L.1287)**

#### **ESTABLISHMENT OF A WORKING PARTY ON REVIEW AND APPRAISAL**

1. The CHAIRMAN recalled that at the 1515th meeting, during the organization of the Committee's work, the representative of the Netherlands had made a formal proposal to establish a working party on review and appraisal which would consider item 46 and report to the Committee later in the session. The Committee had agreed that a decision on the Netherlands proposal should be postponed so that delegations could have

informal consultations on the proposal and the substance of the item. At the 1526th meeting the Committee had agreed that a decision should be taken on the establishment of a working party on 12 October. He intended to deal, for the moment, with only the procedural aspects of item 46. He had received the following information regarding the outcome of the informal consultations: first, there seemed to be a consensus that the most practical procedure was to establish a working party of the Committee, the membership of which would be open to all members. Secondly, he understood that, since the positions of the various groups on the substance of the item had not as yet been definitely formulated, it would be advisable to allow consultations to proceed for a few days longer—perhaps until the end of the resumed fifty-fifth session of the Economic and Social Council.

2. In order to facilitate the Committee's work, he wished to make three suggestions. First, he urged the Committee to decide at the current meeting to set up a working party, the membership of which would be open to all delegations, to consider item 46 and to report to

\* Resumed from the 1526th meeting.

the Committee later in the session; formal consideration of item 46 was scheduled for the two weeks beginning on 19 November. The Committee would authorize the working party to elect its own officers, and to choose its own methods of work and documentation. Secondly, in order to enable consultations within the groups on the substance of item 46 to continue, the Committee might decide that, in principle, the working party should hold its first meeting on Monday, 22 October. Thirdly, the Committee would continue in the meantime with the work programme adopted at the 1515th meeting (A/C.2/L.1289). In that connexion, he stressed the importance of adhering to the Committee's programme, which had been worked out in consultation with other bodies and with senior Secretariat officials who would be coming to New York to introduce reports and to participate in the Committee's work.

3. Mr. MACKENZIE (United Kingdom) said that his delegation was in general agreement with the Chairman's proposals, and believed that the note by the Secretary-General reproducing the working paper transmitted by the Economic and Social Council (A/C.2/L.1287) should be the basis for the Committee's discussion. However, his delegation was not committed to the working paper in any way, as was clear from Council resolution 1827 (LV), to which it was annexed. The document was unfinished, and it was to be hoped that the working party would endeavour to produce a document that would lead to a deeper understanding of the problems of development and a stronger commitment to it, particularly in the developed countries. Ultimately, it was the peoples, not the Governments, of the developed countries who provided the money for aid and who must have the will to give. The document should therefore convince them of the need to contribute, without antagonizing them by exaggerated criticism.

4. His delegation had participated in work on the document in an attempt to bring it to the point at which it could be adopted by consensus, as a shared view of the extent to which the goals and objectives of the International Development Strategy had been met in the first two years of the Second United Nations Development Decade, and of the implications for policy arising from that assessment. As a result of the efforts of all delegations at the fifty-fifth session of the Economic and Social Council, the working paper, as it stood, was a vast improvement on the original document. However, his delegation still had some constructive criticism to offer on the document. Apart from certain ungenerous language and the grudging terms in which reference was made to positive achievements, the paper was still at fault in assigning blame or praise to certain countries. He understood that, time permitting, the fifty-fifth session of the Economic and Social Council would have corrected that fault. However, in the document, responsibility for action or inaction on matters which could only be decided by agreement between the whole international community was placed in the sections dealing with the developed countries; obvious examples were the sections dealing with commodities, monetary reform and indebtedness. Unless proposals were made by the Chairman on that point, his delegation intended to make suggestions for rearranging the sequence of the paper.

5. Regarding the recommendations for future action in section III of the working paper, he said that the

review process was not one in which it was practicable to take decisions in areas on which specialized bodies of the international community were working. It was entirely right to list and emphasize those actions agreed upon, or being worked on, by the appropriate bodies which seemed particularly important in the context of the Strategy. However, it was unreasonable to expect substantive moves of position which were not possible in specialized bodies to be made by a generalized body such as the Committee. To expect Governments to give their support to such advances in the Committee could only lead to disappointment, to discrediting of the review process or to a list of reservations which would weaken the impact of the review report. In the Council, his delegation had indicated its difficulty in accepting some references in the document which went beyond the current state of agreement reached in the appropriate international bodies and his delegation would explain its views on those references at a later stage.

6. The paper could, however, serve as a basis for further work, provided that the final version honestly ascribed responsibility for various actions and inactions, and the recommendations were realistic in the light of the current state of agreement in the case of subjects in the hands of deliberative bodies. Whether his delegation could ultimately join in the adoption of the assessment naturally depended on there being a genuine attempt to meet the kind of points he had made, so that his Government could subscribe to it without reservations.

