



Chairman: Mr. Narciso G. REYES (Philippines).

AGENDA ITEM 12

Report of the Economic and Social Council [chapters III to VII, VIII (sections A to E), IX to XIV, XXI and XXII] (continued) (A/8403; A/C.2/271, A/C.2/L.1184/Rev.1, A/C.2/L.1193/Rev.1, A/C.2/L.1194/Rev.1, A/C.2/L.1218/Rev.1)

1. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Committee had before it a proposal to adjourn debate on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1184/Rev.1 until the next meeting. Under rule 117 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, he put the proposal to the vote.

The proposal to adjourn debate on the item was adopted by 38 votes to 9, with 24 abstentions.

2. Mr. RAMIREZ-OCAMPO (Colombia) said his delegation did not agree with the decision just taken by the Committee. There had already been lengthy discussion of the draft resolution, which should be disposed of as soon as possible. He hoped that a decision on it would be taken at the next meeting.

3. Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America) asked what was the status of the proposal for closure of the debate made at the previous meeting by the representative of Kenya.

4. The CHAIRMAN replied that the proposal could, if delegations desired, be reintroduced at the next meeting.

5. Mr. MOLINA DUARTE (Venezuela), introducing draft resolution A/C.2/L.1194/Rev.1 on behalf of the sponsors, said that almost all the views on the original text expressed by delegations had been taken into account. In operative paragraph 2 the sponsors had deleted the reference to the view of the Meeting of Experts that support should be given to the establishment of regional centres for public administration in each developing region. In view of the importance of the whole of the Experts' report, they had not felt they should stress one of its many conclusions at the expense of the others. In paragraph 3, the reference to "programmes" had been deleted, since the General Assembly could not support programmes which in many cases had not yet been announced. In addition, the words "whose primary purpose is" had been deleted, and the words "and efficiency" had been added after "administrative capability". That addition had been made at the suggestion of a developed country, and the co-sponsors agreed that to increase capability without increasing efficiency would be meaningless. In

paragraph 4, the word "offer" had been replaced by the word "provide", to meet the point that UNDP did not offer assistance except on request. In addition, the words "the Centre of" had been added before "the Arab Organization for Administrative Sciences". The co-sponsors hoped that with those changes, the draft resolution could be adopted unanimously.

6. Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America) said his delegation would not stand in the way of the unanimous adoption of the draft resolution if that was the wish of the Committee. However, it believed that paragraph 4 came close to being a direct instruction to an agency which was not fully appropriate. His delegation supported the regional centres for public administration, and sympathized with the desire to establish two more; however, it would have preferred the draft resolution to invite the Governing Council of UNDP to give sympathetic consideration to proposals for the establishment and operation of the new centres. Moreover, his delegation understood the last part of the paragraph, inviting the Governing Council to continue to provide the necessary assistance to the existing centres, not to be a means of securing permanent support beyond the arrangements which had already been entered into between UNDP and the centres. As the main purpose of the draft resolution was to advance the establishment of two additional centres, the phrase seemed unnecessary, but in view of the explanations given by the co-sponsors, his delegation would not insist on its deletion.

7. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, in his delegation's understanding, the aim of the draft resolution was to encourage the efforts of many developing countries to improve their administrative capability, as a means of enabling them to solve problems of economic and social development. Since his delegation supported those efforts, it welcomed the draft resolution, and was particularly grateful for the co-operation of the co-sponsors in improving it. His delegation would support the draft resolution, and his Government was prepared to assist the United Nations in future in its efforts to promote public administration.

8. Mr. JURASZ (Poland) said that the draft resolution was extremely significant, in that it stressed the importance of administrative capability for economic and social development. Poland operated two postgraduate courses in national and regional planning, and his delegation hoped that the new centres would make full use of the facilities thus offered.

9. Mr. HEMANS (United Kingdom) said his delegation recognized the draft resolution as an important initiative, and was prepared to support its unanimous adoption.

However, it associated itself with the interpretation given to operative paragraph 4 by the representative of the United States.

