

United Nations  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY

EIGHTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



SECOND COMMITTEE, 940th  
MEETING

Monday, 2 December 1963,  
at 10.55 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 33:</i>	
<i>Economic development of under-developed countries (continued):</i>	
(c) <i>Decentralization of the economic and social activities of the United Nations and strengthening of the regional economic commissions (continued) . . . . .</i>	367
<i>Agenda item 12:</i>	
<i>Report of the Economic and Social Council (continued) . . . . .</i>	369

*Chairman:* Mr. Ismael THAJEB (Indonesia).

AGENDA ITEM 33

Economic development of under-developed countries (A/5532) (continued):

(c) Decentralization of the economic and social activities of the United Nations and strengthening of the regional economic commissions (E/3786, E/3798, A/5584, A/C.2/L.742/Rev.3 and Add.1) (continued)

1. Mr. HOLMES (Ireland) confirmed that he had withdrawn his amendments (A/C.2/L.776) in favour of the newly revised text of the draft resolution (A/C.2/L.742/Rev.3 and Add.1) on the understanding that, in following the recommendation in operative paragraph 4, the Secretary-General would explore ways and means of finding a solution to the problem of decentralization in the Middle East.

2. Mr. DE ALTHAUS (Peru) explained that he supported the draft resolution for purely technical reasons.

3. Mr. KADOTA (Japan) said that sponsors had failed to explain why they had not accepted the Japanese amendment to operative paragraph 5, presented orally at the preceding meeting. Since the point in question was important and had been stressed both in the report of the Secretary-General (E/3786) and in that of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (A/5584), he formally proposed that the words "in full association with TAB resident representatives and directors of Special Fund programmes" should be added at the end of paragraph 5. He also suggested that the words "as appropriate" should be inserted after the words "should continue" in operative paragraph 7, and he asked the Chairman to put that paragraph to a separate vote if the sponsors did not accept his suggestion. He was prepared to accept the new wording of paragraph 9 on the understanding that TAC would in fact have an opportunity of considering the report in question.

4. Mr. VIAUD (France) said his delegation would abstain in the vote on operative paragraph 4, preferring to leave the matter of the United Nations Office

in Beirut to the Secretary-General. He could support the Japanese amendment to paragraph 5 because it did not change the substance and clarified the text. Similar provisions had been included in previous resolutions on the subject. He was glad to note that the sponsors had assured the Committee that in paragraph 7 they were in no way seeking to undermine the basic principle that each country had the right to submit requests for technical assistance directly to the organizations concerned. With reference to paragraph 9, his delegation had already abstained from voting on previous resolutions on the same subject on the grounds that, in some respects, the policy of decentralization was going too far. Moreover, the words "to accelerate the continuing implementation" were not clear. He would abstain in the vote on that paragraph or request a separate vote on that particular phrase.

5. Mr. GHAUS (Afghanistan) stressed that even with the addition proposed by the Japanese representative, the text of operative paragraph 5 remained ambiguous. It implied that the regional economic commission would be able to interfere in projects requested at the country level, whereas in fact all States should be able to apply directly to Headquarters for such projects. He would therefore request a separate vote on paragraph 5. He could accept the Japanese amendment to paragraph 7 but, if the sponsors rejected it, he would have to abstain on that paragraph too. He also requested separate votes on the words "vigorously" in paragraph 1 and "to accelerate" in paragraph 9, because neither of them had appeared in previous resolutions and both implied an all-out policy of decentralization.

6. Mr. TELL (Jordan) said the sponsors could accept the Japanese amendment to operative paragraph 7, but still felt that that delegations's amendment to paragraph 5 was unnecessary. The resident representatives of TAB and the directors of Special Fund programmes were not concerned with regional projects—the subject of the draft resolution—and to mention them would run counter to the whole purpose of the text. The sponsors had already made it clear that they were not seeking to introduce any new policy or to infringe the basic principle that countries were fully entitled to submit requests at the country level with no interference from anybody, even the resident representatives. In any case, the draft resolution was concerned with permanent arrangements: it was to be hoped that in ten or fifteen years the resident representatives would no longer be necessary, once countries were able to prepare requests themselves.

7. Mr. AYARI (Tunisia) thought it would be extremely inadvisable to engage in a discussion of the role of the resident representatives. It would be far better to allow the executive secretaries of the regional economic commissions to decide in each case whether consultation with them was necessary. He would therefore propose that, at the end of the Japanese amendment to

operative paragraph 5, the words "wherever necessary" should be added.

