

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SEVENTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



SECOND COMMITTEE, 854th
MEETING

Wednesday, 28 November 1962,
at 2.55 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 39:

*Permanent sovereignty over natural resources
(continued)*

*Consideration of the draft resolution of the
Commission on Permanent Sovereignty
over Natural Resources (continued) 357*

Agenda item 35:

*Economic development of under-developed
countries (continued):*

*(f) Decentralization of the economic and social
activities of the United Nations and
strengthening of the regional economic
commissions
Consideration of the joint draft resolution
(continued) 360*

*(c) Industrial development and activities of the
organs of the United Nations in the field of
industrialization
Consideration of the joint draft resolution
concerning the role of the United Nations
in training national technical personnel for
the accelerated industrialization of the less
developed countries 362*

*Chairman: Mr. Bohdan LEWANDOWSKI
(Poland).*

AGENDA ITEM 39

Permanent sovereignty over natural resources (A/4905, A/5060, A/5225, A/AC.97/5/Rev.2 and Corr.1, A/C.2/L.654 and Corr.1, E/3511, E/L.914, E/L.915, E/L.918, E/L.919, E/SR.1177-1179, E/SR.1181) (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT RESOLUTION OF THE COMMISSION ON PERMANENT SOVEREIGNTY OVER NATURAL RESOURCES (A/C.2/L.654 AND CORR.1) (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN said that the text submitted by Burma and the Sudan had been distributed on the preceding day as document A/C.2/L.694. The Committee should decide whether the time-limit—originally 1 November and then 5 November—for submitting draft resolutions on items other than item 36 included in the first group of topics on the agenda should be applied to that text. The Committee could, if it so wished, settle the matter by putting it to the vote. Invoking rule 115 of the rules of procedure, he proposed to limit to five minutes the length of statements made during the procedural debate.

It was so decided.

2. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) observed that it must first of all be decided whether the proposal was substantive or procedural and he recalled that, to

clarify the point, the representative of Afghanistan had asked the advisory opinion of the Legal Counsel.

3. Mr. APPIAH (Ghana) warned the Committee against too hasty a decision to proceed to the vote. The document in question had an apparently innocuous title, but it was in fact a draft resolution dealing with the substance of the question. That being so, his delegation appealed to the sponsors of the text to admit what its true nature was and therefore to consider themselves bound by the limits which the Committee had previously fixed.

4. Mr. FARHADI (Afghanistan) stated that, now that the Committee had before it the text proposed by Burma and the Sudan, it was no longer necessary to have a legal opinion to realize that it was most certainly a draft resolution, which even had financial implications. Hence, Afghanistan formally proposed that it should be decided by an immediate vote whether the Committee wished to apply its own decision, which would enable a perhaps dangerous procedural debate to be avoided.

5. Mr. KLUTZNICK (United States of America) was not of the opinion that Burma and the Sudan were precluded from seeking to alter the decision taken by the Committee; the Committee could go back on that decision if a two-thirds majority so desired, after which there would be no need for a long debate since the new proposal would be in order.

6. U MAUNG MAUNG (Burma), supported by Mr. SAHLOUL (Sudan), stated that his delegation had introduced that procedural motion because it had seemed to it that the matter under discussion deserved more thorough examination. Burma would like to have the opinion of other delegations on the question of whether its text constituted a new draft resolution which could be considered only if so decided by a two-thirds majority, or whether it could be regarded as an amendment without detracting from its importance.

7. Mr. TODOROV (Bulgaria) considered that the Committee was not in the situation described by the representative of the United States. It must first be determined whether the decision on the time-limit for the submission of draft resolutions was applicable in the case under discussion, and for that a two-thirds majority vote was not required.

8. Mr. AYARI (Tunisia) considered that the text of Burma and the Sudan presented certain difficulties. It could be interpreted as a proposal arising from the debate itself, and there would be no objection to a text which, because of the present impasse, sought to find a procedure whereby further clarification could be made; however, it was a different matter when the text also proposed adjourning discussion of the question in the Second Committee. Those were two entirely different aspects.