10. Mr. ILONIEMI (Finland) agreed that the draft resolution was an extremely important one. However, it would be grateful if the co-sponsors could amend operative paragraph 4 to avoid giving the impression of instructing the Governing Council to undertake a specific course of action.

11. Mr. SKOGLUND (Sweden) endorsed that comment.

12. Mr. MOLINA DUARTE (Venezuela) said that the co-sponsors had deliberately used the word "Invites", rather than the more mandatory "Requests" or "Urges". They were aware that the Governing Council had its own machinery for taking decisions, and interpreted the wording of the paragraph as an appeal or recommendation, rather than as an instruction.

13. Mr. ILONIEMI (Finland) said that the explanation by the representative of Venezuela satisfied his delegation, which would support the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.2/L.1194/Rev.1 was adopted without objection.

14. Mr. HILLEL (Israel) said that his delegation had reservations with regard to paragraph 4 of the resolution just adopted, in that it invited the Governing Council of UNDP to provide assistance and financial support to an organization in the Middle East which was directly affiliated with a political organization whose main objective was the struggle against Israel. Israel supported efforts to improve public administration in developing countries, and had voted for the strengthening and increase of activities in that field. It welcomed any effort undertaken by the United Nations for better dissemination of knowledge in public administration, a field which required improvement and could make a substantial contribution to the development effort. However, it could not support the channelling of resources to the organization to which he had referred.

15. Mr. KHALIL (Egypt) pointed out that the Arab Organization for Administrative Sciences had existed long before the State of Israel, and dealt not only with political affairs, but with social, administrative and many other questions.

16. Mr. PARDO (Malta), introducing draft resolution A/C.2/L.1193/Rev.1, said that he had submitted the original draft resolution in the belief that its adoption would benefit the United Nations system and the developing countries. He had thought that the comparatively small costs involved and the great advantages to the developing countries of an early and effective expansion of training programmes in marine trades and sciences in an international context would justify the accelerated procedure to enable a decision on the substance to be taken the following year.

17. However, intensive consultations during the past two weeks had revealed widespread doubts unrelated to the substance of the proposal. He had tried to accommodate the main points raised by delegations in the revised draft.

Many delegations considered that the proposal had been introduced too late in the proceedings, that the concept was a new one and that Governments would need more time to study it before committing themselves to a definite course of action. It had also been suggested that the study by the Secretary-General requested in operative paragraph 1 and the *ad hoc* international working group proposed in operative paragraph 3 of the original draft would involve heavy expenditure which the United Nations could ill afford at the present time.

18. The revised draft merely requested the Secretary-General to seek the views of Member States and of the specialized agencies and to submit a preliminary report to the Economic and Social Council at its fifty-third session in 1972. As indicated in document A/C.2/L.1218/Rev.1, the estimated financial implications had been reduced to about \$3,000, but if the Secretary-General could provide for the consultant services needed to prepare the report out of the resources available to him for 1972, there would be practically no cost at all.

19. In the revised draft resolution he had reluctantly accepted the postponement of a decision by the General Assembly until at least 1973 and possibly later, in order to allay the concern of certain countries lest the creation of an intergovernmental sea service should prejudice the functions and competence of the international machinery to be established under General Assembly resolution 2750 C (XXV). There was now no possibility of creating an international sea service prior to the proposed conference on the law of the sea and it was made clear in operative paragraphs 1 and 2 that its creation would not prejudice the competence or the functions of the machinery to be created at the conference. If the international machinery were created in 1973 his proposal would lapse, but if the sea service were created first it would be integrated with the international machinery when the latter was established.

20. As a further reassurance, he recalled that in the draft treaties and working papers on international machinery submitted to the summer session of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction by a number of delegations including those of Tanzania, the United Kingdom, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and a group of Latin American States, the functions proposed were almost exclusively confined to exploration and exploitation of the resources of the sea-bed and no mention was made of training in maritime trades and sciences as an important function of the proposed international machinery. His proposal could not therefore prejudice the international machinery to be established.

