

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-FIRST SESSION

Official Records



**SECOND COMMITTEE, 1063rd
MEETING**

Tuesday, 8 November 1966,
at 3.10 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 94:</i>	
<i>Development of natural resources (continued)</i>	235

Chairman: Mr. Moraiwid M. TELL (Jordan).

AGENDA ITEM 94

Development of natural resources (continued) (A/6303, chap. VII; A/6460, A/C.2/L.882 and Corr.1, A/C.2/L.883, A/C.2/L.887-890)

1. Sir Edward WARNER (United Kingdom) said that he supported the draft resolution on the development of natural resources (A/C.2/L.883) and hoped that the Economic and Social Council would be successful at an early date in establishing means by which the five-year survey programme could be implemented. He noted that the Secretary-General, in accordance with Council resolution 1127 (XLI), was to make an interim report on the implementation of the programme to the resumed forty-first session. He did not believe that it was for the Second Committee to decide on the inclusion in the programme of a survey of petroleum and natural gas and hoped that the representative of Poland would not press his amendments (A/C.2/L.887). The programme had already been reviewed by a group of independent experts, by the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development and by the Economic and Social Council. There might still be a case for changing its contents, but not at such short notice in the Second Committee.

2. Without questioning the great importance of the resources of the sea, he shared some of the doubts expressed by the representatives of Israel and Malta concerning the draft resolution on that subject (A/C.2/L.882 and Corr.1), namely, that a vast new and continuing activity in the United Nations might be opened up without adequate consideration of the financial and other implications: his delegation would therefore abstain with regret.

3. Mr. ELM (Iran) hoped that the interim report to be submitted by the Secretary-General on his five-year survey programme would offer the developing countries further opportunities to develop their non-agricultural resources. Those surveys should, however, be limited to the most promising possibilities, because they were so expensive, especially those that would deal with petroleum and natural gas, if the Polish amendments were adopted. It would be better to discuss the surveys requested by the Polish representative later, when the Committee had detailed information on the cost.

4. He supported the draft resolution on the resources of the sea which were still badly exploited and looked forward eagerly to the result.

5. Mr. FERNANDINI (Peru) said that Peru, with 2,000 kilometres of coastline, owed its economic stability mainly to fishing and to its fish production—the world's largest. Experiments had been made with fish flour intended for human consumption, the high protein content of which could help to alleviate the world food shortage. But Peru was also interested in developing sea resources other than fish. That was why his delegation was a sponsor of the resolution on resources of the sea, which might have to be amended to include a reference to closer co-operation with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and an extension of the studies on which UNESCO was at present engaged in that connexion.

6. The draft resolution on natural resources was not controversial. The sponsors had, however, not yet managed to hold an exchange of views on the amendments submitted by Poland, but, in view of the high cost of the surveys requested therein and of the limited resources available for the project, it might be better for the surveys on petroleum and natural gas to be the subject of another resolution, after the funds necessary for undertaking them had been found.

7. Mr. INGRAM (Australia) commended the United States delegation on its initiative in submitting the draft resolution on resources of the sea, the importance of which was undeniable, because those resources would certainly be a "new frontier" for the next few decades. The emphasis of the draft resolution was correctly laid on the development of a concerted international programme as distinct from an inventory of present-day knowledge on the resources of the sea, the latter having been taken care of in Economic and Social Council resolution 1112 (XL). Thus, operative paragraph 3 (a) of the draft resolution complemented the request for a survey contained in Council resolution 1112 (XL).

8. In submitting his draft resolution, the United States representative had laid great emphasis on fish as a source of protein. However, the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development had already made a number of recommendations for an international programme in the field of edible proteins, including fish proteins and proteins produced by special industrial processes. Certainly, the Advisory Committee considered that the use of fish for human consumption must be increased, for, at present, fish provided only one tenth of the world's edible protein requirements. For that

purpose, an inventory must first be taken of the world fish resources by means of co-ordinated surveys, since previous surveys were insufficient. In that connexion, the Advisory Committee had recognized the importance of the work of UNESCO's Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission. However, the Advisory Committee considered that the question of edible protein must be looked at as a whole.

9. It was therefore essential to explore all the possible avenues in order to launch a concerted international attack which would include an evaluation of the various practical methods of increasing the supply of low-cost edible protein. More importance should be given in the draft resolution to the work already being done by the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development. While he was not submitting a formal amendment, he thought, therefore, that some such paragraph as "Taking into account also the relevant activities of the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development" should be added to the preamble.

