

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SEVENTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**SECOND COMMITTEE, 853rd
MEETING**

Tuesday, 27 November 1962,
at 3.15 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda items 33 and 94:</i>	
<i>Economic and social consequences of disarmament: report of the Secretary-General transmitting the study of the group of expert consultants appointed under General Assembly resolution 1516 (XV) (continued)</i>	349
<i>Economic programme for disarmament (continued)</i>	
<i>Agenda item 39:</i>	
<i>Permanent sovereignty over natural resources (continued)</i>	
<i>Consideration of the draft resolution of the Commission on Permanent Sovereignty over Natural Resources (continued)</i>	350
<i>Agenda item 35:</i>	
<i>Economic development of under-developed countries (continued):</i>	
<i>(f) Decentralization of the economic and social activities of the United Nations and strengthening of the regional economic commissions</i>	
<i>Consideration of the joint draft resolution (continued)</i>	351
<i>Organization of the Committee's work.</i>	356

Chairman: Mr. Bohdan LEWANDOWSKI
(Poland).

AGENDA ITEMS 33 AND 94

Economic and social consequences of disarmament: report of the Secretary-General transmitting the study of the group of expert consultants appointed under General Assembly resolution 1516 (XV) (A/5199; A/5203, chap. II; A/C.2/L.647 and Add.1; E/3593/Rev.1, E/3593/Add.1-5) (continued)

Economic programme for disarmament (A/C.2/L.646) (continued)

1. Mr. RICHARDSON (Jamaica) recalled that the question of the economic and social consequences of disarmament was still being dealt with by the Economic and Social Council. By its resolution 891 (XXXIV), the Council had invited Member States to continue their studies and had asked the Secretary-General to report again to the Council at its thirty-sixth session. It had nevertheless also requested the Secretary-General to place the question on the agenda of the seventeenth session of the General Assembly, and in doing so, its aim had certainly not been simply to secure an endorsement of its work. The General Assembly had decided, at its 1135th plenary meeting, to add to the agenda consideration of a draft declaration and of a

draft resolution submitted by the USSR (A/C.2/L.646) proposing the formulation of a programme of economic assistance to the under-developed countries with the aid of part of the resources that would be released by disarmament. Some representatives had considered that the drafting of such a programme would be premature and would only raise false hopes in the under-developed countries.

2. The General Assembly must consider the problem of the arms race in all its aspects, including the economic aspect with which the Second Committee was called upon to deal. The excellent study of the Consultative Group of Experts (E/3593/Rev.1) should prompt the Committee to do more than adopt a draft resolution endorsing the action of the Economic and Social Council and congratulating the Secretary-General. What it should do was to make recommendations on what economic and social action might be taken to bring nearer the goal of disarmament which everyone desired to achieve.

3. It seemed to him that in many organs of the United Nations where disarmament was discussed, useful conclusions were being prejudiced by the words "general and complete". No one expected general and complete disarmament to come about in the immediate future, but if proposals to achieve partial and progressive disarmament were considered, disarmament would no longer be merely a dream but might commence at once. He proposed that the Committee should try to introduce into the discussion of disarmament four principles: first, an immediate limitation on arms expenditure; second, a reduction of expenditure on arms in all countries, such reduction to begin forthwith and to be progressively intensified over a three-year period; third, a channelling of the resources released in the industrialized countries by reducing arms expenditure towards trade with the developing countries; and, fourth, the transfer of part of the funds released by the reduction of arms expenditure to a United Nations capital development fund.

4. The disastrous consequences which would follow on the continuation of the arms race were obvious. Furthermore, the discussions concerning the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development had shown that the per caput increase in output in the developing countries which was envisaged in the Secretary-General's programme for the United Nations Development Decade (E/3613) was too low and that if, at the end of that period, the rate of increase was no higher than 5 per cent annually, the relative misery of the developing countries would be greater than it was.

5. The experts' study disclosed that the world spent \$120,000 million annually on armaments and that 85 per cent of that expenditure was concentrated in seven developed countries. As there seemed to be a universal desire to put an end to the arms race, the Committee should make a positive recommendation to that

end. It might ask of all nations that expenditure on armaments should never in any subsequent year exceed the 1963 level.

