



Chairman: Mr. Walter GUEVARA ARZE (Bolivia).

**AGENDA ITEM 12**

**Report of the Economic and Social Council (continued)**  
(A/8003 and Corr.1, chaps. I to VI, VII (sect. A, paras. 234 to 239), VII, X (sects. A to C), XI (sects. B to D, F to J and L) and XIII (sects. A to C and E); A/8003/Add.1)

1. Mr. RANKIN (Canada) said that since draft resolution A/C.2/L.1126 on the World Population Year met the difficulties that had prompted Canada and Madagascar to propose an amendment (A/C.2/L.1113/Rev.1) to the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council for adoption in its resolution 1485 (XLVIII) the sponsors of that amendment were withdrawing it. Canada would support the new draft resolution submitted by India, Indonesia and Pakistan.
2. In view of the economic and social problems the developing nations had to face as a result of too rapid population growth, Canada was now prepared to provide assistance to such countries in the field of population and family planning, as part of its international development assistance. Growing awareness in many developing and developed countries of the implications of the population problem had led to some large-scale voluntary family planning programmes, and the United Nations and IBRD were also giving high priority to support of programmes in the population field.
3. The Canadian International Development Agency had now been authorized to undertake assistance in the population field. Assistance could include contribution to intergovernmental multilateral organizations and internationally recognized private organizations, and support of population research. Bilateral aid would be in response to specific requests from developing countries.
4. The Canadian Government would contribute a total of \$4.25 million over a two-year period to two international agencies: the United Nations Fund for Population Activities would receive \$3 million, \$1 million for 1970-1971 and \$2 million for 1971-1972, and the International Planned Parenthood Federation would receive \$1.25 million, \$0.5 million for 1970-1971 and \$0.75 million for 1971-1972.
5. Mr. GALLARDO MORENO (Mexico) said that his statement should be regarded as an explanation of his vote on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1126. He could not support the draft resolution. He did not consider correct the statement in the third preambular paragraph that the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade (General Assembly resolution 2626 (XXV)) provided for action to deal with the problem of population growth, and he could not accept operative paragraph 5, concerning participation of Member States in the World Population Year. He believed that funds to aid countries that asked for assistance with programmes to control population growth should be specifically designated for that purpose, as indicated by the representative of Canada. The United Nations had such funds available and so had IBRD; they could be used by countries that agreed with such programmes. It was clear that not all countries did so, and thus there was no justification for the implication of the draft resolution that the funds of United Nations bodies in general could be used for that purpose.
6. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) thanked the sponsors of the draft (A/C.2/L.1126) for their efforts to improve on the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council for adoption. It showed a welcome awareness of the importance of rapid population growth to development in some countries, such as Brazil, where there was a low population density in territories rich in natural resources. No uniform solution was possible, and population policies were a matter for the sovereign competence of each Government. He could not support a draft that did not explicitly recognize the need for rapid population growth in certain circumstances. Nevertheless, in a spirit of co-operation, and with due regard for the importance that some countries attached to their population policies, he would abstain from voting instead of opposing the draft resolution, since it did not specifically endorse the United Nations population programmes. His Government's position must not be regarded as any obstacle to United Nations aid in the population field to countries that wanted it; Brazil understood their point of view, and expected the same understanding for its own. The developing countries had the same ideals, and must not allow any external interference to undermine their joint efforts to ensure prosperity for the two thirds of mankind still living in misery, not because they were too many, but because of an unfair world economic situation.
7. Mr. BELFRAGE (Sweden) welcomed the initiative of the Population Commission and the Economic and Social Council in proposing a draft resolution advocating a World Population Year. As his delegation had stated in connexion with the adoption of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade, there was a growing awareness of the gravity of the world population question and an increasingly positive attitude towards population planning. Quite obviously such planning called for co-ordinated international action. To the satisfaction of his delegation, there seemed to be growing resources and preparedness both in individual countries and

in international organizations within the United Nations family to provide the necessary assistance to the developing countries.

8. His delegation considered draft resolution A/C.2/L.1126, which called for a World Population Year, as a first step towards a global strategy in the population field. Such a strategy would, however, have no meaning if it was not based on the measures and actions of the individual countries. Those countries would adopt the policy measures they considered appropriate and necessary in dealing with their own national population problems and in accordance with their own concept of development. At the same time, and in order to obtain a global action, it was the common responsibility of the Member States that those countries would be able to reckon upon a common support. The United Nations system would obviously against that background play an important role when it came to promoting a global and comprehensive approach in the population field. His delegation would in that perspective support the draft resolution.

9. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation's position on the population question was set forth in the joint statement by eight socialist countries on the second decade of development and social progress (A/8074). Demographic policy in any country must be the business of its own independent Government, in the light of its own conditions, and must have the broad support of public opinion in the country, in accordance with the principles of humanity and respect for the basic rights and dignity of the individual. Consequently the Soviet delegation had voted against resolution 1485 (XLVIII) of the Economic and Social Council on the World Population Year. That resolution had been severely criticized by many delegations during the present session. That was why draft resolution A/C.2/L.1126 had been submitted.

10. The new draft was also open to criticism. First, its purpose was to devote substantial material, financial and staff resources from the United Nations, various international organizations, and national Governments, and use them for ends that the Soviet Union regarded as useless. The approach adopted was more a form of advertisement than a scientific attempt to solve important population problems.