8. Mr. KADOTA (Japan) accepted the Tunisian sub-amendment.

9. Mr. GHAUS (Afghanistan) failed to see why the sponsors could not accept the Japanese amendment to operative paragraph 5 when they had accepted the principle underlying it. Instead of requesting a separate vote on the words "to accelerate" in operative paragraph 9, he asked the sponsors to accept the wording "to continued implementation of the policy . . ."

10. U MAUNG MAUNG (Burma) said the sponsors could not accept the deletions sought by some delegations because those modifications would destroy the whole aim of the draft resolution and hence the reason for submitting it. It had been said that such words as "vigorously" and "to accelerate" had not been included in previous resolutions but, if the text was to confine itself to language already used, no progress would be made and no further resolution would be necessary. The draft resolution was the logical outcome of the implementation of the policy laid down in the most recent General Assembly resolution on the subject and hence the text contained words which were in the nature of a logical progression of the implementation measures. In any case, the words in question were concerned with matters of implementation and hence did not constitute any qualification of the general policy of decentralization laid down by the General Assembly.

11. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) thought it might be advisable for the sponsors to assure the Committee that the assistance to be given by the regional economic commissions would be rendered only at the request of the countries concerned.

12. Mr. GHEBEH (Syria) said that the draft resolution was in full conformity with General Assembly resolutions 1709 (XVI) and 1823 (XVII). As from 1 April 1963, only two economic affairs officers had been outposted to the economic unit in the United Nations Office in Beirut. The unit had three main shortcomings. First, it was too small to carry out its responsibilities, which were described in paragraph 23 of the Secretary-General's report (E/3786). Secondly, its inclusion within the administrative structure of the existing Regional Social Affairs Office for the Middle East, at Beirut, limited the importance of the unit and its ability to function. The economic unit should eventually be separated from the Regional Social Affairs Office. Meanwhile, the unit should be enlarged within the existing organizational structure. The Regional Social Affairs Office should be renamed "United Nations Economic and Social Affairs Office" and should be headed by a director who was a senior economist. The economic section should have a separate budget. The third shortcoming was that the unit lacked the necessary means to fulfil its technical role of assisting in the formulation and evaluation of technical assistance and Special Fund projects.

13. It was to be hoped that the Secretariat would explore ways and means of expanding the economic and social activities of the United Nations Office in Beirut along those lines and in accordance with operative paragraph 3 of Economic and Social Council resolution 955 (XXXVI). The work of the economic unit at Beirut would be of only limited usefulness unless it was co-ordinated with the development plans of the region. It was therefore essential to provide a technical assistance co-ordination unit for the countries

concerned. Budgetary resources had provided for the establishment of technical assistance co-ordination units in the ECA, ECAFE and ECLA secretariats and the Technical Assistance Office in Geneva had already been transferred to the ECE secretariat. The establishment of a technical assistance co-ordination unit in the Beirut Office would render justice to an area which had for long been deprived of the services enjoyed by other regions.

14. The sponsors of the draft resolution had originally wanted to include an invitation to the Director of the United Nations Office in Beirut to attend annual meetings with the executive secretaries of the regional economic commissions. The attendance of the Director of the Beirut Office at such meetings was necessary for him to express his views on the work of the Office and to benefit from the experience gained in other regions. However, in order to eliminate any misunderstanding, the sponsors had agreed to delete that invitation. They hoped that the Secretariat would in the future bear in mind their recommendation in that connexion.

15. The draft resolution proposed measures which were justified by the objectives set forth in the United Nations Charter and in previous General Assembly resolutions. His delegation hoped that the text, of which it was a sponsor, would be adopted unanimously.

16. Mr. ALI (Pakistan) shared the doubts expressed by the Afghan representative regarding operative paragraph 5. Although it was desirable to strengthen them, the regional economic commissions should not intervene in requests for technical or Special Fund assistance, which should be made directly by the Governments concerned.

17. Mr. AHMED (Sudan) said that, in a spirit of co-operation, the sponsors agreed to make certain changes. They thought, however, that the terms of the draft resolution, which was a statement of general policy, should not be too specific since that would make it difficult for the Secretary-General to implement the resolution.

