

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records



SECOND COMMITTEE, 1173rd
MEETING

Friday, 8 December 1967,
at 4.25 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

<i>Agenda item 12:</i>	
<i>Report of the Economic and Social Council</i>	
<i>Consideration of the draft resolution entitled "The role of the Economic Commission for Europe in the development of international economic co-operation"</i>	359
<i>Agenda item 41:</i>	
<i>United Nations Development Decade: report of the Secretary-General (continued)</i>	361

Chairman: Mr. Jorge Pablo FERNANDINI
(Peru).

AGENDA ITEM 12

Report of the Economic and Social Council (A/6703 and Corr.1, chap. I-X, XIII, XIV (sect. II and VIII-X), XV and XVII; A/6703/Add.1, chap. I, III and IV; A/C.2/L.985)

CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT RESOLUTION ENTITLED "THE ROLE OF THE ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION" (A/C.2/L.985)

1. Mr. WALDHEIM (Austria) said that the idea of submitting a draft resolution on the role of the Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) in the development of international economic co-operation had first been given expression by the sponsors of the text which had become General Assembly resolution 2129 (XX). In preparing draft resolution A/C.2/L.985, the sponsors had been encouraged by two events. One had been the twentieth anniversary of the establishment of ECE, commemorated by a ministerial meeting in April 1967 which had unanimously adopted a declaration (see E/4329, para. 260) setting out in broad terms the Commission's future goals. The other had been the Secretary-General's statement contained in paragraph 65 of the introduction to his annual report on the work of the Organization, submitted to the General Assembly at its present session (A/6701/Add.1), in which he noted that ECE and its members had reiterated their determination to intensify their efforts and co-operate more closely in order to narrow the gap between rich and poor nations.

2. The Economic Commission for Europe, which was made up of countries with a high standard of living, had a somewhat different task from the other regional economic commissions and had in many respects a twofold responsibility: on the one hand, it had to try to overcome difficulties in relations between its

member countries and, on the other hand, it had to create the optimum conditions for intensifying co-operation with other regions of the world. The latter aspect had been clearly described by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Austria at the commemorative meeting of ECE.

3. After having concentrated during its early years on the economic reconstruction of its members, ECE was now trying to expand and reorient its activities. The member countries had expressed a desire to facilitate and encourage the development of new forms of co-operation in the economic, scientific and technical fields. Although much remained to be done to improve economic relations among its members, increased attention would have to be paid to the impact of the Commission's work on the outside world, and in particular on the developing countries. Europe would have an ever-increasing role to play in the efforts of the United Nations to assist the developing countries and close co-operation between all members of ECE was a prerequisite for continued progress in those countries.

4. Those were the reasons why the sponsors had submitted a draft resolution drawing attention to the interdependence between countries and to the value of the work done by ECE. After referring to the declaration adopted by ECE, the observations by the Secretary-General in the introduction to his annual report to the General Assembly at its twenty-second session and Assembly resolution 2129 (XX), the draft resolution emphasized in the fourth preambular paragraph the role of ECE in facilitating the economic progress of developing countries. In the operative part, an appeal was made to member countries of ECE to intensify their common efforts in order to promote co-operation in traditional as well as new fields and in particular to expand their trade relations with each other. Operative paragraph 3 referred to the need for close co-operation with countries in other regions and with all United Nations bodies.

5. In conclusion, he expressed the hope that the draft resolution would be adopted unanimously.

6. Mr. VRATUSA (Yugoslavia) noted that there was general recognition of the fact that, in its twenty years of existence, ECE had made a valuable contribution to the promotion of co-operation among its members, whatever their social systems or international alliances. By doing so, it had encouraged the spirit of co-operation based upon mutual interest and respect. It was in that same spirit of solidarity that in the declaration (see E/4329, para. 260) adopted on the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of the Commission, the representatives of the Governments of member States stressed their determination

to continue to utilize the Commission for the development and strengthening of co-operation in the interests of promoting peaceful and friendly relations and safeguarding peace and security. That opened up new prospects for expanding co-operation in all fields. Yugoslavia supported such efforts, because it was convinced that the future of Europe did not lie in division but in a community of interests among independent and equal countries.