10. His delegation supported the draft resolution on natural resources and joined the other delegations which had requested the Polish representative to withdraw his amendments. The draft resolution was purely formal and it was not for the Committee to make it into a substantive resolution by adding or deleting surveys included in a programme whose composition had been considered by technical bodies.

Mr. Boiko (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

11. Mr. GALLARDO MORENO (Mexico) said that he whole-heartedly supported the two draft resolutions, which would lead to practical and swift results, especially the text dealing with the resources of the sea which could be expected to solve the hunger problem. If priority had to be given to some surveys, because of the limited resources available to the United Nations, it should obviously be given to the most important research—that on proteins.

12. Mr. FILALI (Morocco) welcomed the Secretary-General's initiative and the Economic and Social Council's discussions and resolutions aimed at formulating a five-year survey programme on the development of non-agricultural resources, since those surveys were of particular importance for the developing countries. His delegation was therefore satisfied with the draft resolution contained in document A/C.2/L.883, which it would support, but without underestimating the importance of the Polish delegation's remarks and amendments concerning surveys of certain energy resources. Surveys of that kind were of concern to many developing countries, including Morocco, but they were very costly and sometimes of doubtful value, and the countries in question did not have the means to carry them out by themselves. Morocco had prepared an accurate geological map of the various deposits in its sub-soil. But, while he believed that the Committee should take the Polish amendments into account, he did not press for any change in the programme already adopted by the Council and under way.

13. He urged the Polish representative to withdraw his amendments and asked the Secretary-General to bear the underlying idea in mind and to ascertain to what extent such a survey was feasible, or at least to submit a report on the matter to the Council at an early session.

14. Mr. ORR (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations) stressed the importance which his organization attached to the development of fisheries resources. In November 1965, the Conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) had raised its Fisheries Division to the level of a department, headed by an assistant Director-General, in charge of expanding the FAO fisheries programme during the next six years and had authorized the establishment of the Committee on Fisheries, whose members were to be appointed by the Council of FAO, which had begun its work in June 1966 with the participation of very high-ranking representatives.

15. Mr. ANANICHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that economic and social progress was inconceivable without the planned surveying and exploitation of natural resources. The development of those resources was extremely important to the developing countries, which were struggling to consolidate their economic independence through industrialization.

16. There were three essential aspects to the question under consideration. First, it was important that the developing countries should have national prospection services which could take an inventory of their natural resources and lay down rules for their exploitation. Secondly, it was necessary to utilize the achievements of science and technology for that purpose and to apply a uniform scientific policy. Lastly, it was necessary to enlist international co-operation in order to provide those countries with the practical assistance they needed to develop their resources. The work done so far in that connexion by the Economic and Social Council should be viewed in the light of those three criteria.

17. In view of the limited resources available to the United Nations and the developing countries, the proposed five-year programme should be designed primarily to obtain immediate practical results. Of course, that work could not be carried out solely with the resources available to the United Nations and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Many developing countries, which were the principal parties concerned, had already prepared plans for surveying their natural resources. In order to organize properly the activities connected with natural resource surveys, those countries should be helped to establish national geological services or institutions which could direct all research activities in that field.

18. In the absence of a planned scientific policy, the solution of the main problems could be hampered by the proliferation of secondary questions. In that connexion, it was essential to study first the geological structure of the developing countries by means of geological surveys, the re-evaluation of known deposits and the preparation of geological, tectonic, geophysical and prospection maps of the most important minerals.

The scope of that work would depend on the conditions prevailing in each country and the present state of its geological surveys. The developed countries could contribute by handing over their geological and cartographical material on the developing countries, in pursuance of the recommendations of the regional economic commissions. The successful execution of the programme for developing the natural resources of the developing countries depended on the extent of the co-operation given by the States Members of the United Nations and members of other international organizations. The specialized agencies and the regional economic commissions should also be associated with the survey of those resources. The United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) and the International Symposium on Industrial Development should also give the matter the importance it deserved.

19. How should the United Nations five-year survey programme be evaluated in the light of those objectives? It consisted essentially of pre-investment surveys of nine kinds of natural resources, was estimated to cost \$10 million and made no provision for field surveys. In his delegation's view, the proposed method of execution took almost no account of the main elements of the problem as he had just defined them.