6. The representative of the USSR had mentioned the possibility of 20 per cent of all military expenditure being used for aid to under-developed countries. He himself suggested that all countries should be asked to reduce their arms expenditure from 1964 onwards, the reduction in that year to be only 5 per cent of the expenditure in 1960. If that was done, about \$5,000 million would be released. It must be assumed that, in the industrialized countries, more than half of the resources released by the reduction in armaments would be used for producing additional consumer goods and for additional capital formation. If only one third of those resources was used for aid to the under-developed countries, \$1,600 million would be available for that purpose in the first year. If in the third year (1966), the reduction was brought to 20 per cent, a total of \$6,600 million would be released in aid to the under-developed countries.

7. In accordance with the third principle which he had mentioned, each developed country could be asked to distribute the funds released by disarmament among those countries which were its trading partners in strict proportion to its trade with them during the preceding year. Two thirds of the funds made available for aid should be applied in that manner. The remaining third should be contributed to a United Nations capital development fund and be used for loans and grants to developing countries according to the principles which had already been accepted by the United Nations. That was the purpose of the fourth principle.

8. In conclusion, he said that the proposal which he had outlined would require appropriate consideration by the Economic and Social Council and the Secretariat. That proposal was not intended to delay the Committee's consideration of the two items before it, and Jamaica would not submit a draft resolution or amendment unless other delegations regarded that as desirable. If, however, that proposal was accepted, it could easily be added, in the form of an amendment, to either of the draft resolutions which had been submitted (A/C.2/L.646, A/C.2/L.647 and Add.1). The essence of the proposal would be that the General Assembly should ask the Economic and Social Council to examine the feasibility of an immediate programme for the reduction of military expenditure and the use of all or part of the funds so released along the lines he had indicated.

9. Mr. HAJOUÏ (Morocco) said that everyone realized that the enormous sums used for the production of armaments, which became more rapidly obsolete as they increased in cost, defied all reason and that the arms race not only represented a permanent danger without precedent in the history of mankind but was also paralysing the productive forces which could otherwise be used to better the lot of all people. All nations had a duty to join forces to stop such a gigantic waste, which was especially deplorable at a time when poverty was still rampant in many countries. No one could be unaware of the results that would accrue from disarmament if only one third of the resources currently used for defence was used for economic development. Opinion today seemed to be unanimous that disarmament would be beneficial for the international community as a whole and for the developing countries in particular. The two draft resolutions

before the Committee had many points in common and tended, in different ways, to the same end. His delegation regarded them as a real step forward. The amendment submitted by Nigeria and Pakistan (A/C.2/L.680) was also useful as a bridge between the two drafts and as a means of linking disarmament with economic development. His delegation therefore appealed to the sponsors of the draft resolutions and of the amendment to prepare a final text that would be acceptable to all.

AGENDA ITEM 39

Permanent sovereignty over natural resources (A/4905, A/5060, A/5225, A/AC.97/5/Rev.2, 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)

10. The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretariat study on the status of permanent sovereignty over natural wealth and resources (A/AC.97/5/Rev.2) had just appeared in printed form in English and in Spanish and that the French version would be issued very shortly.

11. Mr. TENNEKON (Ceylon) said that the Commission on Permanent Sovereignty over Natural Resources had done excellent work. It had not, however, completed its assignment and his delegation hoped that the Second Committee would take the necessary steps to enable the Commission to continue its examination of the matter.

12. Everyone now agreed that, in order to achieve true economic independence, a State must have full possession and absolute control over its natural resources. That did not mean that a developing country did not need outside assistance in the form of capital or technical know-how, but it must retain the right to decide in which sectors of its economy that assistance should be employed. That kind of international economic co-operation was vital to most developing countries and it should be accompanied by a spirit of mutual understanding between the parties concerned.

13. When a country invited foreign capital, it naturally undertook to observe certain principles and agreements as the only means of gaining the investor's confidence. There were, however, cases where the developing countries considered certain agreements which had been concluded before their independence as inequitable and damaging to their interests. His delegation favoured negotiations that might lead to the amendment or termination of such agreements, in the light of the legitimate interests of the parties involved, but the acceptance of the idea that negotiations should take place did not mean that the developing countries should expropriate foreign investments without compensation. On the other hand, it might happen that a country was unable freely to release the foreign exchange that would enable it to fulfil its obligations within the time specified; its failure should not be considered a hostile act and might merely be the result of temporary difficulties. So long as limitations on the transfer of dividends or the repatriation of capital were not imposed deliberately, they could not be interpreted as a means of expropriation; investors should show understanding, especially if they had hitherto experienced no difficulties in freely drawing their profits.