9. Mr. HAKIM (Lebanon) considered that, if the document in question was nothing but a draft text to be

inserted in the Rapporteur's report, the Committee had nothing to decide by a vote. If it was a draft resolution, it would be difficult to decide immediately whether it was a procedural proposal or a text bearing on the substance of the question. The debate might end without agreement being reached on the draft resolution before the Committee (A/C.2/L.654 and Corr.1), and a resolution which did not gain wide support would lose much of its usefulness. That being so, it would in fact be better to postpone consideration of the question for a year, according to the procedure proposed by Burma and the Sudan or any other procedure. Perhaps it would be advisable to defer the decision on the matter until the end of the debate because the Committee would then be in a better position to make a properly considered decision.

10. Mr. Mamadou TRAORE (Mali) considered that the confusion was growing. His delegation refused for the time being to voice an opinion on the substance of the matter. If it was simply a matter of reconsidering a decision of the Committee, rule 124 of the rules of procedure was applicable. But the text submitted by Burma and the Sudan also brought up another procedural question which might well be covered by rule 15. Mali would prefer not to have to vote and hoped that the appeal made by Ghana would be heard.

11. Mr. SCHWEITZER (Chile) considered that to judge from its title, the text submitted by Burma and the Sudan was premature. As it was not yet known what decision the Committee would take, it prejudged the outcome of the debate. The text in fact proposed that the Second Committee should decide to adjourn the discussion. If that was the only point to be settled, the Committee could easily reach a decision. But there were several conditions attached to it: it was suggested that the mandate of the Commission on Permanent Sovereignty over Natural Resources should be renewed for one year and that it should not be extended since an enlargement of its membership was also proposed. The Committee was therefore faced with a new question of substance with which it had not dealt, and not with an amendment or a procedural text. Moreover, paragraph 2 of the proposed text would make the Commission on Permanent Sovereignty over Natural Resources responsible for taking up again all the work it had done for more than two years. The resumption of consultations with Governments would have the effect of delaying for two or three years a decision which the Second Committee was perfectly able to make forthwith.

12. Mr. UNWIN (United Kingdom) thought that the procedural question before the Committee was perfectly simple. The Burmese and Sudanese text was a new draft resolution and proposed a procedure quite different from the one that would result from the adoption of the draft resolution which had been officially before the Committee on 31 October 1962, i.e. within the prescribed time-limit. On the other hand, the new proposal had not been submitted within that time-limit. The Committee could, of course, reverse its own decision by a vote in accordance with rule 124 of the rules of procedure; if that matter were put to the vote, the United Kingdom delegation would cast a negative vote. It had seen some merit in the Ghanaian proposal to seek an opinion on the draft resolution from the International Law Commission; that procedure would certainly have delayed the adoption of the draft resolution, but it would not have changed and might even have improved the contents of that text. The proposal of

Burma and the Sudan offered no advantage, since its effect would be to compel the Commission on Permanent Sovereignty over Natural Resources to redo all the work it had done two years before. That solution was even less desirable since the possibility of reaching agreement on the text of the draft resolution before the Committee had become apparent. To change course would therefore be contrary to the Committee's present intentions. As the Chilean representative had said, it would be inappropriate to vote a text into the report before the debate to which it related had taken place.

13. Mr. BRILLANTES (Philippines), speaking on a point of order, asked the United Kingdom representative to clarify his statement. He thought he had heard that representative say that the draft resolution under study (A/C.2/L.654 and Corr.1) had been circulated on 31 October, before the expiry of the time-limit. In fact, that document had already appeared during the preceding session.

14. Mr. VIAUD (France) thought that the Burmese and Sudanese draft was procedural to the extent that it proposed the adjournment of the discussion, but substantive to the extent that it proposed the renewal of the mandate of the Commission on Permanent Sovereignty over Natural Resources and the enlargement of its membership. The French delegation therefore thought that the proposal was a new one, which was covered by the decision taken by the Committee on the time-limit for the submission of draft resolutions. He urged the sponsors to consider withdrawing it. If the text were discussed, however, the French delegation would support the Afghan representative's proposal that a vote should be taken as soon as possible on the question of whether or not the draft was in order. He pointed out that the Burmese and Sudanese proposal would not have the effect of adding any new substantive elements to the problem. The French delegation had suggested that the matter should be referred to the International Law Commission for the opinion of competent jurists. That solution would take no longer than referring the matter to the Commission on Permanent Sovereignty over Natural Resources, whether or not that body was enlarged.

15. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled how the time-limit for the submission of draft resolutions had been fixed. The Committee had already changed that date twice without a decision by a two-thirds majority or the opinion of jurists. Moreover, the Burmese and Sudanese proposal did not touch upon any fundamental aspect of the text of the draft resolution under study. Its purpose was to defer discussion of the problem and it raised the purely procedural question of how the matter was to be dealt with in future. It therefore came under rule 120 of the rules of procedure, which provided for the adjournment of the debate on an item for an indefinite period. Furthermore, rule 121 provided that motions as to procedure could be discussed at any time. Rules 120 and 121 of the rules of procedure therefore provided a legal basis for examination of the Burmese and Sudanese proposal. Nevertheless, if the Chairman wished to clarify the situation by means of a vote, he was at liberty to do so. On the other hand, as the Tunisian and Lebanese representatives had already pointed out, a proposal like that of Burma and the Sudan could be made only during the debate and after the submission of a number of amendments. There was nothing extraordinary in the fact that, in the twenty-two days which had passed since the expiry of the time-limit, the

delegations of Burma and the Sudan had reached different conclusions and had decided that adjournment was necessary. The Soviet delegation considered that proposal to be wise and fully supported it. He also drew the Committee's attention to the haste with which the delegations of France, the United Kingdom and the United States wished a draft resolution to be adopted. That haste seemed to him highly suspect and the delegations of the developing countries should take that point into account.

16. The CHAIRMAN summed up the situation and suggested, in view of the differences of opinion, that the Committee should decide on the applicability to the case at issue of the decision it had taken on the time-limit for the submission of draft resolutions. He suggested, however, that the Committee should first consider the Lebanese delegation's proposal to defer the discussion of that procedural point until the end of the debate on the draft resolution and the amendments.

17. Mr. SCHWEITZER (Chile) recalled that the Burmese representative had intimated that he would decide whether or not to withdraw document A/C.2/L.694 after he had heard various statements. If that text were withdrawn, as the Chilean delegation hoped it would be, the procedural question would be solved.

18. U MAUNG MAUNG (Burma), speaking also on behalf of the Sudanese delegation, withdrew his procedural motion and asked permission to submit forthwith an amendment to draft resolution A/C.2/L.654.^{1/}

19. Mr. AYARI (Tunisia) thought that before continuing the debate, the Committee should know the content of the amendment to be submitted by the Burmese delegation. The various delegations which would speak on that matter would take into account the new position adopted by Burma and the Sudan.

20. Mr. DAVIS (Australia) agreed with other speakers that draft resolution A/C.2/L.654 and Corr.1 raised various economic, legal and political problems. It was not surprising, therefore, that differences of opinion had emerged, not only on amendments, but also on the expediency of referring the matter to the International Law Commission or to the Commission on Permanent Sovereignty over Natural Resources. The Australian delegation had some reservations concerning the wording of the draft resolution, some passages of which needed clarification, but it considered the substance of the draft to be acceptable and did not share the view that it should be re-examined. The draft would not alter or amplify the provisions of international law, since a General Assembly resolution had no legal effect. It merely recalled certain aspects of the right of sovereignty over natural resources and contained some observations on the exercise of that right. As a country which received large foreign investments, Australia had a direct interest in studying the draft resolution carefully, as did States which were seeking to protect their right of sovereignty over their national wealth.

21. The Australian delegation also believed that it would be wise to ensure an even balance between references to the rights of States receiving capital and those of investing States. In relations between States and individuals, the existence of rights implied the existence of obligations. If investments were to be encouraged, it was essential not to discourage the investor and to inform him of any risks other than

commercial ones that he would be running. That was why the clarifications introduced by the United Kingdom and United States amendments (A/C.2/L.686/Rev.1 and Add.1) were necessary; the incorporation of those amendments would ensure a well-balanced and acceptable text. Like some others, the Australian delegation believed that confidence was an extremely important aspect of investment in developing countries and that the draft resolution would help to strengthen that confidence if it were well-balanced and not one-sided. He considered that the Commission on Permanent Sovereignty over Natural Resources had done useful work by taking all points of view and interests into account.