7. As the only all-European organization for multi-lateral co-operation, ECE provided the appropriate framework for action to intensify economic relations and encourage new forms of co-operation. It gave small countries an opportunity to play a more active part in European affairs. The strengthening of ECE's role should be accompanied by intensification of co-operation with other regions, which, in its turn, should result in greater integration of its activities with those of the Organization on a world scale.

8. The period ahead opened up new possibilities for the Commission and all countries of the region to make an active contribution to the second session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) and to the adoption of a new international strategy for development. It would be no exaggeration to say that increased activity aimed at eliminating the danger resulting from the gap between industrially developed and developing countries could be one of the most suitable ways for Europe to build in co-operation with other regions a better future and thus contribute to the welfare of the community of the nations as a whole.

9. The number of sponsors of the draft resolution before the Committee was proof of the growing spirit of co-operation and it was to be hoped that it would be adopted unanimously.

10. Mr. MALITZA (Romania) said that as a European country, Romania participated actively in the work of ECE, a special feature of which was that its members were States with different social and political systems. In twenty years, ECE had accumulated rich experience from the efforts made to harmonize different interests and outlooks and to promote international co-operation. That was a process of great importance, particularly since Europe had for centuries been the scene of turmoil, which had finally culminated in two world conflicts within one generation. To promote European co-operation was thus to serve the cause of peace throughout the world.

11. There were undoubtedly still many problems to be solved on the European continent, but despite the difficulties, economic and cultural relations between European countries with different philosophies helped to improve the international atmosphere and enabled Europe to give more attention to the urgent questions which preoccupied other parts of the world. His delegation shared the opinions expressed by the Secretary-General of UNCTAD and by the Rapporteur of the ministerial meeting of the group of seventy-seven developing countries held at Algiers, who had both stressed that while the expansion of trade and economic co-operation within Europe was important for all countries on the continent, it also stimulated co-operation between each of those States

and the developing countries. Romania, for its part, had always regarded the expansion of economic co-operation with other European countries, not as a process which should be confined to Europe, but as an additional opportunity for promoting co-operation with the developing countries also. It was only fair to recognize the part played by the Commission in the results already achieved. The declaration, the resolutions and the other documents adopted on the occasion of the Commission's twentieth anniversary at its twenty-second session (see E/4329) were expressions of the general desire for co-operation. Romania's interest in the Commission's efforts relating to international economic development followed from one of the essential objectives of its foreign policy—to promote co-operation with all countries, on the basis of respect for the principles of sovereignty and independence, equal rights and mutual benefit. Romania intended to play an active part, in so far as its resources and capacity allowed, in the process of international economic co-operation, which was showing itself more and more to be a prerequisite for mutual understanding and strengthening of confidence between peoples as a basis for peaceful co-existence. Romania maintained economic relations with over a hundred countries in all continents and took part in the work of over seventy international organizations of an economic and technical nature. Because of that basic position and the practical activities it had undertaken in the field of economic co-operation with all countries in the world, whatever their social and economic systems, and in view of the fact that ECE's activities in that field could make a valuable contribution to the development of general economic co-operation, his delegation had co-sponsored draft resolution A/C.2/L.985. It hoped that the draft resolution, which was of general interest, would win unanimous approval.

12. Mr. BOIKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the commemorative meeting of ECE to celebrate its twentieth anniversary had adopted a series of specific recommendations (see E/4329, para. 260) which showed the interest taken by the countries of the region in closer co-operation in the fields of economic affairs, science and technology. The declaration adopted by the Commission (*ibid.*) emphasized the leading role it could play in strengthening co-operation between States with different economic and social systems. But the capitalist Western Powers, whose representatives often voted for General Assembly resolutions advocating such co-operation, had so far opposed participation by the German Democratic Republic in the Commission's work. He hoped that that anomalous situation would soon be corrected.