14. The draft resolution before the Committee (A/C.2/L.654 and Corr.1) was an attempt to devise an arrangement in which both the idea of permanent sovereignty over natural resources and that of international economic co-operation would find a place. That was a legitimate concern, especially since Ceylon believed that the idea of international economic co-operation was neither unalterable nor static: such co-operation might assume different forms as new circumstances arose.

Mr. Allana (Pakistan), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

15. U MAUNG MAUNG (Burma) requested that his delegation's proposal (850th meeting) should be issued as a Committee document.

16. The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretariat would circulate the document when it received the text in writing.^{1/}

17. Mr. FARHADI (Afghanistan), speaking on a point of order, said that the Committee should avoid any procedural irregularities which might constitute an unfortunate precedent. He wished to know the nature of the document in question. If it was a draft resolution relating to one of the subjects in the first group of agenda items, as it appeared to be from the various statements made by the Burmese delegation, it was out of order because the time-limit for the submission of draft resolutions had expired. The Committee should give careful consideration to any proposal which might involve reversing both a decision which it had adopted almost unanimously at the time it had organized its work on the various items referred to it by the General Assembly and also a decision taken by the General Assembly at its sixteenth session. He therefore wondered why the Secretariat intended to distribute the document in question.

18. The CHAIRMAN understood that the text which had just been transmitted to the Secretariat concerned not an agenda item but a procedural matter. In any case, he would prefer to decide after having seen the document.

19. Mr. FARHADI (Afghanistan) feared that what was involved was not a procedural proposal but a text aimed at diverting the Committee's attention. The Committee had before it a draft resolution by the Commission on Permanent Sovereignty over Natural Resources, which it was considering. Any substantive proposal which urged it not to study that draft resolution or to take a decision on it, or which would require substantive recommendations calling for new measures to be taken in that area, could not be a procedural motion.

20. Mr. MALINOWSKI (Secretary of the Committee) recalled that the Burmese representative had on two occasions made an oral proposal which he had described as a procedural proposal. He had now requested that that proposal should be circulated in writing and he had apparently handed it to one of the Secretary's assistants. Since rule 121 of the rules of procedure ("Proposals and amendments shall normally be introduced in writing and handed to the Secretary-General, who shall circulate copies to the delegations") was categorical, the Secretariat considered itself bound to distribute the document. That in no way prejudged the decision which the Committee might wish to take and

which was its right to take on the question of whether or not the proposal itself was in order.

21. Mr. FARHADI (Afghanistan) said he had no desire to prevent a delegation from submitting a text which it considered necessary, but hoped that, when the Secretariat circulated the document, it would, at the following meeting, state clearly whether in its view the text dealt with substantive or with procedural matters.

22. The CHAIRMAN said that in the present case, as in all others, the Committee was master of its decisions in regard to both substance and procedure.

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, E/3643)

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

23. Mr. AYARI (Tunisia) said that he had already had occasion, during the sixteenth session of the General Assembly (753rd meeting), to request that a review of the structure and general framework of technical assistance should be carried out whenever necessary. At a time when emphasis was being placed on the need for co-ordinating efforts and for collectively reconsidering economic policies, it was somewhat contradictory at the same time to claim that some organs should have independence of action merely for the sake of appearances. Whenever centralization ended in rigidity, decentralization was necessary. On the other hand, whenever centralization was necessary for co-ordinated action, it must be preserved. Decentralization was therefore part of the general policy of strengthening the international institutions both at Headquarters and in the regional economic commissions. It should be a selective and flexible operation involving a delegation of powers to the executive secretaries for operational activities, especially technical assistance. What was important was to bring about close co-ordination between Headquarters and the regional economic commissions and especially to avoid disputes in which the latter accused the former of monopolizing and claimed to be more representative—in a word, to prevent any harmful "provincialism". The regional economic commissions were more familiar with the particular problems of their regions and could prepare means of more direct action; since the role of the executive secretaries of the commissions should be expanded, his delegation would support paragraph 5 of the draft resolution (A/C.2/L.653/Rev.1), as well as the United Arab Republic amendment (A/C.2/L.681).