22. There were also difficult economic, legal and political problems associated with the emergence of new States and with the question of acquired rights; the Australian delegation considered that that aspect need not be mentioned in the draft and that any attempt to mention it would raise legal difficulties with which the Second Committee was not competent to deal. Those problems would be studied as a matter of priority in January 1963 by a sub-committee of the International Law Commission. The Australian delegation could not support the amendment proposed by the Algerian delegation (A/C.2/L.691), but it could accept the draft resolution modified by the amendments of the United Kingdom and the United States.

23. Mr. PRIMELES (Cuba) explained that, when the Revolutionary Government of Cuba had assumed power in 1959, the State had not exercised its right of sovereignty over its natural resources. Those resources had been largely controlled by foreign interests and by a national minority which had derived immense profits from the land and labour of the inhabitants. The Government now exercised that right, except in the area of the Bay of Guantánamo, which was illegally occupied by United States troops. Two acts promulgated in 1959 and 1960 had led, respectively, to the expropriation of the latifundia, particularly of the large United States sugar companies which had occupied the best land in the country, and to the nationalization of the main industries, including the sugar industry on which the national economy was based. Those lawful expropriations had given rise to the political attacks and the military and economic aggression which were well known to all. The Cuban Government admitted its need of outside aid, but that assistance should be technical and should be provided through Governments or international organizations, and not in the form of private investments, which in the long run harmed the recipient country by jeopardizing its political stability. In that connexion, he recalled that the President of Brazil, at the time an agreement was concluded with the Italian Government for a grant of \$73 million for a hydroelectric power plant, had declared that he was opposed to certain types of investment which were used for speculation to the detriment of the people and had urged that the installations set up with those funds should be the property of the Brazilian State.

24. His delegation acknowledged the good intentions of the Commission on Permanent Sovereignty over Natural Resources, which had concerned itself with the protection of the small States, but it did not agree with the draft resolution as a whole. He had no objections to make to the preamble, except for the last paragraph, which mentioned securing the economic independence of under-developed countries; there were some countries which, before consolidating that independence, would first have to attain it. With respect

^{1/} Subsequently circulated as document A/C.2/L.696.

to the operative part, his delegation considered it necessary to recall, in paragraph 1, that the nations which must exercise the right in question were sovereign States. Paragraph 2 was vitally important and should be included in any resolution on that question. Paragraphs 3 and 4 were unacceptable to his delegation: the reference to international law in paragraph 3 was unnecessary; and as for paragraph 4, there was sometimes no reason for granting "compensation". The wording of paragraph 8 was also unacceptable. His delegation found it strange that a State should be asked to respect the sovereignty of other peoples and nations, and the words "strictly" and "conscientiously" were unsuitable, since, first, a nation's sovereignty either was or was not respected and, secondly, he liked to think that States and international organizations always acted conscientiously.

25. His delegation supported the amendments proposed by the Soviet Union (A/C.2/L.670), which considerably improved the draft resolution, although it objected to the word "compensation" in the amendment concerning paragraph 4 of the draft. The amendments proposed by the United Kingdom and the United States were limited to certain aspects of State sovereignty and contained nothing which guaranteed the exercise of the right of sovereignty over natural resources. It was sometimes difficult, indeed, to determine exactly whether the agreements in question had been concluded freely or not, and similar doubts arose with respect to the word "faithfully".

26. His delegation supported the amendments submitted by Mauritania (A/C.2/L.690) and Algeria (A/C.2/L.691). Alleged acquired rights led to many violations of the principle of permanent sovereignty over natural resources, as was proved by the occupation of the territory of Guantánamo by American troops. Consequently, the text to be adopted, whether the one now before the Committee or any other, should give due consideration to the Algerian amendment. His delegation would also have supported the proposal of Burma and the Sudan if it had not been withdrawn.

27. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) read out the new revised version of the amendments of the United States and the United Kingdom (A/C.2/L.686/Rev.2), which were intended as a useful supplement to the draft resolution.