13. The Ukrainian SSR had been a member of the Commission since its creation in 1947 and Ukrainian experts had played an active part in its work. Every year, Ukrainian specialists took part in dozens of meetings of experts, seminars and study tours in many fields (extractive industries, power, transport, economic statistics, etc.), which enabled member countries to get to know each other better and to exchange experience. The specialists taking part in those activities were generally very satisfied, which showed that the secretariat of the Commission organized them well. He welcomed the growing interest taken

by the Commission in co-ordinating its work with the activities of other regional economic commissions. The process should be encouraged, since in that way the experience of the industrial countries could be made available to the developing countries in other regions. His delegation hoped that draft resolution A/C.2/L.985 would be adopted unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 41

United Nations Development Decade: report of the Secretary-General (continued) (A/6703 and Corr.1, chap. III; A/6824, A/C.2/235, A/C.2/241 and Corr.1, A/C.2/L.992/Rev.1, E/4362 and Corr.1, E/4376)

14. Mr. O'CONOR (United States of America) said that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.992/Rev.1 had agreed to make a number of changes in the text. In the third preambular paragraph, the words "efforts in" should be inserted before the word "education". In operative paragraph 1, the words "designate the year 1970 as" should be replaced by the words "reserve the year 1970 for an". In operative paragraph 2, after the words "in particular the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization", the words "and by other interested bodies" should be inserted. At the end of operative paragraph 3, the words "in order to initiate... year" should be replaced by the words "so that the Assembly may decide on the basis of those preparations, on the proclamation of the International Education Year". Finally, he stated that Romania, Guinea and Ethiopia had decided to co-sponsor the draft resolution.

15. Mr. OULD SIDI (Mauritania) said that a particular year should not be chosen as international education year when no international organization had been consulted and the Committee did not in fact have any information on the subject. His delegation would like operative paragraph 1 to be put to the vote separately.

16. Mr. CHTOUROU (Tunisia) agreed with the representative of Mauritania that it was premature to "designate" or "reserve" a year for international education year. His delegation understood and shared the concerns of the sponsors of the revised draft resolution. It considered, however, that the programme for the international year should first be drawn up and that no date should be fixed for the project until agreement had been reached on what constituted education.

17. Mr. SAHLOUL (Sudan) supported the observations of the representatives of Mauritania and Tunisia and requested a separate vote on the new wording of operative paragraph 2. The expression "other interested bodies" might in fact refer to non-governmental organizations and his Government would not co-operate with some of them for political and social reasons.

18. Mr. TSERENCHOODOL (Mongolia) regretted that the sponsors had not accepted his delegation's amendment to operative paragraph 1 and requested a separate vote on that paragraph.

19. Mr. METUALLY (Syria) said that his delegation would abstain from voting on the revised draft resolution as a whole. It attached primary importance to education, which was at the root of economic and social development and of peaceful coexistence. However, be-

fore fixing a date for an international year, it was essential to establish conditions conducive to its success. In particular, the hundreds of thousands of Palestinian refugees who had been driven out by force should be enabled to return to their homeland by 1970.

20. Mr. BOZA (Peru) suggested that the wording of operative paragraph 1 should be replaced by the following version: "Envisages the possibility of designating 1970 as International Education Year".

21. Mr. POZHARSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that the meeting should be suspended so that the sponsors of the revised draft resolution could consult each other.

It was so decided.

The meeting was suspended at 5.20 p.m. and resumed at 5.40 p.m.

22. Mr. O'CONOR (United States of America), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said that the year 1970 still seemed to them to be the most rational choice. The necessary preparations would take more than one year, while two years seemed long enough for the organizations in the United Nations system to prepare for the project. It would be undesirable to adopt a vague and dilatory resolution; furthermore, if the General Assembly found that insufficient progress was being made with the preparatory work, it could defer the proclamation of the International Education Year.

23. Mr. CHTOUROU (Tunisia) said he was not convinced by the reasons given by the representative of the United States. The Ministers of National Education could reconsider the question at the General Conference of UNESCO in October 1968. It was not so urgent as to brook no delay.

24. Mr. OULD SIDI (Mauritania) thought it was essential not to mention the year 1970 in the revised draft resolution. His delegation supported the reservations expressed by the representative of Sudan concerning the amendment to operative paragraph 2.

25. Mr. JARAMILLO (Colombia) observed that the second development decade was due to begin in 1970 and that education had so far been notably absent from development. The year thus had symbolic significance.

