

word "both" should be deleted and the words "a significant proportion of" should be inserted between "and" and "their". The paragraph would then reflect precisely the wording of paragraph 63 of the Strategy. He further suggested that the word "such" should be deleted from the third preambular paragraph. In paragraph 2, the words "with a view to revising paragraphs 60, 61 and 63 of the International Develop-

ment Strategy" should be deleted and the words "of the International Development Strategy" added at the end of the paragraph, the closing quotation marks also being placed at the end of the paragraph. He hoped that the sponsors would accept his suggestions so that his delegation could support the draft resolution.

The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.

1583rd meeting

Monday, 10 December 1973, at 3.10 p.m.

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

A/C.2/SR.1583

AGENDA ITEM 46

Review and appraisal of the objectives and policies of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade (concluded) (A/9003 and Corr.1, chap. III; A/9389, A/C.2/L.1287, A/C.2/L.1337, A/C.2/L.1338)

QUANTIFICATION OF SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL ACTIVITIES RELATED TO DEVELOPMENT (concluded) (A/C.2/L.1337)

1. Mr. ROUGÉ (France) said that, in his statement to the Committee at the beginning of the session (1516th meeting), the Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs had said that no provision in the Strategy merited closer consideration than that concerning science and technology. Accordingly, his delegation greatly regretted that, for lack of time, it was not possible for the Committee to discuss the draft resolution in detail. The draft resolution had been introduced as a purely procedural one, but it seemed to his delegation to place undue stress on the quantification of international efforts in relation to science and technology. What the Committee on Science and Technology for Development and the General Assembly would be better advised to do, in his delegation's view, was to attempt to define the fields of activity involved and determine the methods to be used to implement assistance programmes in the field of science and technology. Accordingly, his delegation supported the amendments proposed at the previous meeting, particularly that of the United Kingdom. Alternatively, paragraph 1 might be amended by excluding the idea of priority, specifying instead that the Committee on Science and Technology should not overlook the subject of quantitative targets, and paragraph 2 might be changed to avoid specifying the title of the proposed agenda item which limited its scope. That paragraph could refer instead to a decision by the General Assembly to consider the question at its twenty-ninth session when it discussed the reports of the Economic and Social Council and the Committee on Science and Technology for Development. In any event, his delegation would be unable to vote for or participate in a consensus on the text as it stood.

2. Mr. NEUHOFF (Federal Republic of Germany) said that, apart from other measures in favour of the

developing countries in the field of science and technology, his Government had in 1973 commissioned a survey from a firm of consultants, which had contacted approximately 400 private companies in the Federal Republic and had identified over 200 products that could be manufactured easily in the developing countries. That information would be transmitted to private concerns in his country in order to encourage them to co-operate in such production with firms in the developing countries. Furthermore, his Government intended to establish a technological institute for development which would start its operations in 1974. In collaboration with scientific and economic institutions, at home and abroad, and with multinational organizations, the institute would disseminate information on production processes that were particularly suited to the developing countries, and would serve as a clearing-house for patents and licences. In its statement to the Committee at the 1538th meeting on the item concerning UNIDO, his delegation had given a detailed description of the institute, which it hoped would make at least a modest contribution to reducing the technological gap between the industrialized and the developing countries.

3. With regard to the establishment of quantitative targets in the field of science and technology, the draft report of the Intergovernmental Group of Experts on the Quantification of Scientific and Technological Activities Related to Development on its meeting in December 1973 indicated that no satisfactory basis as yet existed for the quantification of targets in that field. Statistical data on the performance of developing countries were not readily available. Furthermore, it was difficult to define the nature of research of specific relevance to the developing countries. It was doubtful whether a clear line could be drawn between expenditure on general research and that on specific research in favour of the developing countries, since all research work would ultimately benefit those countries. Work on the subject would have to continue, and as matters stood any revision of paragraph 63 of the International Development Strategy, including the definition of the quantitative targets contemplated in that paragraph, would be premature.

4. Consequently, his delegation was not in a position to accept the part of paragraph 2 of the draft resolution which followed the words "related to development", and associated itself with the amendments proposed by the representatives of Japan and France.