28. The sponsors had tried to give wide consideration to the comments of certain delegations, particularly those of Brazil and Algeria. Fully aware of the need of States Members to derive full benefit from their natural resources, they had given particular attention to the question of the rights and obligations of successor States and Governments in respect of property acquired before the accession to complete sovereignty of countries formerly under colonial rule. Incidentally, the question of the succession of States and Governments was being studied by the International Law Commission. He thought that the new text would dispel any apprehension and, in particular, meet the objections of the Algerian delegation. The text was now clearly without prejudice to any aspect of State succession and to rights acquired in former colonial territories.

29. The United Kingdom and United States delegations hoped that it would be possible to achieve wide agreement within the Committee in order to give greater weight to the draft resolution which the amendments were intended to supplement.

30. Mr. YAKER (Algeria) explained that in submitting its amendment (A/C.2/L.691), his delegation had wished to safeguard the rights of formerly colonized countries which were trying to attain complete independence. The permanent sovereignty of those countries over their natural resources should in no case be compromised and any "alleged rights acquired before the accession to full national sovereignty" could not be placed on the same footing as those lawfully acquired by virtue of contracts freely entered into between sovereign States.

31. Several delegations had shown themselves willing to support the Algerian amendment, and he thanked them for that. In a spirit of compromise, he would agree to the text contained in document A/C.2/L.686/Rev.2, which did not dispute the fundamental aspects of the Algerian amendment. That text was of a positive character, and he hoped that a large majority would come out in favour of it, with a view to enabling each State to dispose freely of its wealth and natural resources, in conformity with its national interests and with the assurance of respect for its economic independence. With that in mind, his delegation withdrew its amendment.

32. Mr. FARHADI (Afghanistan) said that he was grateful to the Secretariat for having published the excellent study on the status of permanent sovereignty over natural wealth and resources (A/AC.97/5/Rev.2 and Corr.1). The new edition of that very useful document would make it accessible to a larger public.

33. Since the United States representative had read out document A/C.2/L.686/Rev.2, he wondered if it would not be advisable to wait for the translation of that document.

AGENDA ITEM 35

Economic development of under-developed countries (A/5220) (continued):

(f) Decentralization of the economic and social activities of the United Nations and strengthening of the regional economic commissions (A/5196, A/C.2/L.653/Rev.1 and Add.1, E/3643)

CONSIDERATION OF THE JOINT DRAFT RESOLUTION (A/C.2/L.653/REV.1 AND ADD.1) (continued)

34. Mr. DAVIS (Australia) recalled that his country had voted for General Assembly resolution 1709 (XVI), which had sought to achieve a balance between decentralization and the central substantive functions, including policy guidance and co-ordination. His country had also voted for Economic and Social Council resolution 879 (XXXIV). It had done so in the belief that decentralization was desired by the developing countries and that it would increase efficiency, subject however to the proviso that it should be a progressive development, carried out pragmatically and cautiously. The question of method was important; it was necessary to avoid duplication, to watch the cost factor and to maintain a balance between Headquarters and the regional economic commissions.

35. His delegation had been glad to note that the eight-Power amendment (A/C.2/L.685/Rev.1) stressed the principle of balance already brought out in General Assembly resolution 1709 (XVI). He had no objection to the amendment of Afghanistan and Jordan (A/C.2/L.689), although it did not appear to make any real contribution. With respect to the five-Power amend-

ments (A/C.2/L.682/Rev.1), he fully shared the view expressed at the preceding meeting by the representative of the United Kingdom.

36. Mr. CUBILLOS (Chile), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the amendments contained in document A/C.2/L.682/Rev.1, wished to give a few explanations in reply to the comments which had already been made by certain representatives. The sponsors had been guided by the desire to obtain as large a majority as possible and, at the same time, to ensure maximum efficiency. The revised amendments took into account the results which had already been obtained, thanks to the activities of the Secretary-General. He hoped that it would be possible to continue to make progress while emphasizing the transfer of responsibilities and means to the regional economic commissions. In view of the spirit of conciliation in which the revised amendments had been drafted, he hoped that the sponsors of the draft resolution would be able to accept them and that the resolution as amended would provide the United Nations with a tool which was better adapted to the problems which it had to solve.

37. Mr. TELL (Jordan) recalled that, as the representative of New Zealand had already observed, the sponsors of the eight-Power amendment (A/C.2/L.685/Rev.1) had based their draft on General Assembly resolution 1709 (XVI) and had wished to ensure the greatest possible efficacy, a wish, moreover, which was shared by a large number of delegations.