21. Some delegations had suggested that the Secretary-General's preliminary report should be considered by the General Assembly at its next session instead of by the Council. He would have no objection in principle if that would facilitate adoption of his proposal, but since the question of training in maritime trades and sciences came within the Council's terms of reference, it would be more appropriate for the Council to discuss the question before it was returned to the General Assembly. He had therefore not changed his draft resolution in that respect.

22. Certain representatives had expressed concern lest the proposal should interfere with existing bilateral training agreements with technologically advanced countries. On the contrary, his proposal, if adopted, would increase the options available to developing countries. The requirements of many coastal developing countries in that respect were urgent and immense and could seldom be fully satisfied by existing bilateral arrangements.

23. A number of delegations had expressed disappointment at the modest nature of the proposal that there should be five ships and 500 fellowships per annum. That would still meet some needs and would exercise a strong influence within the United Nations system with a view to the granting of fellowships for practical shipboard training. His delegation regarded five vessels as only the minimum needed to make the establishment of an intergovernmental sea service worth while.

24. His delegation shared the concern expressed lest the creation of an intergovernmental sea service should lead to a bureaucratic proliferation and hoped that the Secretary-General would comment on the matter in his preliminary report to the Council. As he had stated earlier, on the assumption that the sea service was started with five vessels, a total headquarters staff of not more than 30 would probably be required and there was reason to believe that about half could be provided by secondment from organizations within the United Nations family.

25. An expert representative had suggested that the mothballed LST type ship proposed for the sea service would be unsuitable because of their excessive rolling in high seas. He had not envisaged that those ships only would be used and would have no objection to other types. Governments might wish to comment on that point in their replies to the Secretary-General.

26. It had also been suggested that retired navy or merchant marine officers would not be competent to give training and that other methods of recruiting should be studied. Governments might also wish to comment on that point in their replies to the Secretary-General. He was not opposed to the consideration of other practical and economic methods but to his personal knowledge a pool of competent, highly skilled and trained retired naval and merchant marine officers existed in a number of countries.

27. If it were studied now, the idea of an international sea service would provide developing countries with the possibility of accelerated practical training for their nationals in essential maritime skills, without which no country could conserve the marine environment or develop the resources of the ocean space under its jurisdiction. It was time for practical measures to remedy the situation.

28. Mr. ARVESEN (Norway) said that, in view of the complex nature of the subject and the shortage of time, it was inadvisable for any substantive decision to be taken at the present juncture. He proposed that the Committee should recommend the adoption of a purely procedural decision on the following lines:

“The General Assembly,

“Having given preliminary consideration to the question of the creation of an intergovernmental sea service,

“Decides to remit this question for further consideration by the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction.”

29. Mr. GUERREIRO (Brazil) said that his delegation attached great importance to the idea of the United Nations and the specialized agencies helping the developing countries to acquire the necessary techniques for using the sea in all its aspects. In the past assistance had been provided through UNDP but the Maltese draft resolution embodied a new concept, whereby the United Nations could promote operational activities under its direct supervision, including training particularly for nationals of developing countries. The General Assembly was obviously not ready to take a decision on the substance of the question, since it needed time to consider all the implications. The terms of reference of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed had been enlarged to cover preparations for the proposed conference on the law of the sea in 1973, including a comprehensive list of subjects and issues for consideration by the conference. At least one of the items in the lists already submitted to the Sea-Bed Committee included the question of training in techniques for use of the sea. The Sea-Bed Committee had already acquired considerable experience of the problems of the uses of the sea and it would be useful for the General Assembly to have its views on the Maltese proposal. His delegation therefore supported the Norwegian proposal.

30. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines) said that his delegation agreed with the Norwegian representative on the desirability of postponing discussion of the item. It considered, however, that the question of training did not come within the scope of the Sea-Bed Committee's terms of reference and that it would be better to refer the question to the Economic and Social Council for further consideration. He proposed that the Norwegian proposal should be amended to that effect.