20. In order to improve the programme and ensure its success, national experts must work side by side with United Nations experts in collecting and analysing data on non-agricultural resources. The national experts could constitute the nucleus of future national services for the prospecting and development of natural resources. Prospecting should cover not only known resources and deposits but also the unexplored natural wealth unknown to the developing countries concerned but known to some Western countries and their companies, which had carried out geological research in their territories. The General Assembly should request those Western countries to make that information, which might be of great theoretical and practical value, available to the experts from the United Nations and the developing countries participating in the implementation of the programme.

21. The programme in its present form was unsatisfactory, for the proposed surveys would merely bring up to date or improve the classification of known statistics on the developing countries' resources. Even if its basic objectives were approved, the cost of the programme could not be estimated at \$10 million. The Secretariat, with the assistance of a few experts, could and must do the work at a much smaller outlay. It would, moreover, be logical to defray the expenses involved through the UNDP. When the Economic and Social Council had considered the development of natural resources at its fortieth and forty-first sessions, many delegations had said that, on the basis of the insufficient data available, it was impossible to decide whether the proposed programme met the most urgent needs of the developing countries, or to take organizational and financial steps for its execution. His delegation felt that the United Nations should concentrate its resources and efforts on priority problems, and it therefore supported the Polish

amendments to the draft resolution on resources of the sea.

22. Turning to the question on the resources of the sea, he reminded the Committee that a number of international organizations, the most important being UNESCO's Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission, were responsible for international co-operation in the matter. In adopting resolution 1112 (XL), the Economic and Social Council had once again emphasized the urgent need to develop those resources.

23. The motives of the sponsors of the draft resolution on resources of the sea were apparently easy to understand. The draft resolution was designed to encourage better co-ordination of the studies of the sea and of the exploitation of its riches; it was therefore surprising that it did not mention the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission, despite the fact that that Commission performed precisely those world-wide co-ordinating functions with which the sponsors were concerned. The omission was all the more curious since the United States participated actively in the Commission's work. If that was meant to signify distrust of the Commission, it was unjustified. In those circumstances, the establishment of a group of experts to review the activities of oceanographic organizations would be a classic example of the "duplication or overlapping" which the sponsors opposed.

24. His delegation believed that the existence of Council resolution 1112 (XL) made it unnecessary for the General Assembly to take new decisions at its current session. In view of the concern felt by some delegations, however, it was prepared to support the draft resolution if it was amended so that it did not establish a new group of experts but asked the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission, whose essential role should be stressed, to assist the Secretary-General in formulating his proposals.

25. After reading out the amendments proposed by his delegation (A/C.2/L.889), he said that the United Nations must rely as much as possible on existing international organizations.

26. Mr. ROOSEVELT (United States of America), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the United States had fully supported the UNESCO Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission, which, as the USSR representative had rightly pointed out, was doing remarkable work. However, its statute limited its terms of reference to science and its membership to States Members of United Nations bodies wishing to take part in oceanographic research programmes. Furthermore, when the Commission had requested its secretariat to prepare a report on the impact on marine science of the activities of newly-created international organizations, the secretariat had replied that the absence of objective criteria made such analysis virtually impossible but drew attention to dangers of continuing proliferation.

27. Mr. DJOUDI (Algeria), after recalling the relevant provisions of Economic and Social Council resolutions 1113 (XL) and 1127 (XLI), on which draft resolution A/C.2/L.883 was based, said that, according to the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development, the inventory,

evaluation and planned use of natural resources were priority projects. The unanimous adoption of Council resolution 1113 (XL) showed that co-operation was possible between the poor countries which produced minerals and the industrial countries which imported raw materials. That co-operation could centre particularly on commodities of which there was a shortage on the world market and those of which the supply exceeded the demand.

28. The proposals submitted by the Secretary-General were of great importance to the developing countries. His delegation had already pointed out the importance it attached to some of the proposed surveys, especially those of iron ore resources, non-ferrous metals, selected mines in developing countries and the water needs and resources of those countries.

29. His delegation also regretted that it had not been possible to include in the programme the study of new prospecting and development techniques for petroleum and natural gas deposits. At the present stage, however, it was difficult to make major changes in the programme without delaying its execution. It was difficult to tell what form an additional programme of surveys on petroleum and natural gas might take and when the delegations which were concerned with the financial implications of such surveys would agree to the expansion of the programme. In that connexion, he recalled that the formula of voluntary expert services had been proposed by the group of experts consulted by the Secretary-General. His delegation would like to obtain further information on that subject from the Secretariat or from other delegations and believed that some common ground could be found.