38. It should be made clear that the amendment was designed to give all the necessary flexibility to the work done by the United Nations in the economic and social fields. Moreover, it was quite obvious that the rights of countries which were not members of any regional economic commission should not be violated and that all Governments should be able to decide freely concerning the advice or assistance required by them.

39. Like the representative of the USSR, he thought that the structure of the Technical Assistance Board could be revised to advantage. That was a question, however, which deserved careful consideration and which was more a matter for the Economic and Social Council. It was necessary to eliminate any rigidity in the functioning of the system, and his delegation hoped that the draft resolution, as supplemented by the revised amendment, would be a positive element and facilitate the Council's task.

40. Mr. KOSHUBEI (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) recalled the various resolutions in which the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly had decided to decentralize the economic and social activities of the United Nations, and he asked that that policy should be applied fully. The impetus given at the centre must reach the periphery and, in the first place, the regional economic commissions. At the seventeenth session of the Economic Commission for Europe, the Acting Secretary-General had recognized that those commissions had demonstrated their flexibility and usefulness and that their tasks would continue to grow as a consequence of the increased membership of the Organization. The Ukrainian SSR shared that view, as did many other countries. Unfortunately, in his recent statement (852nd meeting), the Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs had not given any concrete information concerning the decentralization measures already taken. Since the work of the regional economic commissions would increase, obviously their financial resources and their staff must be expanded at the

expense of the services of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs, whose responsibilities would be transferred to the regional secretariats; that would also make possible a reduction in the highly inflated United Nations budget.

41. He then stressed the considerable contribution made by a commission such as ECE which was the only one to include countries with different political and economic systems. Not only did it seek to promote economic, technical and scientific co-operation in Europe, but it aided the Economic Commission for Africa and other regional economic commissions and took an increasing part in the United Nations technical assistance programmes. Accordingly, it must not be overlooked when the role of the regional commissions was strengthened. It should speed up its work in all fields, particularly in assistance to promote the economic progress of the developing countries and in technical research, in chromium or synthetic products for example.

42. Since it favoured a decentralization which was in the interest of the members of the regional economic commissions and particularly of the developing countries, the Ukrainian SSR would support any proposals intended to promote the activities of those commissions.

43. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) felt that the USSR amendment (A/C.2/L.695) did not relate precisely to the decentralization of the activities of the United Nations in the economic and social field or to the strengthening of the regional economic commissions but proposed a modification of the procedures applied at Headquarters for the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance and the Special Fund. It would be preferable for that sort of proposal to be considered first as part of the technical assistance activities and therefore in the inter-governmental bodies directly concerned, namely, TAC, the Governing Council of the Special Fund and the *ad hoc* Committee of Eight established by the Economic and Social Council under resolution 851 (XXXII). In paragraph 84 of its report (E/3639), that committee had recommended that the Council request the Managing Director of the Special Fund to consider the possible desirability of expanding in due course the membership of the Consultative Board by admitting those among the specialized agencies which carried out the greatest number of projects. The *ad hoc* Committee had also recommended, with a view to utilizing the expert knowledge of the secretariats of the regional economic commissions, that the Secretary-General be accompanied at the Consultative Board's meeting by officials of the regional economic commissions' secretariats where he deemed it desirable.

44. Those recommendations, the outcome of a thorough study, had been accepted by the Council, which had also decided that the *ad hoc* Committee, which henceforth would include ten members, should continue its work. As the USSR was a member of the *ad hoc* Committee, it could certainly make known its views at the meetings of that committee. In any event, the United States delegation did not believe that it was necessary to require the executive secretaries to attend the three sessions held each year by the Technical Assistance Board and the two meetings of the Consultative Board of the Special Fund, in addition to the Economic and Social Council session. They would no longer have enough time to visit their respective areas and to direct the work of their secretariats.

The recommendations made by the *ad hoc* Committee in paragraph 84 of its report, therefore, seemed to provide a more direct route to effective decentralization of the activities of the United Nations.

45. The CHAIRMAN proposed to close, at 5.00 p.m. on the following day, the list of representatives who wished to speak on the subject of the draft resolution under study and the related amendments.

It was so decided.