31. Mr. MOLINA DUARTE (Venezuela) supported the Norwegian proposal. The Sea-Bed Committee, with its expanded terms of reference and its enlarged membership, was the appropriate body to consider the complex and important question of training.

32. Mr. DALYANOGLU (Turkey) supported the Philippine amendment in view of the importance of the subject and the need for further study.

33. Mr. SANTA-CRUZ (Chile) supported the Norwegian proposal. The objectives set forth in subparagraphs (a) and (b) of operative paragraph I were directly related to the Sea-Bed Committee's task concerning the creation of international machinery to deal with the sea-bed and the ocean floor beyond the limits of national jurisdiction, and that Committee should at least take a preliminary decision.

34. Mr. AYOUB (Tunisia) said that there were two aspects to the draft resolution. The first concerned training—in particular for nationals of developing countries—and scientific research, both of which had been discussed by

Sub-Committee III of the Sea-Bed Committee at the summer 1971 session. The second was the creation of an intergovernmental sea service which would have implications for the United Nations system and hence would involve co-ordination. He suggested that the Norwegian and Philippine proposals could be combined and that the Sea-Bed Committee should be requested to report to the General Assembly through the Economic and Social Council. The Sea-Bed Committee and the Council would thus be able to study and report on the aspects within their respective spheres of competence.

35. Mr. DE RIVERO (Peru) said that the importance of the subject had been stressed by the Group of 77 at their recent meeting in Lima. The draft resolution introduced a new idea, the most important part of which related to the provision of ships and facilities referred to in subparagraph (a) of operative paragraph 1. The subject needed much more study and his delegation would find it difficult to support the draft resolution at the present time. The Sea-Bed Committee was the appropriate body since it was considering all aspects of marine scientific research. The provision of ships and facilities for use by the United Nations and the specialized agencies would inevitably have repercussions on the proposed international machinery and those would have to be considered by the Economic and Social Council and by the Sea-Bed Committee in connexion with preparations for the conference. It was clearly not the appropriate time for a substantive decision. He supported the Norwegian proposal.

36. Mr. PRAGUE (France) said that the problem was too complex for a decision to be taken at the present session. The matters referred to in the draft resolution were outside the competence of the Sea-Bed Committee but fully within the competence of the Council. He therefore supported the Philippine proposal.

37. Mr. PARDO (Malta) said that the Committee seemed to be in general agreement that it was too late for the General Assembly to take any decision at that time, and his delegation was reluctantly resigned to that fact.

38. In deciding whether to remit the matter to the Sea-Bed Committee or to the Economic and Social Council, the mandates of those two bodies must be taken into account. The enlarged terms of reference of the Sea-Bed Committee (General Assembly resolution 2750 C (XXV)) made no mention of co-ordination within the United Nations system or of training. Certain delegations, including his own, wished international machinery to be set up not merely for the sea-bed but for the ocean as a whole; but the only draft treaty submitted to the Sea-Bed Committee dealing with international machinery for superjacent waters was the one submitted by his own delegation. The annex to the report of the Sea-Bed Committee (A/8421) listed the subjects suggested for the Committee's programme in future years. The suggestions sent in by Norway and the Latin American countries did not include training; the list submitted by the Afro-Asian States contained a point on the transfer of technology which might be so interpreted, but it did not cover the type of training envisaged in his own delegation's draft resolution.

39. If the matter were referred to the Sea-Bed Committee it would take up time better devoted to the conference on

the law of the sea, whereas the Economic and Social Council had specified competence in the matters covered by operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, and for training. The Council had already lost prestige, and should not be deprived of its functions.

40. The Norwegian proposal did not specify when the Sea-Bed Committee should discuss the question, and it would therefore be improved by the addition of the words "at its July-August session in 1972".

41. The urgent question of training nationals of developing countries in maritime skills should not be postponed until after the conference on the law of the sea, for without immediate further training such countries would always be dependent upon the technologically advanced nations which might or might not serve their purposes.