7. The proposed working party could decide either to discuss the working paper paragraph by paragraph or to deal only with certain vital issues. However, when the major issues had been resolved, time would have to be given to consideration of the general format of the paper and to lesser points of language.

*Mr. Arvesen (Norway) took the Chair.*

8. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines) said that his delegation would support the establishment of the working party and the terms of reference suggested by the Chairman. He asked whether, when the Committee was considering item 46, beginning in the week of 19 November, there would be any formal meetings of the working party.

9. The CHAIRMAN said that all the meetings of the working party would be informal. The intention was that when, on 19 November, the Committee once more took up item 46, the working party would have completed its work and would be able to submit a report to the Committee. If, however, the working party had not completed its work on 19 November, the Committee could then decide either to continue meetings of the working party and cancel its own meetings, if it was not behind schedule, or to consider the points still outstanding.

10. Mr. OGISO (Japan) said that throughout the biennial review and appraisal exercise, his delegation's view had been that the over-all review of the Strategy should result in an agreed document to be adopted by consensus in the General Assembly. His delegation had maintained the following specific long-term objectives for the review exercise of the Strategy: first, in order to enhance the efficiency of development efforts, the achievements of developing countries should be classified in several groups according to their stage of de-

velopment and other criteria. Remedial measures appropriate to each of those groups should be determined. Secondly, the question of income distribution in the developing countries called for exploration of the concept of net beneficial products, including the elaboration of social indicators. Thirdly, greater emphasis should be given to the importance of the rural sector of the Strategy in achieving its goals and objectives. Fourthly, due attention should be paid to the important role of private investment in development.

11. His delegation was pleased to note that tangible improvements had been made in the working paper at the fifty-fifth session of the Economic and Social Council; the new version of the working paper was more objective than the original version presented to the Committee on Review and Appraisal at its second session,<sup>1</sup> and reflected the efforts of both developed and developing countries to produce an agreed document on the subject. He was glad to note that the paper took into consideration some of the views which he had expressed earlier. Although a number of paragraphs of the document should be further improved if it should be adopted by the General Assembly, his delegation would consider it as a basis for discussions in the Committee.

12. His delegation supported the proposal to establish an open-ended working party to examine the document, and agreed that the working party should meet concurrently with the Committee from 22 October onwards. Suggestions on improving the basic document could be presented in advance in writing to avoid loss of time.

13. Mr. SHEMIRANI (Iran) said that an open-ended working group of the Group of 77 had recently been established. That working group could become part of the open-ended working party suggested by the Chairman to discuss item 46. His delegation agreed with the Chairman's proposal on the procedure for the Committee's work and believed that an open-ended working party could expedite the Committee's work.

14. Mr. PARIS (Costa Rica), referring to the remarks of the United Kingdom representative, said that the process of review and appraisal was not simply a historical exercise, but was forward-looking as well, in that it was intended to develop new concepts of assistance and co-operation to promote the implementation of the objectives of the Strategy.

15. Mr. MAKEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the difficulties which had arisen at the current session regarding the review and appraisal exercise could be attributed to the fact that all delegations had not had the opportunity to participate in the Committee on Review and Appraisal, the fifty-fifth session of the Economic and Social Council and the Council's Working Group on Review and Appraisal. Moreover, some delegations wanted more time to consider the results of the informal consultations on the working paper which had been held since the fifty-fifth session of the Council. For those reasons his delegation would prefer the Second Committee itself to consider the document, so that all delegations would have the opportunity to take part in preparing a very important document which would take into account the political and economic positions of all participants in international economic co-operation. Nevertheless, his dele-

gation would not oppose the setting up of a working party, if that was what the majority of the members wished.

16. The working party, if it was established, should be small, but should be representative of the various regions and groups. Interpretation services must be available and delegations should be able to submit texts in writing for translation. Otherwise, his delegation would not participate; furthermore the Committee's work would be delayed. It should be possible for the working party to meet at times when the Committee was not in session, a point that was particularly important for small delegations. All those matters should be settled at the outset so that delegations could not claim later that they had not had the opportunity to take part in the deliberations on the document on review and appraisal, which would mean that the Committee would have to start over again.

17. With regard to the Iranian representative's statement, he said that any group had the right to organize consultations and, having done so, to present a joint position. However, it was important to decide on the exact relationship of the working group of the Group of 77 to the Committee's working party, and on how the former's work would be co-ordinated with that of the Committee as a whole.

18. The CHAIRMAN said that the purpose of establishing a working party of the Committee was to save time. Its meetings would be informal in the sense that no summary records would be prepared. The usual interpretation facilities would be available. The working party's membership would be open, which meant that any delegation desiring to participate would be able to do so. Naturally, the Committee as a whole would take a decision on any text prepared by the working party.

19. Mr. SHEMIRANI (Iran), referring to the comments of the Soviet representative, said that the working group of the Group of 77 was open-ended and that it was based on the widest possible regional representative within that group.