24. However, any desire to give them the monopoly of action would be impracticable and inconsistent with the general idea of decentralization. No screen should be set up between the Secretary-General and the States nor should operations be disrupted by the automatic and immediate transfer of powers to the regional economic commissions. Thus the General Assembly had quite rightly decided in resolution 1709 (XVI) to request that the secretariats of the regional economic commissions should be strengthened "while maintaining the central substantive functions, including policy

^{1/} Subsequently circulated as document A/C.2/L.694.

guidance and co-ordination, and without affecting the provision of assistance to countries that are not members of any regional economic commission". The latter problem surely remained and was expressed very clearly in paragraph 4 of the present resolution. In some cases, however, such as those to which the Afghan representative had drawn attention at the preceding meeting, national projects were so highly individual that they could not be usefully formulated in one of the regional economic commissions. Moreover, each country should be able to turn to the appropriate authority and, if necessary, to consult Headquarters on the formulation of its national projects. In the present circumstances, the regional economic commissions could only be one instrument of action among others. While some had internal structures which enabled them to claim more powers, it was still true that the Economic Commission for Africa, for example, could not do so in the immediate future. The main concern should be good performance and, while decentralization had launched the United Nations on the course of an inevitable evolution, it should not be precipitated by hasty action which would not lead to the desired results. For those reasons, he would support the eight-Power amendment (A/C.2/L.685/Rev.1) and that of Afghanistan and Jordan (A/C.2/L.689).

25. Mr. TELL (Jordan) announced that, in order to avoid any misunderstanding, the sponsors of the amendment contained in document A/C.2/L.685/Rev.1 had decided to delete the words "including policy guidance and co-ordination" at the end of the first paragraph which they proposed for the operative part.

26. Mr. TEZEL (Turkey) said that in decentralizing its economic and social activities, the United Nations should be guided by three principles. First, the process of decentralization should not diminish the authority of Headquarters or detract from its right to keep the work of the regional economic commissions under review. Headquarters should continue to play the part of a "programming brain" and to co-ordinate the activities of the United Nations, bearing in mind the interests of all Member States. Secondly, sight must not be lost of the special characteristics of each region if the strengthening of the regional economic commissions was to produce good results. A measure that was excellent for one region might be bad for another, and United Nations resolutions should leave the Secretary-General sufficient latitude in the matter of implementation. Finally, there should be no infringement of the right of countries receiving technical assistance to choose their programmes freely, as well as the means of execution, in other words, their right to determine quite independently what assistance they required and what outside sources they would like to turn to.

27. Hence, it seemed to him that the draft resolution would be even more effective if its sponsors accepted the eight-Power amendment. As the representative of New Zealand had pointed out (847th meeting), the need should be borne in mind to maintain the central functions of the Secretary-General as well as the necessary balance in the system as a whole. He also hoped that the sponsors could agree to be guided by the amendment contained in document A/C.2/L.689.

28. Mr. UNWIN (United Kingdom) said that the report of the Secretary-General (A/5196) showed that the latter continued to see the work of the Secretariat at Headquarters and in the regions as interlinked and complementary. That meant that the strengthening of

the regional economic commissions would be one element in the total policy of the United Nations in the economic and social field, but not the dominant element. Decentralization would therefore continue to be conditioned by the available resources both in staff and finance and also by the suitability of different subjects to central or regional treatment. In practice, the responsibility for a programme might be delegated to a region, shared between the central and regional secretariats, or placed entirely under Headquarters control; finally, experts would be posted out to the regions in certain cases, where that was dictated by the shortage of qualified staff.

29. In other words, the Secretary-General approached the need for further decentralization in a flexible manner with the intention, on the one hand, of avoiding any gaps in the economic and social activities of the United Nations and, on the other, of preventing the overlapping of activities between Headquarters and the regional commissions. As several representatives had stressed, decentralization was not an end in itself but a means of increasing the effectiveness of economic and social activities. As such, it should continue to be based on the fundamental consideration that policy guidance and recruitment should remain at the centre where the financial control was. As the Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs had pointed out (852nd meeting), the executive secretaries and their colleagues were all part of the staff of the Secretary-General, who had to work in close consultation with them. That idea was endorsed in operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution.

30. The United Kingdom delegation considered the draft resolution acceptable in general terms. It was a clear reaffirmation of the approach to decentralization set out in the resolutions mentioned in its operative paragraph 2 and amplified in the various reports of the Secretary-General. Two of the amendments (A/C.2/L.689, A/C.2/L.685/Rev.1) would bring welcome clarification to the text and he would vote for them. His delegation suggested that the report called for in paragraph 4 of the draft resolution should go first to the Economic and Social Council, and it hoped that the sponsors would be able to accept that minor change. His delegation felt that the amendments of the five Powers (A/C.2/L.682) would bring too much detail into a resolution which ought to concentrate on the application of the policy of decentralization as described by the Secretary-General; such detail might change the character of the draft resolution. What was more, his delegation did not believe that the reports proposed in those amendments were necessary at that stage. It might well be that, over the next few years, the annual reports of the regional economic commissions would themselves offer an adequate basis for the Council and the General Assembly to form an opinion of the progress made on decentralization. The United Kingdom delegation would therefore not be able to support the five-Power amendments.