(c) Industrial development and activities of the organs of the United Nations in the field of industrialization (A/C.2/L.658 and Add.1-3, E/3600/Rev.1, E/3656, E/3656/Add.1)

CONSIDERATION OF THE JOINT DRAFT RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE ROLE OF THE UNITED NATIONS IN TRAINING NATIONAL TECHNICAL PERSONNEL FOR THE ACCELERATED INDUSTRIALIZATION OF THE LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRIES (A/C.2/L.658 AND ADD.1-3)

46. Mr. KOCHUBEI (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) introduced the draft resolution (A/C.2/L.658 and Add.1-3) and said that the scarcity of trained technical personnel, added to the illiteracy and the low school attendance of the populations of the underdeveloped countries, was one of the factors contributing to the economic backwardness of those countries. That situation was only aggravated by the extraordinarily rapid progress of science in the developed countries, which themselves had some difficulty in keeping their own personnel informed of the latest discoveries. The Committee for Industrial Development had noted, moreover, that the developing countries would not be able to meet their increased requirements in trained manpower at a rate equal to that of the acceleration of their industrial development. The deficiency in trained personnel made the new States totally dependent on foreign specialists, which might be very dangerous, as the Suez crisis and the events in the Congo had shown. Furthermore, indigenous specialists would have a better knowledge of the local situation and would get along better with the subordinate personnel. The Ukrainian SSR did not deny, however, that foreign specialists could play an important part in the developing countries, particularly by their participation in large public works or technical surveys. The USSR itself, during the first stages of its industrialization, had profited from their assistance, but it had later taken measures to plan the preparation of its technical personnel, with a success which was well known.

47. The remarkable results obtained, in the Ukrainian SSR for example, were explained by the fact that the annual rate at which trained engineers had been turned out had exceeded the rate of development of the economic sectors. Taking 1956 as the base year at 100, the 1961 index numbers for the training of engineers and the training of technicians had been 182 and 223 respectively. The increased growth rate was therefore tied, not only to capital equipment, but also to the training of personnel.

48. The preparation of technical personnel was one of the subjects with which the United Nations had been concerned since the thirteenth session of the General Assembly. In particular, General Assembly resolution 1515 (XV) and Economic and Social Council resolution 898 (XXXIV) might be cited. Specialized agencies such as the ILO and UNESCO were also concerned with the training of personnel and had made some progress, but UNESCO was engaged primarily in the campaign against illiteracy and the International Labour Office was concerned more especially with the vocational training of subordinate personnel and, as its Director-General had observed in part II of his report to the forty-sixth session of the International Labour Conference (1962), the preparation of personnel at a level higher than foreman was not contemplated and could even be excluded in certain sectors. That was why the co-sponsors had considered it necessary to submit the draft resolution to the Committee in order to enable the United Nations to play a part in that field which was so important for the industrialization of underdeveloped countries.

49. The United Nations should encourage exchanges of views on the experience acquired and encourage the important contribution which could be made by the regional economic commissions, including ECE, the members of which were highly developed countries. It was necessary, however, to know both the requirements of the developing countries and the manner in which the developed countries provided professional training. Consequently, the draft resolution provided that the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to prepare a report, the main lines of which were specified in operative paragraph 2. The list of topics given was not exhaustive, however, and the report could deal with others. As the Committee for Industrial Development at its second session had established a programme of work which, despite its defects, had some value (E/3600/Rev.1, chap. V), the draft resolution also contemplated the development of the Committee's activities, particularly under project C.1.a (methods of assessing requirements for trained personnel); the results of that work would have to be taken into account in the preparation of the report. That document, which should be brief but concrete so as to give useful assistance to the developing countries, would then be considered by the Council. The Governments of the developed countries for their part should consider increasing the assistance they were giving in the training of personnel. Independently of the considerable efforts made in that respect by the USSR, the United Kingdom and the United States, the Ukrainian SSR itself received more than 2,000 foreign students and many specialists in its institutes of higher education. Lastly, the United Nations organs which carried out the programmes of technical assistance, the regional economic commissions and the specialized agencies should pay due attention to projects, national and regional, aimed at training national technical personnel for industry. The co-sponsors hoped that the draft resolution would be well received by the Committee.

The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.