42. Mr. HAMAMOTO (Japan) said that the idea of an intergovernmental sea service was new and his Government had had little time to study it in detail.

43. Regarding draft resolution A/C.2/L.1193/Rev.1, his delegation thought that consideration should be limited to training since the scientific programme, as could be seen from document A/C.2/271, was wide-ranging and not easily definable.

44. If strengthening maritime training was to be considered, the first point should be to strengthen existing projects being undertaken by various United Nations bodies, including FAO and ECAFE.

45. His delegation had difficulties with operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, since it felt that any further studies should be more flexibly defined than in that paragraph.

46. His delegation attached great importance to training personnel from developing countries in maritime affairs, and believed that choice between the idea of an intergovernmental sea service and other forms of training should be at the first instance open to such countries.

47. The Economic and Social Council was the right forum for further consideration of the matter, and he therefore supported the procedural amendment of the Philippine representative.

48. Mr. RAMIREZ-OCAMPO (Colombia) thought that there was a third possible solution, as the representative of Tunisia had indicated. Under Article 63 (2) of the Charter, the Council could co-ordinate the activities of the specialized agencies through consultations, and the Council should therefore act as a co-ordinator in the present matter.

49. The terms of reference of the Sea-Bed Committee would, of course, have to be enlarged if the important matter of training in maritime skills were referred to it. However, the Sea-Bed Committee was more representative than the Council and more competent to deal with the question, which his delegation believed should be referred to it, with the Council retaining the right of co-ordinating the activities of the specialized agencies. He supported the Norwegian proposal.

50. Mr. HUTAGALUNG (Indonesia) supported the proposal to remit the matter to the Council at its fifty-third session.

51. Mr. GUERREIRO (Brazil) thought that there had been a misunderstanding concerning the competence of the Sea-Bed Committee, whose terms of reference had now been broadened to include preparations for a conference on the sea in general. The Sea-Bed Committee necessarily had to consider not only legal matters but also technical, economic and political ones, including the question of how to help the developing countries take better advantage of the sea.

52. The substance of the Maltese proposal was therefore quite relevant to the work of the Sea-Bed Committee, which indeed would be dealing with it whether requested or not to do so by the General Assembly. The Council would have its part to play at a later stage when it became clear whether a new agency was to be set up. No delay would be involved since in any case nothing could be done for at least a year, during which time the developing countries would have to use the existing training facilities. Those countries had confidence in the Sea-Bed Committee to act in accordance with their interests.

53. Mr. RANKIN (Canada) said that his delegation was in favour of the Philippine proposal. He pointed out that the developing countries wishing to obtain maritime skills could do so through the UNDP country programming procedure, and he therefore saw no urgency in the Maltese proposal.

54. Mr. SULEIMAN (Libyan Arab Republic) thought that the matter should be referred to the Council rather than the Sea-Bed Committee, which had to deal with many complex subjects and from which no results could be expected before the conference on the law of the sea, tentatively scheduled for 1973.

55. Mr. CASTAÑEDA-CORNEJO (El Salvador) agreed that the competent body to deal with the matter was the Sea-Bed Committee.

56. Mr. ARVESEN (Norway) thanked the Maltese representative for his co-operative attitude. Opinion in the Committee seemed to be equally divided concerning the merits of referring the question to the Sea-Bed Committee or to the Council. He was prepared to accept the Maltese amendment to include a mention of the July-August session in 1972.

57. As a compromise solution, which he hoped would meet with the unanimous approval of the Committee, he proposed to add to the draft resolution he had orally proposed a second operative paragraph reading:

“Requests the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction to report on this question to the General Assembly through the Economic and Social Council.”

58. Mr. SIBAJENE (Zambia) said that his delegation attached great importance to the draft resolution, which he hoped would be applicable to all developing countries,

coastal and land-locked alike. The developing countries were losing much invisible trade and the establishment of an intergovernmental sea service would improve their position vis-à-vis the developed ones. His delegation felt that the matter should be referred to the Economic and Social Council for further study.