31. Mr. VIAUD (France) observed that the decentralization measures taken so far had certainly produced good results. The establishment of regional economic commissions and the expansion of their activities, in particular in the planning and execution of regional projects, had made it possible to bring United Nations resources more precisely to bear on the specific needs of large areas of the globe and had helped to overcome the defects inherent in any over-centralization. However, the ideal solution would not be found by gradually

weakening the centre. Any excessive "provincialization" might disorganize technical assistance programmes. A distinction had, in any case, to be drawn between decentralization, which meant the strengthening of deliberative bodies such as the regional economic commissions, and deconcentration, which consisted of increasing the powers of the regional executive secretaries. In the latter case, while it would certainly be useful to empower the executive secretaries to keep under review and expedite the execution of certain regional projects, such a shifting of responsibilities should not be left unco-ordinated and it was the Secretary-General who was in the best position to judge whether measures already taken ought to be supplemented. So far as decentralization was concerned, it would be risky to give the regional economic commissions "carte blanche" in technical assistance matters since contributing States might avail themselves of the situation in order to ask that their contribution should be allocated to a particular field or a particular country. Decentralization of that kind would encourage the attachment of conditions to contributions and presage the end of United Nations budgetary universality.

32. The intermediate approach of the Secretary-General was therefore the path of wisdom, and the only test should be that of effectiveness and performance. Any measure which could be better applied at the regional level should be decentralized, and similarly, work which had so far been done nowhere else could be assigned to the regional economic commissions. Such an approach was more realistic than that of the delegations which would like systematic decentralization to remedy defects which were really inherent in any complex organization like the United Nations. The French delegation would therefore support the amendments contained in documents A/C.2/L.685/Rev.1 and A/C.2/L.689, which defined decentralization in more precise terms and would make for good results without impairing the authority that normally rested in Headquarters. If those amendments were not adopted, his delegation would find it difficult to support the draft resolution.

33. Mrs. PANGALOS (Greece) said that her delegation was in general agreement with the views expressed by the Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs. The Secretary-General's reports on the decentralizing of United Nations economic and social activities showed that the process was progressing successfully. In resolution 879 (XXXIV), the Economic and Social Council had expressed its confidence that the Secretary-General would continue to take steps to ensure such decentralization, and there did not appear to be any reason for adopting a draft resolution which would only repeat what had been adopted the year before. Nevertheless, the Greek delegation would be prepared to vote for a draft resolution provided that it was drafted in the spirit of General Assembly resolution 1709 (XVI). But it was very difficult to define what was meant by decentralization. In the view of her delegation, the word implied the elimination of red tape which prevented the regional economic commissions from doing their work; it also meant a better administrative organization which would enable Headquarters to concentrate on its world-wide functions while delegating certain duties and responsibilities to the regional economic commissions. In this way, the strengthening of the regional economic commissions would go hand in hand with the strengthening of supervisory services at Headquarters. Again, decentraliza-

tion should in no way impair the Secretary-General's potential authority to supervise, direct and co-ordinate all United Nations operations and activities, nor should it prevent the Governments concerned from having direct access to Headquarters, particularly with regard to technical co-operation activities.

34. In the light of those considerations, the Greek delegation felt that the amendment contained in document A/C.2/L.685/Rev.1 strengthened the original text and it would support it. It particularly urged the inclusion in the draft resolution of the proposed paragraph 1, because the principles in question should be set out in clear terms in order to avoid any misunderstanding. Her delegation also supported the amendment contained in document A/C.2/L.689, which consisted solely of two sentences taken from the Secretary-General's report, but it could not support the five-Power amendments (A/C.2/L.682), which would have the effect of incorporating almost the whole of the Secretary-General's report in the draft resolution.

35. The Greek delegation deemed it unnecessary to request the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions to submit its recommendation to the General Assembly, as indicated in paragraph 3 of the revised draft resolution. It would be better for the Secretary-General to do that, on the understanding that he could consult the Committee if he considered that necessary. In addition, paragraph 5 of the draft seemed superfluous, as the Secretary-General met the executive secretaries of the regional economic commissions during sessions of the Economic and Social Council and also had the right to convene special meetings whenever he considered them opportune. Finally, note should be taken with satisfaction of the reports of the Secretary-General, and she therefore proposed the insertion of the words "with satisfaction" after the word "Noting" in the second preambular paragraph.

36. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) said that the United States fully appreciated the advantages of sound decentralization—an established policy in his country. However, it would be wrong to take a dogmatic attitude on the question: the United States felt that the realistic approach was to decentralize those activities of the United Nations which could be carried out most effectively by the regional economic commissions.

37. The United States delegation would be able to support the draft resolution as it stood, even though it was doubtful whether there was any point in asking the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary questions to submit new recommendations at the eighteenth session of the General Assembly. If that was the majority feeling, however, the United States would raise no objection. The amendment contained in document A/C.2/L.685/Rev.1 made no material change in the draft resolution, but clarified certain points, as did the amendment contained in document A/C.2/L.689. The United States would therefore support them.

38. The five-Power amendments (A/C.2/L.682), on the other hand, were open to criticism; he agreed with the United Kingdom representative that it was inadvisable to go into excessive detail at the present stage. Moreover, in considering any proposal to strengthen the regional economic commissions at the expense of Headquarters, it had to be remembered that, in the case of one of the commissions, its resources in relation to its responsibilities were greater than those

available to Headquarters. Over the last two years, the responsibilities of the regional economic commissions had been appreciably increased, and they must be provided with the resources, and in particular with the personnel, they needed. But in view of the size of the resources involved throughout the world, there must be control, and that control must remain in the hands of Headquarters. In addition, Headquarters must have available resources commensurate with its increased responsibilities in the field of industrial development, planning and projections, trade, housing, natural resources and other fields. For those reasons the United States delegation would oppose the fourth of the amendments contained in document A/C.2/L.682.

Mr. Lewandowski (Poland) resumed the Chair.

39. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Soviet delegation had always attached very great importance to economic and social decentralization. The economic development of the currently under-developed countries required that the greatest possible volume of resources should be applied for their benefit; consequently, international economic co-operation must be improved. The USSR had always held that it was essential to strengthen the regional economic commissions, so that they could make a greater contribution to the development of the countries in their regions.

40. Accordingly, the commissions should be given greater autonomy; the action taken up to the present did not fully satisfy the Soviet delegation. If the trends to be noted in certain countries continued, international economic co-operation would be made more difficult; for example, the fears and hesitations already manifested in some quarters with regard to decentralization seemed premature or indeed unjustified. Any concentration of funds and resources in the hands of a small number of organs was fraught with real danger, and if the activities initiated were to be made more effective, the regional economic commissions would have to be given a greater part in operational planning. The peripheral organs must be in a position to influence the central organs. The regional economic commissions were closer to the problems to be solved and were thus specially qualified to encourage and supervise the development of industrialization, the exploitation of water resources, the application of social programmes, etc.; such activities should no longer be the sole responsibility of the central apparatus. Thus the time seemed to be ripe for a review of the present structure; and if necessary a new system should be set up which would do away with the present trend towards a veritable economic dictatorship.

41. In addition, a study should be made of the progress really achieved in the field of decentralization; accordingly, the Secretariat should be asked to submit a specific report. It should not be forgotten that decentralization must, in fact, result in strengthening the regional economic commissions at the expense of Headquarters—whereas the actual tendency was sometimes in the opposite direction. Since they would be given increased responsibilities, the commissions should be provided with the staff they needed, so that they could not be denied their rightful role on the pretext of their scanty resources. If action of that kind was taken, the regional commissions would frequently prove capable of solving the problems of their regions more easily and more rapidly than Headquarters. The discriminatory bureaucratic methods

which too often prevailed must be resisted; the regional economic commissions must have their say in the utilization of technical assistance resources under both the regular programme and the Expanded Programme. They must also be consulted with regard to the appointment of resident representatives, staff and experts. The USSR had asked at the thirty-fourth session of the Economic and Social Council whether the regional economic commissions had shared in the preparation of document E/3643; a precise answer must be given to that question.

42. The executive secretaries must take a more active part not only in the execution but also in the preparation of programmes and should be consulted more frequently in that connexion. In addition, Governments should be asked for their views on the implementation and effects of current programmes. Technical assistance operations could be placed under a new small but permanent organ, consisting, for example, of ten to twelve member countries suitably representing the various geographical zones. The Soviet delegation would go into further detail on those proposals at a later date. It was wrong, however, for the activities of a regional economic commission, specifically ECLA, to tend more and more to come under the control of a political organization, namely the Organization of American States, which represented a military bloc.