20. Mr. ALEJO (Mexico) said that his delegation was concerned at the fact that, after lengthy discussion in various bodies, there was still no uniform position regarding the evaluation of the Strategy; it recognized that that situation reflected differences of opinion regarding the Strategy and the appraisal machinery. His delegation welcomed the proposal to establish a working party and would take part in its deliberations.

21. Mr. DELIVANIS (Greece) said that although he had initially favoured the establishment of a small working party, he now agreed that membership should be open to all delegations. He agreed with the United Kingdom representative on the need to make realistic proposals and avoid using language that might create difficulties.

22. Should delegations be unable to agree with the position advanced by their regional groups, they should make separate statements to the working party, which should report the differing views to the Committee briefly and clearly. The Committee and the working party should meet daily, one in the morning and one in the afternoon, so that small delegations would be able to attend both. In response to the comments of the Soviet representative, he said that although it was con-

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fifty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 11*, chap. II, sect. C.

ceivable that the working party might not be successful, requiring the full Committee to consider the draft document on review and appraisal, every effort should be made to reach agreement in the working party, in which delegations could speak more freely, since no summary records would be prepared.

23. Mr. MACKENZIE (United Kingdom) proposed that the working party should be asked to report to the Committee not later than 19 November.

24. Mr. RANKIN (Canada) said that he supported the proposal to establish a working party and suggested that, unless there were any objections, the Committee should take a decision forthwith.

25. Mr. PINO SANTOS (Cuba) said that although his delegation had already expressed its views on the review and appraisal exercise in the general debate (1527th meeting), it would like to present them in writ-

ing to the working party and would take part in that body's work.

26. Mr. MAKEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the work of the Committee and the working party should be scheduled as flexibly as possible to ensure that their meetings did not coincide all the time.

27. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee decided to establish a Working Party on Review and Appraisal, the membership of which would be open to all delegations, to consider item 46 and report to the Committee not later than 19 November. The Working Party's meetings would be scheduled as flexibly as possible.

*It was so decided.*

*The meeting rose at 4.40 p.m.*

## 1535th meeting

Friday, 19 October 1973, at 11.05 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Zewde GABRE-SELLASSIE (Ethiopia).

A/C.2/SR.1535

### AGENDA ITEM 47

#### United Nations Institute for Training and Research: report of the Executive Director (A/9014, A/C.2/L.1291)

1. Mr. NICOL (Executive Director of the United Nations Institute for Training and Research) said that the discussions of the UNITAR Board of Trustees at its twelfth session (25-28 September 1973) had focused on the "project on the future" and the adoption of an international staff training programme. The Board had also concentrated on the question of the United Nations University and on the financial situation of the Institute. Those were the main subjects of concern at the present time.

2. Noting with regret that only a few publications had appeared in languages other than English, he said that he had been exploring with various interested Governments the possibility of publishing the Institute's studies in French, Spanish, Russian and Chinese. At the same time, UNITAR was making efforts to reach a wider public and in particular, to see that its publications reached the Government services to which they were likely to be of interest.

3. UNITAR's financial situation was somewhat difficult: the voluntary contributions from which it derived its funds had been static whereas its administrative and maintenance costs had been steadily increasing. In that connexion, he recalled that the Board of Trustees had made an appeal for an increase in voluntary contributions and he assured that Committee that the greater part of any additional contributions which the Institute might receive would be devoted to training and research and not to financing administrative costs. It was gratifying to find that New Zealand and Mexico were now among the contributors and that a number of countries had increased their contributions.

4. The Executive Director's report (A/9014) provided information on the progress of ongoing programmes and described new and important projects. At the twenty-seventh session, on the basis of the report of the Fifth Committee, the Assembly had decided once again to defer a decision on the United Nations staff college (*ibid.*, para. 5). Yet it was an important and urgent question and it was to be hoped that interested Governments would make special purpose grants to finance the project, if only for a trial period of three to five years. For the time being, the Institute had decided to carry out a limited international staff training programme with grants it hoped to obtain from the United Nations, UNDP and some of the specialized agencies. However, the amounts involved were insufficient and the project could only be experimental.

5. The Institute had established a special information and Communications Unit through which it hoped to strengthen links with other training institutes and specialized organizations concerned with training. Seminars had been organized in New York for permanent missions and UNITAR intended to reorganize those courses in the light of the observations of participants and to organize similar courses in Geneva. Bearing in mind in particular those delegations which had no scientific attaché, UNITAR planned to organize courses on the aspects of science and technology with which the United Nations was dealing. Its courses in international law were proceeding successfully; they brought together eminent jurists from all over the world. In that connexion, he urged Member States to send in the names of their candidates in good time.

6. Since it had limited funds, UNITAR was recruiting a relatively limited number of staff, but it was always glad to welcome and provide facilities for visiting scholars whose work was financed by their Governments or by a university or foundation. On the other hand, it