59. Mr. ALCIVAR (Ecuador) recalled the fourth pre-ambular paragraph of General Assembly resolution 2750 C (XXV) to the effect that the problems of ocean space were closely interrelated and needed to be considered as a whole. In view of the very broad terms of reference of the Sea-Bed Committee, it was desirable for that body to deal with the matter.

60. The compromise formula submitted by the Norwegian representative posed a problem, for the Sea-Bed Committee was a subsidiary body of the General Assembly and not of the Council; hence it could not report to the General Assembly through another principal organ of the United Nations. His delegation therefore preferred the Norwegian proposal in its original form.

61. The CHAIRMAN said that, under rule 132 of the rules of procedure, the Maltese draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1193/Rev.1) should be voted upon first. In view of the turn of the discussion, however, he asked whether the Maltese representative still wanted a vote to be taken on his draft resolution.

62. Mr. PARDO (Malta) observed that he had little choice in the matter.

63. Replying to the various comments made, he recalled that the Colombian representative had said that the mandate of the Sea-Bed Committee would be extended by the inclusion of the item under discussion. He suggested that, in that case, the Second Committee should add an additional paragraph to any decision taken, to the effect that the General Assembly had decided to enlarge the competence of the Sea-Bed Committee to enable it to take that item into account.

64. He welcomed the remarks of the Brazilian representative, but would have wished that the Brazilian delegation had given the Maltese delegation more help in the Sea-Bed Committee when it had been trying to change the Committee's title and enlarge its competence.

65. He did not agree that improvement of training for the developing countries, land-locked or otherwise, should await the uncertain outcome of the conference on the law of the sea, and hoped that serious attention and priority could be given to the matter before that time.

66. Mr. SANTA-CRUZ (Chile) endorsed the proposal of the representative of Norway, as amended by the representative of Tunisia. In answer to the comment made by the representative of Ecuador, he pointed out that the General Assembly was fully entitled to request the Sea-Bed Committee to report to it through another principal organ of the United Nations.

67. After a procedural discussion in which Mr. GUERREIRO (Brazil), Mrs. AUGUSTE (Trinidad and Tobago),

Mr. VERCELES (Philippines), Mr. SANTA-CRUZ (Chile), Mr. PRAGUE (France) and Mr. ARVESEN (Norway) took part, Mr. SCHRAM (Iceland) proposed that the debate on the item should be closed.

68. The CHAIRMAN said that in the absence of any objection, the debate was closed. In his opinion, rule 132 of the rules of procedure applied, and the draft resolution submitted orally by the representative of Norway should be voted on first, before the proposal by the representative of the Philippines.

The Norwegian draft resolution was adopted by 46 votes to 14, with 25 abstentions.

69. Mr. PRAGUE (France) said his delegation had opposed the draft resolution because it ignored the proper division of competence among United Nations organs. It was absurd to transmit to the Sea-Bed Committee a proposal for the establishment of a United Nations fleet.

70. Mr. BALLAH (Trinidad and Tobago) said that in its view, the Sea-Bed Committee was competent to deal with training and had done so in the past. General Assembly resolution 2750 C (XXV) instructed that Committee to prepare a comprehensive list of subjects and issues relating

to the law of the sea, which were by no means confined to questions relating to the sea-bed and the ocean floor. A number of the working papers contained in annex I to document A/8421 referred to the question of training, in particular that submitted by the Latin American countries, which stated in article 16 that the international authority to be established for the sea-bed should establish oceanographic institutions on a regional basis for the training of nationals of developing countries in all aspects of marine science and technology. As a member of the Sea-Bed Committee, his delegation attached great importance to that point, and had accordingly voted for the draft resolution.

71. Mr. DALYANOGLU (Turkey) said his delegation had opposed the draft resolution for the same reasons as the representative of France.

72. Mr. SOMERHAUSEN (Belgium) said his delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution on the grounds that no consideration had been given to assigning the study to be carried out to the specialized agency most competent to deal with the subject, namely the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization.

The meeting rose at 6.45 p.m.