30. Mr. PISANI-MASSAMORMILE (Italy) said that his delegation was convinced of the value of the survey of petroleum and natural gas resources advocated in one of the Polish amendments. The incorporation of that amendment in the draft might, however, lead to confusion between two different problems. Actually, the proposed programme, which had been approved by the Council, was very modest, and the draft resolution was aimed at facilitating its execution. The adoption of Poland's amendment would reopen the matter of priorities and would therefore run counter to the sponsors' intention.

31. He wondered whether the draft resolution on resources of the sea did not involve the risk of duplication by requesting the Secretary-General to make a survey of marine resources. If it did, his delegation would be unable to support it. However, operative paragraph 2 stated that the survey would be made in consultation with the international organizations concerned. In that connexion, he was gratified that the United States representative had agreed to mention the role of the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission in the preamble. By submitting the survey and proposals prepared by the Secretary-General to the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development it would be possible to interest wider sectors of public opinion in the project and hence obtain further contributions.

32. Mr. KAUL (India) said he hoped it would be possible to reach agreement on the new operative

paragraph submitted by Poland. His delegation supported the general tenor of the draft resolution on resources of the sea. It could not be assumed, however, that the exploitation and development of the sea's resources would necessarily raise the economic level of the developing countries. Better knowledge of marine resources was not enough. Capital would be needed to exploit them, and it would be easier for the developed countries to profit from any scientific advances made in that field. In order to make full use of the knowledge acquired from the proposed survey of marine resources, the technical means of exploiting those resources must be made available to the developing countries.

33. Mr. PARDO (Malta) reminded the Second Committee that, at the previous meeting, he had submitted amendments (A/C.2/L.888) which greatly improved the draft resolution on the resources of the sea by requesting the Economic and Social Council to evaluate the proposed survey more precisely, in the light of present and prospective resources of the United Nations system and the utilization of those resources in the execution of other projects in the field of natural resources. Moreover, the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development should first submit suggestions and comments to the Council so that the proposed survey was not purely academic but productive. While he hoped that the sponsors of the draft resolution, whose aims he endorsed, would accept his amendments, he would not press his proposal, in order to avoid prolonging the debate.

34. With regard to the draft resolution on natural resources, he endorsed the remarks of the representative of the Soviet Union and made it clear that his vote for the draft resolution did not mean that he approved of the utilization of UNDP's limited resources for the execution of comprehensive surveys.

35. Mr. THAWLEY (New Zealand) said that, while in principle he supported the surveys envisaged in the draft resolution on natural resources, he doubted whether some of the specific projects, such as that on iron deposits, would have any short-term value to the developing countries. The survey of non-ferrous metals should also be revised to include those minerals offering the best prospects of early and stable returns, while New Zealand would regard the surveys of off-shore mineral resources and oil shoals as having relatively less priority. He had some sympathy for the sentiments expressed by the representative of Poland, but did not think it a practical proposition for the United Nations to venture into the vast realm of petroleum and natural gas, given the limited resources available to the Organization. He therefore welcomed the talks between the sponsors and the representative of Poland.

36. He was glad that the representative of China had reminded the Committee of the importance of regional surveys. As stated in the New Zealand reply to the Secretary-General (see E/4186/Add.1, annex), those could often be more useful to the developing countries than global surveys. The survey programmes should be co-ordinated within UNDP especially because of the need to avoid any conflict with agricultural development, which must continue to receive the highest

priority. They should be financed either from UNDP funds or by appropriations from the United Nations regular budget, according to the type of work.

37. New Zealand was perhaps surrounded by as much ocean as any country, and his delegation supported the draft resolution on resources of the sea. However, it felt it was essential to co-ordinate the proposed programme with the work of UNESCO and FAO, which had great experience and expertise in the matter. Given that co-operation, already envisaged in the draft resolution, the proposed survey could be extremely productive and would avoid duplication of effort.