26. Mr. GALLARDO MORENO (Mexico) suggested that operative paragraph 1 should be replaced by the following text: "Decides to celebrate an International Education Year and envisages the year 1970 for this purpose, subject to subsequent review of the question".

27. He also moved the closure of the debate on item 41 of the agenda.

28. After an exchange of views in which Mr. FRANZI (Italy), Mr. WILMOT (Ghana), Mr. BRADLEY (Argentina) and Mr. LAVALLE (Guatemala) took part, Mr. GALLARDO MORENO (Mexico) withdrew his suggestion, while maintaining his motion for the closure of the debate.

29. Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta) and Mr. MWENDWA (Kenya) said that they opposed the closure of the debate.

30. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the meeting should be suspended.

It was so decided.

The meeting was suspended at 6.15 p.m. and resumed at 6.35 p.m.

31. Mr. GALLARDO MORENO (Mexico) announced that the sponsors of the revised draft resolution (A/C.2/L.992/Rev.1) had decided to replace operative paragraph 1 by the following text:

"Decides to observe an International Education Year and provisionally designates the year 1970 for this purpose, subject to review at the twenty-fourth session in the light of the preparatory work;"

32. Mr. MUZIK (Czechoslovakia) proposed, on behalf of the delegations of Chad, Czechoslovakia, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, the Sudan, Syria and Tunisia, that operative paragraph 1 should be replaced by the following text:

"Invites the Secretary-General to examine, with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and other interested specialized agencies, the possibility of designating an International Education Year at the beginning of the next decade;"

33. He added that the Sudanese and Czechoslovak delegations proposed that the word "intergovernmental" should be inserted between the words "interested" and "bodies" in the text of operative paragraph 2, as orally revised.

34. Mr. MARTIN WITKOWSKI (France) asked whether the implementation of the revised draft resolution would have any financial implications.

35. Mr. KASSUM (Secretary of the Committee) said that after having examined the original text of the draft resolution, the Secretariat had come to the conclusion that it would not have any financial implications. However, that would not necessarily be the case if the text were amended.

36. Mr. MARTIN WITKOWSKI (France) said his delegation considered that the revised draft resolution would have no financial implications. If such were not the case, it would be obliged to reconsider its position on the subject.

37. Mr. AHMED (Pakistan) said that the sponsors of the revised draft resolution accepted the amendment to operative paragraph 2 proposed by Sudan and Czechoslovakia.

38. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the amendment to operative paragraph 1 proposed by Chad, Czechoslovakia, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Sudan, Syria and Tunisia.

The amendment was rejected by 30 votes to 26, with 21 abstentions.

39. Mr. CHTOUROU (Tunisia) requested a separate vote on the new operative paragraph 1 introduced by the representative of Mexico on behalf of the sponsors.

40. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the new operative paragraph 1.

Operative paragraph 1 was adopted by 55 votes to 4, with 18 abstentions.

41. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the revised draft resolution (A/C.2/L.992/Rev.1) as a whole, as amended.

At the request of the representative of Nigeria, a vote was taken by roll-call.

Hungary, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Cuba, Ivory Coast, Mauritania, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia.

The revised draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 76 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

Mr. Attiga (Libya), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

42. Mr. MUZIK (Czechoslovakia) said that his delegation, together with the Hungarian and Mongolian delegations, had voted in favour of the revised draft resolution, on the understanding that it would not be for UNESCO and the specialized agencies to decide when the International Education Year would take place or what form it should take.

43. Mr. MARTIN WITKOWSKI (France) said that his delegation's favourable vote did not mean that it considered itself committed with respect to the General Assembly's decisions on the next decade, or vis-à-vis UNESCO and the other specialized agencies with respect to the announcement of the International Education Year and the preparations to be made for that purpose.

44. Mr. POZHARSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on operative paragraph 1. It considered that the essence of the revised draft resolution was contained in operative paragraph 3, which recognized that it was for the General Assembly to proclaim International Education Year.

45. Mr. CAMEJO ARGUDIN (Cuba) said that his delegation had abstained from voting in conformity with the position it had previously expressed on the question. However, it reserved the right to modify that position

when the resolution was considered in the plenary meeting.

The meeting rose at 7.20 p.m.