5. Mr. HAQ (Pakistan) announced that, after consultations with a number of delegations, the sponsors of the draft resolution had accepted a number of amendments. In the third preambular paragraph, the word "such" had been deleted. In paragraph 2, the words "with a view to revising paragraphs 60, 61 and 63 of the International Development Strategy" had been deleted, and the words "of the International Development Strategy" added at the end of the paragraph, the closing quotation marks also being placed at the end of the paragraph. The representative of Japan had decided not to press other amendments to that paragraph after the sponsors had pointed out that paragraph 63 of the International Development Strategy did mention specified targets in relation to science and technology. The phrase "to give priority" in paragraph 1 had created difficulties for some delegations. The sponsors did not interpret priority as implying exclusiveness; their understanding was simply that the item would be the first one discussed in the Committee on Science and Technology for Development, without excluding other important items on its agenda.

6. The draft resolution should be viewed in the context of the whole idea of quantitative targets for scientific and technological activities. It was not a static document, and there need not be a repetition of the events which had occurred at the first session of the Committee on Science and Technology for Development. The sponsors had noted that the report of the Intergovernmental Group of Experts had been adopted unanimously, and believed that the second session of the Committee would give due attention to that report. They hoped that the draft resolution, as revised, could be adopted by consensus.

7. The CHAIRMAN announced that the delegation of Uruguay wished to become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

8. Mr. HEMANS (United Kingdom) said his delegation welcomed the flexibility the sponsors had shown in accepting two amendments proposed by the Japanese delegation and in explaining their interpretation of the phrase "to give priority"; by so doing, they had completely reassured his own delegation as to the resolution's purport and implications, and he was therefore prepared to agree to its adoption without a vote.

9. Mr. KOSSEV (Bulgaria), speaking on behalf of his delegation and those of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, requested that the draft resolution should be put to the vote.

10. Mr. ABHYANKAR (India) appealed to the representative of Bulgaria not to press his request; the reservations he had expressed on behalf of those countries at the Committee's 1582nd meeting could be fully recorded in the summary record.

11. Mr. BRITO (Brazil) endorsed that appeal. The draft resolution was purely procedural, and in no way affected the substance of the matter, which would be discussed at the appropriate time in the Committee on Science and Technology for Development. It would augur well for the success of those discussions if a consensus could be achieved at the outset.

12. Mr. KOSSEV (Bulgaria) said he would withdraw his request for a vote, on the understanding that the reservations he had stated, on behalf of the countries he had mentioned, at the Committee's 1582nd meeting would be reflected *in extenso* in the summary record.

13. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Committee) drew attention to paragraph 10(e) of General Assembly resolution 2538 (XXIV); the financial implications of reproducing the statement in question *in extenso* would be approximately \$100 a page.

14. The CHAIRMAN said he would take it that the Committee agreed that the statement of the representative of Bulgaria at the 1582nd meeting would be reproduced *in extenso* in the summary record, and that the Committee agreed to approve draft resolution A/C.2/L.1337, as orally revised, without a vote.

It was so decided.

The draft resolution, as revised, was adopted without a vote.

15. Mr. ROUGÉ (France) said his delegation welcomed the revision of the draft resolution, which had enabled it to join in the consensus. Nevertheless, despite the explanation given by the representative of Pakistan, it still feared that the phrase "to give priority" might be wrongly interpreted. His delegation continued to believe that the Committee on Science and Technology for Development should attempt to define the fields of activity which international co-operation in relation to science and technology would cover, and to determine what measures were required, rather than confining itself to the sterile exercise of quantification.

16. Mr. CAVAGLIERI (Italy) said that his delegation had been pleased to join in the approval by consensus of the draft resolution. However, it had a number of reservations. He was pleased to learn that the report of the Intergovernmental Group of Experts had been adopted unanimously. That report, he gathered, was extremely technical, and would therefore require careful evaluation of the experts' conclusions. As matters stood, therefore, it was not possible to decide on the specific and far-reaching steps suggested in the draft resolution. A better course of action would have been simply to welcome the completion of the work of the Group of Experts and to await analysis of its report by the Committee on Science and Technology for Development. It was too early for the Economic and Social Council to give the Committee instructions or to decide to include a specific item in the agenda of the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly.

17. Mr. EKBLOM (Finland) said his delegation welcomed the fact that the sponsors had accepted certain amendments to the draft resolution. It agreed that consensus action on that document was appropriate, since it should be viewed in the context of the over-all review and appraisal exercise. However, his delegation's participation in its approval by consensus did not prejudice his Government's view as to the feasibility of quantification.