38. Mr. MARTIN WITKOWSKI (France) said that, while he had no fundamental objection to the draft resolution on resources of the sea, he would not oppose certain minor improvements: the deletion, in the first preambular paragraph, of the phrase "which cover 71 per cent of the earth's surface"; the replacement, in the French text of the third preambular paragraph, of the words "d'autres" by the words "les autres"; the substitution, in the French text of operative paragraph 2, of the words "l'Organisation des Nations Unies et les institutions qui lui sont reliées" for the words "les organisations du dispositif des Nations Unies". With regard to operative paragraph 5, he thought it would be difficult for the Secretary-General to submit his survey of those proposals to the twenty-third session, and he proposed that he should do so at the twenty-fourth session. Finally, his delegation would welcome information on the financial implications of the draft resolution.

39. Mr. AHMED (Pakistan), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said that he was gratified by the Committee members' reactions to the draft resolution on natural resources, which was intended to be no more than a procedural draft resolution covering resolution 1127 (XLI) which the Economic and Social Council had adopted after studying, at its fortieth session, some proposals by the Secretary-General (E/4132) and, at its forty-first session, those same suggestions supplemented by the comments of a group of experts and the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development (E/4186, annexes I and II).

40. That was why the sponsors, despite their sympathy for the amendments proposed by the representative of Poland, had not been able to incorporate them in the text. Moreover, the draft resolution invited the Council to continue its study of the means of implementing the survey programme, and not to determine what surveys should be undertaken. Some of the nine surveys suggested were of general interest, while others were of special interest to particular developing countries. As it was impossible, at the present juncture, to reopen the whole debate on the surveys to be made, Poland's amendments could not be accepted. He was, however, gratified that, after consultations conducted in an atmosphere of such goodwill, it had been agreed to add a third operative paragraph, so as to satisfy the representative of Poland, who had consequently agreed not to press his amendments. The operative paragraph 3 would be worded as follows:

"Invites the Secretary-General to study the technical and financial implications of carrying out sur-

veys of petroleum and natural gas resources in the developing countries and to submit specific proposals on this subject to the Economic and Social Council."

That compromise solution took account of the urgency of not delaying the execution of the five-year survey programme and left it to the Council to take any appropriate decision on surveys of petroleum and natural gas resources.

41. He hoped that the draft resolution, as amended, would be adopted unanimously.

42. Mr. WOULBROUN (Belgium) said that, convinced as he was of the importance that the exploitation of the resources of the sea would assume in the future, he supported the draft resolution on that subject. He would prefer, however, to have the expression "comprehensive survey" in operative paragraph 2 translated in the French text by "étude globale" or "étude d'ensemble", which suggested a project of more limited scope. He also hoped that the Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs would give the Committee some idea of the financial implications of the draft.

43. His delegation also supported the draft resolution on natural resources. However, the new paragraph which the sponsors had added by agreement with the representative of Poland gave the impression that the General Assembly was inviting the Secretary-General to make a new survey. He would therefore prefer the Secretary-General to be invited to "study the technical and financial implications" and "make a report in this regard to the Economic and Social Council", rather than to "submit specific proposals".

44. Mr. SVENNEVIG (Norway) pointed out that the draft resolution on the resources of the sea, of which his delegation was a sponsor, was of a preliminary nature since substantive decisions should only be taken later in the light of the possibilities opened up by the survey which the Secretary-General was requested to make. For the time being the important point was to review the research already being done in order to achieve, if possible, a more efficient international co-operation. Owing to the precarious world food situation, everything possible should be done to increase food resources, inter alia, by exploring the immense resources offered by the oceans and the preservation of fish reserves.

45. His delegation believed that the survey requested in the draft resolution could be financed from the United Nations regular budget and with the help of any voluntary contributions that might be forthcoming.

46. So far as the draft was concerned, it believed that the Australian suggestion improved the text, but it could not agree with the USSR amendments. While appreciating the anxiety of the USSR delegation to prevent duplication, it did not think it advisable to make an organ of a specialized agency responsible for co-ordinating the activities of other agencies. Such co-ordination was a matter for the Secretary-General to deal with.

47. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) pointed out that his delegation was keenly interested in the two draft resolutions and had stated its views on the develop-

ment of natural resources at the fortieth session of the Council.

48. He supported the draft resolution on natural resources, although he did not know what order of priority was to be assigned to the nine surveys under the five-year programme. In any case, he felt that the Secretary-General should be authorized to adopt, if necessary, the order of priority to whatever circumstances and needs might arise during that period. With regard to the new paragraph which the sponsors had decided to add, he believed that the session of the Economic and Social Council at which the Secretary-General was to submit his proposals should be specified.