18. In operative paragraph 1, the word "vigorously" had been deleted, despite the fact that it had been used in previous resolutions, because it also appeared in the Secretary-General's report (E/3786). In addition, the phrase "his further intention of implementing" had been changed to read "his intention of further implementing".

19. With regard to operative paragraph 5, the sponsors had accepted the Japanese amendment and Tunisian sub-amendment. In view of the fact that TAB and the Special Fund were bodies which were separate from the Council, the sponsors thought it necessary to use the word "co-operation" instead of the word "association" proposed by the Japanese representative. It must be made clear, however, that by accepting that amendment, the sponsors were not placing the resident representatives on a par with the executive secretaries of the regional economic commissions. Some representatives had expressed misgivings that the paragraph might be regarded as an encroachment on the sovereignty of Member States, but it should not be interpreted as implying any limitation whatsoever on the freedom of States or as imposing any assistance which they did not desire.

20. As regards operative paragraph 7, the sponsors had agreed to accept the insertion of the words "as appropriate," between the words "continue" and "to".

21. The sponsors had not found it possible to accept any amendments to operative paragraph 9 because they believed that any change would represent a step backwards.

22. Mr. KADOTA (Japan) thanked the sponsors for having accepted his delegation's suggestions. The Japanese delegation would vote in favour of the amended draft resolution.

23. Mr. GHAUS (Afghanistan) thanked the sponsors for agreeing to delete the word "vigorously" from operative paragraph 1. In view of the revision of paragraph 5, his delegation withdrew its request for a separate vote on that paragraph. He asked the Rapporteur to include in the report of the Committee the interpretation which the sponsors had given of that paragraph. His delegation was glad that the sponsors had agreed to insert the words "as appropriate" in paragraph 7. He regretted, however, that they had not found it possible to accept his amendment to paragraph 9 and would therefore press for a separate vote on that amendment.

24. Mr. APPIAH (Ghana), Rapporteur, pointed out that, in accordance with past practice, the report would refer the reader to the relevant summary records for the sponsors' interpretation.

25. Mr. VAN TILBURG (Netherlands), explaining his vote, reiterated his delegation's support of the present policy of decentralization. Considerable progress had been made in the implementation of that policy and no new resolutions seemed necessary. The regional economic commissions were performing essential work and their secretariats were very competent.

26. The retention, in operative paragraph 4, of the recommendation to the Secretary-General to establish a technical assistance co-ordination unit in the United Nations Office in Beirut had caused his delegation some difficulty. The sponsors should have repeated the invitation to the Secretary-General in Council resolution 955 (XXXVI). They would thus have left it to the Secretary-General to exercise his judgement and take the necessary action. In that connexion, he recalled the statement made by the Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs in the Committee at the preceding meeting.

27. As it stood, however, operative paragraph 4 implied that the United Nations Office in Beirut was something more than an office under the full and complete authority and responsibility of the Secretary-General, an implication which his delegation could not accept. The Netherlands delegation would have voted in favour of the Irish amendment (A/C.2/L.776). It requested a separate vote on the words "and recommends to the Secretary-General the establishment of a technical assistance co-ordination unit in the United Nations Office in Beirut". If that phrase was retained, his delegation would abstain in the vote on the resolution as a whole.

28. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the Afghan amendment to operative paragraph 9 to replace the words "accelerate the continuing" by the word "continue".

*The Afghan amendment was rejected by 47 votes to 24, with 21 abstentions.*

29. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the phrase "and recommends to the Secretary-General the establishment of a technical assistance co-

ordination unit in the United Nations Office in Beirut" in operative paragraph 4.

*At the request of the representative of the Ukrainian SSR, a vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Saudi Arabia, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Spain, Sudan, Syria, Tanganyika, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Ghana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania.

*Against:* United States of America, Dominican Republic, Israel, Luxembourg, Netherlands.

*Abstaining:* Sierra Leone, Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Cambodia, Canada, Congo (Leopoldville), Cyprus, Dahomey, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, France, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Portugal.