43. Mr. FINGER (United States of America), speaking on a point of order, said that speakers should not be allowed to exceed their allotted time. The Soviet representative had talked more than three times longer than the agreed limit. Rules should apply equally to all delegations.

44. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that speakers submitting amendments could be given extra time.

45. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), reverting to the Soviet proposal for the establishment of an advisory organ which would enable the regional economic commissions to act more effectively in the programming and execution of operations, said in conclusion that the Soviet delegation would transmit to the Secretariat the text of an amendment (A/C.2/L.695).

46. Mr. WODAJO (Ethiopia) said he did not believe that the sponsors of the draft resolution could be accused of trying to abridge the functions of Headquarters or to bring about a gradual "provincialization" of United Nations activities. As a matter of principle, the sponsors considered that the United Nations existed for the purposes of universal co-operation and that the regional economic commissions had been established precisely to foster such co-operation. As a matter of practice, the propose of decentralization was to enable the regional commissions to carry out activities whose scope was limited by their nature or their geographical location; the execution of programmes having a universal impact, for example the drafting of the World Economic Survey, the elaboration of economic projections, or demographic research, should continue to be the responsibility of Headquarters. The sole intention of the sponsors of the draft resolution had been to ensure the continuance of the policy of decentralization, for that was the only means of ensuring that the growing technical assistance activities were carried on effectively.

47. Mr. FARHADI (Afghanistan) urged the sponsors of the amendments contained in document A/C.2/L.682 to

revise their text in the light of the changes made in the original text of the draft resolution. The first amendment could doubtless be left as it stood, but if the others were not revised, the Committee might be in a difficult position when it came to vote on the draft resolution and the amendments.

48. Mr. URTUBEY (Argentina), replying to the representative of Afghanistan, said that the sponsors of those amendments would confer after the meeting to study the revised draft resolution and submit a revised version.

49. Mr. MALHOTRA (Nepal) pointed out that most of the representatives who had taken the floor in regard to the draft resolution had in substance said what the sponsors of the draft had always thought, namely, that it was important to preserve the effectiveness of the United Nations as a whole and that the regional economic commissions should not be strengthened at the expense of Headquarters. He recalled that, at the previous meeting, he had asked the sponsors of the amendments, and in particular of those contained in documents A/C.2/L.682, A/C.2/L.685/Rev.1 and A/C.2/L.689, to withdraw them in order to achieve a unanimous vote on the revised draft resolution. However, the representatives of Afghanistan, New Zealand and Nigeria had maintained and discussed their amendments. Since the sponsors of the draft resolution had decided not to mention any of the Secretary-General's reports in detail, he had not yet dealt with the questions of substance raised by the amendments, particularly the amendment contained in document A/C.2/L.689. The first paragraph of that document differed only slightly from the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. It referred to the Secretary-General's report to the Council (E/3643), which the sponsors of the revised draft resolution had not mentioned, since operative paragraph 2 welcomed Council resolution 879 (XXXIV), which took note of that report. The sponsors had, however, no objection to that reference.

50. Document A/C.2/L.689 had one basic defect. Several representatives felt that it lent itself to controversy and that it was undesirable to quote passages from the reports of the Secretary-General out of context. That objection applied particularly to the second paragraph proposed in the amendment. Paragraph 6 of the report (E/3643), which was quoted in that paragraph, drew a distinction between regional and country projects, but that distinction was not reflected in the amendment. Similarly, in the third proposed paragraph, the sponsors had quoted only the first sentence of paragraph 8 of the report. In that paragraph, which dealt with country projects, the Secretary-General had indicated that it had been his objective that the secretariats of the regional economic commissions should become focal centres for advice to Governments in the planning of their technical assistance and Special Fund assistance and that the regional secretariats were assuming that function on an increasing scale. The role of the regional commissions in both regional and country projects therefore formed a complete whole, and it was wrong to mention one part without mentioning the other. Furthermore, in his report to the General Assembly (A/5196), the Secretary-General had indicated that in the three months which had elapsed since the submission of document E/3643, progress had been made towards the decentralization of regional technical assistance projects. In the 1963-1964 programme, provision had been made for the delegation

of responsibility to the regional secretariats with respect to the implementation not only of regional but also of some country projects, as well as some Special Fund projects. It would therefore be a step backward to say that the role of the regional secretariats was limited to regional projects and did not extend to country projects. The sponsors of the draft resolution did not wish to arouse controversy, and the considerations he had mentioned explained why they had wished to limit the preamble to a simple statement of fact. Moreover, the third paragraph proposed in document A/C.2/L.689 mentioned a principle which had never been called into question; the sponsors therefore saw no reason for incorporating that paragraph in the draft resolution. Its inclusion might be interpreted in the sense that the principle was open to question, and the sponsors did not wish to give such an impression. He therefore renewed his appeal to the sponsors of the amendment to withdraw their text.