18. Mr. GRANQVIST (Sweden) said that the amendments the sponsors had incorporated and the interpretation they had given of paragraph 1, the wording of which had caused his delegation some apprehension, had enabled it to join in the consensus. As was clear from Sweden's bilateral development co-operation programme and its position on related ques-

tions in multilateral organizations, his Government recognized that science and technology were important factors in the acceleration of development. Nevertheless, it remained sceptical about the usefulness of establishing sectoral quantified targets of the kind referred to in the draft resolution.

19. Mr. EHRLICH-ADAM (Austria) said his delegation had joined in the consensus approval of the draft resolution because it fully understood the concern of the developing countries with regard to the establishment of quantitative targets for scientific and technological activities. It agreed that the question was of particular importance in the context of the International Development Strategy. However, his delegation believed that further discussion of such targets should not be regarded as a prerequisite for further efforts by both developed and developing countries to strengthen co-operation in the area. Although it had not read the report of the Intergovernmental Group of Experts, it was not convinced that significant progress could be made by following the course of action outlined in the draft resolution.

20. Mr. CURTIN (Australia) said that his delegation, having attended the first session of the Committee on Science and Technology for Development, had viewed the draft resolution with some trepidation. Its main concern had been with regard to the phrase "to give priority", and it therefore greatly welcomed the explanation given by the representative of Pakistan. It did not believe that the second session of the Committee should be dominated by the item in question.

21. Mr. OLIVERI LOPEZ (Argentina) said his delegation welcomed the consensus approval of the draft resolution, particularly since it was aware of the difficulties a similar procedural decision had created at the fifty-fourth session of the Economic and Social Council. The consensus had been facilitated by the statement of the Acting Director of the Office for Science and Technology on the positive results of the work of the Intergovernmental Group of Experts, and demonstrated the spirit of understanding which prevailed in the Committee.

22. Mr. ABHYANKAR (India) thanked the representative of Bulgaria and the other delegations which had had difficulty with the draft resolution, for agreeing to approve it without a vote. Their co-operation augured well for the future. His delegation hoped the report of the Intergovernmental Group of Experts would be available in time to satisfy the six-week rule for the forthcoming session of the Committee on Science and Technology for Development, and asked that copies should be made available on an informal basis as soon as possible, since that would facilitate delegations' preparations for that session.

23. Mr. KRYGER (Denmark) said his delegation had been able to join in the consensus in the light of the explanation given of the phrase "to give priority" in paragraph 1 and of the revision of paragraph 2. However, despite the importance his Government attached to the role of science and technology in development, it could not regard the draft resolution as in any way prejudging its position on the question of quantitative targets.

24. Mr. UTHEIM (Norway) said his delegation's support for the consensus should not be interpreted as

indicating that it had taken a position on the substance of the question of quantitative targets for science and technology, since such a decision would be premature at the current session.

PREPARATIONS FOR THE MID-TERM REVIEW AND APPRAISAL OF THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY (A/C.2/L.1338)

25. Mr. VAN GORKOM (Netherlands), introducing draft resolution A/C.2/L.1338, said that the Federal Republic of Germany and Turkey should be added to the list of sponsors.

26. Although the document relating to the first biennial review and appraisal exercise (A/C.2/L.1329) and the draft resolution it contained had been adopted without a vote, it was clear from the Committee's discussions that no delegation was entirely satisfied with the results. However, it had to be borne in mind that the International Development Strategy was a unique document in the history of the United Nations and that the review and appraisal procedure was a very new feature of international economic co-operation. The first review and appraisal exercise had therefore necessarily been experimental. Wherever the short-comings of that exercise had been, it was obvious that careful preparation was needed at the regional, sectoral and over-all levels for the mid-term review and appraisal in 1975. The aim of the draft resolution was to provide for such preparation. Although it was primarily addressed to the United Nations system, that did not mean that individual Governments of developed and developing countries did not have an important role to play in the mid-term review and appraisal exercise. However, the sponsors considered that, for the time being, that role was largely covered by the review and appraisal document recently approved by the Committee.

27. Some delegations had considered the sixth preambular paragraph to be too vague or too sweeping. Following consultations with those delegations, the sponsors had decided to revise that paragraph to read:

"Considering that since the adoption of the Strategy new issues and concepts have emerged, such as those mentioned in paragraph 4 of the first biennial over-all review and appraisal of progress in the implementation of the International Development Strategy contained in General Assembly resolution . . . (XXVIII), which require further study".

28. That paragraph should be read in conjunction with the following preambular paragraphs, which emphasized the need for effective implementation of the Strategy. Those paragraphs, together with paragraph 1, should make it quite clear that preparations for the mid-term review and appraisal should in no way delay the implementation process.