49. With regard to the draft resolution on the resources of the sea, he pointed out that Council resolution 1112 (XL) referred to resources "excluding fish". The draft resolution could be extremely important since its primary aim was to overcome the food shortage and since it was very clear that in that respect the developing countries, despite their efforts, would depend for a long time to come on help from the developed countries and on the discovery of new resources. It was the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development, UNESCO and the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission which had to take the lead in its implementation.

50. As the representative of Malta had correctly pointed out, the implementation of that draft resolution and of the other draft resolution before the Committee would be dependent on limited financial resources since, as far as he knew, no country had pledged a voluntary contribution except Czechoslovakia which had offered the services of one expert. The Secretariat would, therefore, have to state what its resources would allow it to do.

51. The Maltese amendments (A/C.2/L.888) correctly emphasized that the Advisory Committee should appraise the potential benefits of the proposed survey. He hoped that it could be included in the draft, and reserved the right to comment on the USSR amendments when he had the text.

52. Mr. DE SEYNES (Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs), referring to the draft resolution on the resources of the sea, thanked the representative of the United States for the contributions his Government had mustered, thanks to trade-union leader Walter Reuther, for the implementation of Economic and Social Council resolution 1112 (XL).

53. Subject to possible revision, the financial implications of the draft resolution would amount to \$63,200 for 1967 and \$59,900 for 1968, which amounts would cover the recruitment of a small number of officials to prepare the survey and the proposals made, the work of the group of experts and travel costs. The Secretary-General would submit a supplementary estimate for 1967 during the second reading of the budget estimates for the current financial year and would include the amount in respect of 1968 in the budget estimates for the following financial year.

54. At the request of the representative of the United States and although it was a departure from the normal

practice, he took the liberty of making a few suggestions concerning the wording of the draft resolution which might help the sponsors and other delegations. He stressed that it was an exceptional case which would not create a precedent. His suggestions were prompted partly by the desire, already expressed by the representatives of the specialized agencies and by the representative of the Soviet Union, to ensure that all agencies with the relevant experience participated effectively in the project, an arrangement which might make it possible to lessen the financial implications.

55. First of all, a distinction should be drawn between Economic and Social Council resolution 1112 (XL) and that which the General Assembly might adopt, whose scope would be different; consequently, the last part of operative paragraph 1 might be revised to read: "... of the resources of the sea beyond the continental shelf, excluding fish, and of the techniques for exploiting these resources". With regard to the fish resources of the sea, he had been glad to hear several members of the Committee refer to the work of the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development on proteins; at its summer 1967 session, the Economic and Social Council would have before it a very comprehensive programme on that subject, which would be especially important as the Council would thus consider the world food shortage.

56. In operative paragraph 2, after the words "United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization" the words "and, in particular, its Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission," should be added, for the latter was the "specialized agency" of UNESCO in the field dealt with in the draft resolution. In the same paragraph, the words "including that relating to mineral resources development" should be added after the words "marine science and technology", for those resources were in fact of capital importance in the present conjuncture. Lastly, in order to take account of the USSR representative's concern, which he himself shared, he would like to see added at the end of operative paragraph 2 the words "as well as by universities, scientific and technological institutions and other interested private organizations", a phrase which was also used in the third preambular paragraph.

57. Similarly, in order to assure the Secretary-General of the co-operation of UNESCO and its Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission, the beginning of operative paragraph 3 could be amended to read: "Requests the Secretary-General, in consultation with UNESCO and, in particular, its Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission and FAO and in the light of such a comprehensive survey to formulate proposals for:". If a group of experts was considered necessary, operative paragraph 3 should indicate that it should assist the Secretary-General not only in formulating specific proposals but also in carrying out the comprehensive survey provided for in operative paragraph 2. Operative paragraph 3 (b) was the most delicate in the draft resolution, for it touched upon a field which came within UNESCO's jurisdiction; he felt that that organization should be mentioned and requested to report to the Economic

and Social Council and the General Assembly on the action it had taken pursuant to the resolution.

58. Draft resolution A/C.2/L.883 had no immediate financial implications, for as a result of the agreement reached between the sponsors and the Polish representative, its text remained close to that of the Economic and Social Council resolutions. Nevertheless, the aim was to initiate, gradually but rapidly, a programme of work for the development of natural resources, a sphere which, in the general view, seemed to have been somewhat neglected thus far and, above all had not been the object of such systematic, planned action as those of industry and international trade, for example.