51. Mr. FARHADI (Afghanistan) said that the allegations made by the Nepalese representative gave the impression that the sponsors of the amendment contained in document A/C.2/L.689 had artfully selected passages to their liking which were out of context in so far as the matter before the Committee was concerned in an effort to change the general trend of decentralization. The Afghan delegation rejected such allegations. In recalling the statement made by the Secretary-General in regard to the importance of the part played by the regional secretariats in regional projects, the sponsors of the amendment were recalling not merely a fact but also a principle. Far from deviating from the context, they were merely recalling a perfectly clear point which did not appear in any resolution in distinct form. The text was improved and completed by the reference to the important principle that in the case of country projects, countries receiving aid should have free choice of programmes and projects and that country programmes should be drawn up at the country level by the requesting Governments. He invited the Nepalese representative to point out those paragraphs of the Secretary-General's report which had allegedly been forgotten; he himself would vote in favour of them if he felt that they contained principles of importance for the question of decentralization.

52. It was wrong to claim that principles which had never been called into question should not be mentioned. Some delegations wished to assure themselves that there would be no interference in the granting of technical assistance to their countries and insisted on the freedom of the countries receiving such assistance freely to choose their country programme. His delegation did not wish the regional secretariats to influence the choice of such programmes. That might happen, however, if decentralization was carried too far.

53. Mr. MIYAKAWA (Japan) believed that the discussion had shown that the views of the majority of the delegations on the question of decentralization were not too far apart. Indeed, the representative of Nepal had shown a spirit of co-operation in stating that the sponsors of the original draft resolution (A/C.2/L.653 and Add.1 and 2) had no objection to mentioning the Secretary-General's report to the Economic and Social Council (E/3643) in order to accommodate the views concerning the part of the eight-Power amendments (A/C.2/L.685) which concerned the preamble; for their part, the sponsors of the revised amendments (A/C.2/L.685/Rev.1) were willing to

delete certain phrases from their text, as the representative of Jordan had stated.

54. However, the representative of Nepal had stated that the proposed paragraph 1 in document A/C.2/L.685/Rev.1 introduced new elements which were not found in any resolution or document. He wished to point out that the concept of improving the efficiency of the activities of the Organization as a whole had been repeatedly emphasized, especially in paragraph 3 of document A/5196, in paragraph 18 of document E/3643 and in paragraph 3 of Economic and Social Council resolution 823 (XXXII), although the expressions might not always be the same. Indeed, the representative of Nepal himself had stated that that concept was one of the main purposes of the policy of decentralization. There was reason to hope that the sponsors of the revised draft resolution would be willing to incorporate in their text the amendment concerning operative paragraph 1.

55. Referring to the amendment contained in document A/C.2/L.689, he said that the New Zealand representative had already explained why some of the sponsors of the amendments contained in document A/C.2/L.685 had withdrawn their sponsorship, although they agreed with those amendments. In replying to the Nepalese representative's criticism of those amendments, he wished to point out that the expression "greatest progress" in the second preambular paragraph proposed in document A/C.2/L.689 did not preclude the possibility of also receiving the assistance of the regional secretariats in regard to certain national projects when the recipient so desired. The Japanese delegation also wished to point out that the

third preambular paragraph proposed in the same document stated a principle that was embodied not only in document E/3643, but also in Economic and Social Council resolution 786 (XXX).

56. In conclusion, he appealed to the sponsors of the revised draft resolution to include the amendments in documents A/C.2/L.685/Rev.1 and A/C.2/L.689 in their draft.

57. Mr. EL BANNA (United Arab Republic) withdrew his amendment (A/C.2/L.681), the text of which was to be found in the revised draft resolution.

Organization of the Committee's work

58. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) proposed that a closing date should be set for the list of speakers wishing to take part in the general debate on agenda items 33 and 94.

59. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the list of speakers should be closed by 5 p.m. on 28 November.

It was so decided.

60. Mr. FARHADI (Afghanistan) recalled that, if necessary, he would like the Secretariat to give an advisory opinion at the next meeting on whether Burma's proposal concerning permanent sovereignty over natural resources was a matter of procedure or of substance.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.