29. The regional economic commissions had an important role to play in review and appraisal and had indeed played such a role in the first exercise. However, the sponsors had deemed it necessary to address paragraph 6 to the regional economic commissions because of their key role in implementing the Strategy. Paragraph 7 requested the Secretary-General to continue and strengthen the very useful work of assisting the developing countries to strengthen their own evaluation and planning procedures. Paragraph 8 should be

read in conjunction with the last preambular paragraph. The sponsors had considered it necessary to stress the need for efforts by the developed countries, since it was important for the taxpayers in those countries to realize that they, too, would benefit from progress in the developing countries.

30. On the basis of the informal consultations which had taken place, he hoped that it would be possible to approve the draft resolution without a vote.

31. The CHAIRMAN said that if there was no objection he would take it that the Committee decided to approve draft resolution A/C.2/L.1338, as orally revised, without further discussion and without a vote.

The draft resolution, as revised, was adopted without a vote.

32. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation took a very favourable view of the draft resolution and had not objected to its adoption without a vote, on the understanding that his Government supported the ideas and targets of the Second United Nations Development Decade and the provisions of the International Development Strategy to the extent to which they were consistent with the joint statements made by the socialist countries on that issue at the twenty-fifth and twenty-eighth sessions of the General Assembly, and with other relevant declarations. The provisions of those joint statements should be borne in mind in the preparations for the mid-term review and appraisal envisaged in the procedural draft resolution just approved by the Committee.

33. Mr. TANK (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote, commended the valuable work performed by the Netherlands delegation in preparing draft resolution A/C.2/L.1338.

34. With regard to the revised sixth preambular paragraph, his delegation understood that the new issues and concepts in question were not limited to those listed in paragraph 4 of the Strategy. It also hoped that, for the purpose of both the mid-term review and appraisal and subsequent work, provision would be made to evaluate United Nations contributions and that the reports to be prepared under paragraphs 5 and 6 of the draft resolution would form an adequate basis for such evaluation, which had not been possible in the first review and appraisal exercise.

35. Mr. AL-KHUDHAIRY (Iraq), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had not objected to the approval of the draft resolution without a vote. It understood that the new issues referred to in the sixth preambular paragraph were only those issues enumerated in the report of the Working Party on Review and Appraisal, and that further study of those issues should in no way be used as an excuse to hinder the development efforts of the developing countries.

36. Mr. JABER (Jordan), speaking in explanation of vote, said that study of the new issues and concepts mentioned in the sixth preambular paragraph should not constitute a pretext for not fully implementing the targets of the Strategy and attaining its goals.

37. With regard to paragraph 2, his delegation had doubts about the practical relevance of research into integrated socio-economic development. The lack of adequate statistics in most developing countries made it very difficult to devise satisfactory indicators in the social field. Even if such statistics could be collected, the development of such indicators might not be justified in all cases.

38. Mr. DE SEYNES (Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs) drew the Committee's attention to an essential element of the over-all review and appraisal procedure, namely, national review and appraisal by individual Governments. When the concept of review and appraisal had started to emerge in 1968 and 1969 in the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council, particular emphasis had been placed on that aspect. Paragraphs 1 and 7 of the draft resolution could be interpreted as a reaffirmation of the importance of governmental participation in the review and appraisal exercise. It was a little discouraging to note that in 1973 relatively few Governments had provided the Secretariat with information that could form a sound basis for the first review. It had been necessary for the Secretariat to resort to its customary sources of information in order to learn what it could about the problems encountered by Governments.

39. That situation was not really satisfactory, particularly in view of the need to study new ideas, issues and concepts. It was important to have some indication of the extent to which those new concepts were accepted by Governments and incorporated in national policies. To be successful, the mid-term review and appraisal exercise would have to be based on information from Governments considerably more comprehensive than that so far supplied.

40. That consideration applied to the industrialized as well as the developing countries. Structural changes would have to take place in the industrialized countries because the framework for their current efforts was rather different from what it had been two years previously. Those countries were on the threshold of an era of shortages, and their national policies were bound to undergo radical modifications. Information would be needed from the industrialized countries about those issues and from the developing countries about the new ideal of a unified approach to development.

41. In accordance with paragraph 7 of the draft resolution, the Secretariat would assist Governments, at their request, to work out methodologies that would enable national data to be analysed and compared.

The meeting rose at 4.25 p.m.