59. However, the development of natural resources raised complex and delicate institutional problems on both the national and international levels which could not be a matter of indifference to the United Nations, considering the Organization's interest in the problem of sovereignty. But the formulation of a programme in that sphere was complicated by the dilemma involved in choosing between numerous alternatives. For example, should field activities be given absolute priority over global surveys? Yet global surveys of the markets on which the products of the exploitation of natural resources would be sold were necessary in order to prevent the developing countries from making mistakes. Should institutions be established in developing countries to enable them to carry out the necessary, but costly surveys themselves or should certain surveys of national interest be entrusted to international services which could carry them out objectively and more inexpensively, even though the principle of sovereignty implied the development of national institutions? Should priority be given to surveys relating to advanced subjects such as geothermal energy, or to those which were likely to be of immediate commercial benefit to the countries concerned? Lastly, should the United Nations undertake work which others were ready to do, or should it rather seek to fill in the gaps? It was neither easy nor desirable to establish general, absolute criteria in any of those spheres. It was necessary to find a pragmatic equilibrium between the various aspirations.

60. When the current work was completed, the Economic and Social Council would have before it only a draft partial programme on natural resources, which would undoubtedly have to be deepened and expanded, but even at the present stage the crucial problem of financial resources must be faced, for the choices and priorities involved in an action programme could only be defined when at least the order of magnitude of the available resources had been established. It was desirable that Governments would begin to take a position on the programme as a whole and on the financial resources which would be suitable for it.

61. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece), speaking on a point of order, thanked the Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs for his interesting comments, but wished to emphasize that, in the interests of the Secretariat itself, the fact of having suggested amendments to the draft resolution under consideration should not—as the Under-Secretary had himself stressed, moreover—constitute a precedent.

62. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Under-Secretary had merely made some suggestions at the request of one of the sponsors of the draft resolution and that in the present instance the practice had proved constructive.

63. Mr. Donald MACDONALD (Canada) said that his delegation was prepared to act as sponsor for the amendments suggested by the Under-Secretary.

64. Mr. NENEMAN (Poland) said that, as his delegation was not a member of the Economic and Social Council, it had not had an earlier opportunity of submitting the proposal which was the subject of one of its amendments to the draft resolution on natural resources. He thanked the sponsors of that text who, in a spirit of compromise, had agreed to take his proposal into account; he also thanked the delegations which had supported that amendment and those which had stated that they approved its substance.

65. In view of the new paragraph which the sponsors had added to their draft resolution, the Polish delegation was withdrawing its amendments and appealed to the Belgian delegation to adopt the same spirit of compromise and not to press the suggestions it had made concerning the new paragraph. Like the representative from Greece, he considered that it should be specified at which session of the Economic and Social Council the Secretary-General should submit his proposals; for his own part, he would suggest the forty-third session.

66. Mr. Donald MACDONALD (Canada) regretted that the proposal in the draft resolution on the resources of the sea had not been submitted in time to be studied by the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development; however, in view of the general opinion in the Second Committee, he would not press for the decision to be postponed. The Maltese amendments reflected the view of the Canadian delegation; however, rather than delete operative paragraph 3, the latter would prefer it to be amended in the way the Under-Secretary had indicated, so as to ensure that UNESCO and FAO were consulted.

67. Concerning the USSR amendments, he thought very highly of the work of the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission, but considered that a small group of experts would be in a better position to carry out the proposed survey, whose scope, moreover, exceeded that Commission's competence. However, the group of experts should include several members of the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission.

68. In conclusion, he expressed the hope that if his delegation submitted the Under-Secretary's suggestions in the form of amendments, the USSR delegation would be able to withdraw its own amendments.

69. Mr. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) said that, in thanking the Under-Secretary for the useful suggestions he had made, he believed he was speaking for all the sponsors of the draft resolution on the resources of the sea; he also wished to thank the Maltese representative for not pressing his amendments. In reply to the representative from Greece, he wished to make it clear that although Economic

and Social Council resolution 1112 (XL) had excluded fish, that was not true of the draft resolution.

70. In conclusion, he expressed the hope that, after consultations, the sponsors of the draft resolution would soon be able to submit a revised text.

71. Mr. WOULBROUN (Belgium) explained that the suggestions he had made concerning the new paragraph of the draft resolution on natural resources in no way constituted a formal amendment proposal.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.