*The phrase was adopted by 59 votes to 5, with 31 abstentions.*

*The draft resolution as a whole (A/C.2/L.742/Rev.3 and Add.1), as amended, was adopted by 88 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.*

## AGENDA ITEM 12

Report of the Economic and Social Council (A/5503, chap. V, sect. I; A/C.2/L.745 and Add.1-3) (continued)

30. Mr. JAZAIRY (Algeria) said that the recent political "détente" and the increasing interest being taken in the development of the developing countries should be reflected at the economic level. That explained the importance attached by several delegations to the formulation of a declaration on international economic co-operation and the interest of his delegation in the draft resolution on that question (A/C.2/L.745 and Add.1-3). There seemed to be no fundamental objection to the principle of a declaration; Economic and Social Council resolution 875 (XXXIII) had been adopted unanimously. At the thirty-third session of the Council, the Australian representative had spoken of the need for a general declaration of the principles of international economic co-operation in the widest possible sense (1203rd meeting). The usefulness of such a declaration and the fact that it would not duplicate previous United Nations resolutions were confirmed in the introduction to the revised compendium of extracts from resolutions of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council involving principles of international economic co-operation (E/3714). Paragraph 13 of the introduction stated that the great majority of the decisions taken contained no statements of principles or beliefs.

31. There were differences of opinion about the contents of a general declaration of principles. However, the draft resolution did not in any way commit Member States in that regard. Some delegations had expressed the fear that the *ad hoc* Working Group established under Council resolution 875 (XXXIII) might prejudice the conclusions to be reached at the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. However, the Working Group had not formulated a final text for a declaration and had been unable to examine proposals concerning articles dealing with international trade. Nor had it been able to decide on a text relating to the role of the United Nations in the development of international economic co-operation.

32. His delegation could not understand the reason for some of the amendments submitted by the Australian delegation (A/C.2/L.777). The term "declaration" had been used in previous resolutions, for which the Australian delegation had voted. The term was not incompatible with the idea of a "generally acceptable pronouncement", which was the aim of the Australian amendment to operative paragraph 1. If the issue was simply one of terminology, the draft resolution could be given the title "Question of a declaration on international economic co-operation", which had been used in previous resolutions. If the Australian amendments concerning deletion of the word "declaration" were intended to be substantive in nature, they might prejudice the conclusions of the *ad hoc* Working Group and of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. All were agreed that the Committee could not at the moment adopt a stand on the question. The Algerian delegation could support the Australian amendment requesting the insertion in operative paragraph 2 of a reference to the *ad hoc* Working Group.

33. Mr. ROUANET (Brazil) said that his delegation had always attached the greatest importance to the drafting of a declaration on international economic co-operation. When the Soviet Union had raised the matter at the thirty-third session of the Council, Brazil had fully supported it. His delegation had pointed out, however, that the Soviet draft (E/3467) was not complete and that the principles it contained could be improved. It believed that a new set of principles should be formulated as soon as possible. At the same session, it had been argued that attempts had already been made in many resolutions to state principles relating to international economic co-operation and that a new set would merely be a supplement. In his delegation's view, the elaboration of valid principles would be far from an academic exercise. There were several General Assembly resolu-

tions which contained a number of important principles concerning international economic co-operation and the time had come to combine some of them in a new General Assembly resolution. The question was all the more important in view of the forthcoming United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, which would surely devote its attention to specific issues. The Brazilian delegation believed, however, that the Conference should also deal with broader subjects, such as the whole pattern of international economic co-operation. It should draw up the constitution of a new order based on its examination of old and new principles.

34. In their joint statement contained in the report of the Preparatory Committee of the Conference on its second session (E/3799), the representatives of the developing countries had said that the existing principles and patterns of world trade still favoured mainly the advanced parts of the world. Those countries had therefore recognized that the existing principles were inadequate. Many of the principles which had governed international economic relations in the nineteenth century were no longer valid and could not be used indiscriminately. The principle of reciprocity was no longer applied; nor was the most-favoured-nation clause observed without qualifications. If a constitution or a set of principles became obsolete, it should be replaced.

35. The draft resolution did not prejudice the results of the Conference. It was procedural and raised no new problems. The question had been discussed for a long time, and the form in which the text should be presented should be settled once and for all. The Algerian representative had recalled that the *ad hoc* Working Group had not drafted any articles on international trade. It had not done so because that matter would be considered by the Conference. The draft resolution did not call upon the Conference to take up specific questions, to draft a declaration or to define the principles which would be laid down in a declaration. It merely expressed the hope that the examination at the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development of the problems of international trade would contribute to the speeding up of the final elaboration and adoption of a declaration on the principles of international economic co-operation.

36. His delegation did not regard most of the Australian amendments (A/C.2/L.777) as helpful, since they sought to omit the idea of a declaration. It was essential to retain that idea.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.