11. Secondly, although the new draft referred to national sovereignty and the need to take account of the special circumstances of various countries, it referred to previous General Assembly and Economic and Social Council resolutions on the subject and, in particular, the report of the Secretary-General (E/CN.9/224) and the report of the Consultative Group of Experts on Questions Relating to the Holding of a Third World Population Conference (E/CN.9/224/Add.1) which had been presented to the Population Commission at its fifteenth session and some ideas that the Soviet Union had not supported when the original draft resolution had been submitted to the Council. In fact, revised wording could not conceal the fact that the new version had the same content as the draft resolution recommended by the Council. The draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1126) conflicted with the sovereign right of Member States to conduct their own population policies, and with national traditions.

12. Thirdly, the draft resolution, like that proposed by the Council, contained no reference to the vital connexion between population policies and economic and social development, which should be the main concern of the United Nations. Accordingly, the Soviet Union would vote against the draft resolution.

13. Mr. SOTO (Venezuela) agreed with the Mexican representative that the statement in the third preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1126 was incorrect, although there seemed to be an error of translation in the Spanish text. Moreover, the fifth preambular paragraph contained a value judgement, about the need for further attention to the population problem, that Venezuela could not accept. It was for each Member State to judge whether that problem needed further attention, in the light of its own development. Similarly, the sixth preambular paragraph, referring to "efforts and undertakings in the field of population", embodied another value judgement with which Venezuela did not agree; each country must decide whether or not its efforts were adequate.

14. It was difficult to him to accept the reference in operative paragraph 3 to the report of the Secretary-General on the holding of a Third World Population Conference (E/CN.9/224), a document containing much with which Venezuela did not agree. Operative paragraph 5 should refer to interested Member States, not all Member States. He thanked the sponsors for the inclusion in their draft of operative paragraph 2, which reflected Venezuela's position. Nevertheless, despite the improvements introduced in the draft resolution, he could not support it in the general context of the World Population Year, since Venezuela did not support that idea. Believing that the approach to the problem should vary for each country, he could not support the general approach adopted in the draft resolution. Each country must decide if its population increase might affect its economic development. In the Population Commission, Venezuela had abstained from voting on the draft resolution submitted then, and as it had served as the basis for draft resolution A/C.2/L.1126, and Venezuela's position had not changed, it would have to abstain on the present occasion.

15. He expressed concern over the growing tendency to regard population control as the key to economic and social development. That was wrong; the key lay in the developing countries' own efforts, together with better trading conditions, external financing for development, and the transfer of technology.

16. Mr. OUÉDRAOGO (Upper Volta) thanked the sponsors of the draft resolution for taking account of some points raised during the debate. Despite the improvements, it still contained ideas far removed from his delegation's. The problem concerned was one that each sovereign State must deal with in the light of its own policies. He feared the draft resolution might lead to unforeseen complications, and therefore could not vote for it. His delegation sympathized with countries that had a demographic problem, but it was not a general problem, and must be dealt with on a national basis.

17. Mr. AUBAME (Gabon) said that, in the context of the fifteenth session of the Population Commission, the draft

resolution must be interpreted as tending towards birth control. Many delegations opposed a World Population Year, because at the World Population Congress to be held in 1974, there would be many advocates of birth control. There was a negative approach. Some developing countries were under-populated, and needed very different policies. The President of IBRD and his supporters regarded the population explosion as an obstacle to development that might offset any economic advance, and prevent the savings and investment needed to raise living standards. But in some countries more local labour was needed if investments were to be productive. Man was the basic productive force for economic development. In many countries resources could not be exploited because the manpower was lacking. A low death rate combined with a low birth rate might lead to an unbalanced population with a large number of old people to be supported by relatively few younger people. The emphasis in the third preambular paragraph of the draft resolution was correct; each country must decide whether its population growth hampered its development. The United Nations had not paid enough attention to the problems of the under-populated countries. Aid was available for family planning and birth control, but not for efforts to increase the birth rate, which was the aim in Gabon. He was sceptical about the application of operative paragraph 6, which did not seem in line with the rest of the text. He would abstain from voting on the draft resolution.

18. Mr. AL-ATRACHE (Syria) referred to his earlier comment (1325th meeting) that the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council for adoption in its resolution 1485 (XLVIII) took insufficient account of the difference between over-populated and under-populated countries. He had pointed out that the latter countries might need a high rate of population growth in order to maximize their economic potential and, for example, that in Syria a shortage of labour was the only obstacle to the furtherance of the Euphrates Project. He was glad that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1126 had taken those views into consideration in formulating their text. Its operative paragraphs 2, 3 and 6 were especially welcome; operative paragraph 6 in particular reflected the idea that international assistance should be guided by the realization that demographic policies were a question not only of reducing population growth, but also of urbanization and population movement, especially where manpower was concerned. Syria would therefore vote in favour of that draft resolution.

19. Mr. PRAGUE (France) was glad draft resolution A/C.2/L.1126 recognized, as his country did, that indiscriminate birth control was inappropriate and that countries should decide their own population policies in the light of their economic and social conditions and their convictions. World Population Year should be an occasion for the objective study and careful reflection often lacking when population problems were considered.

20. Mr. CUBILLOS (Chile) welcomed the changes which had been incorporated in draft resolution A/C.2/L.1126, especially operative paragraph 2; they made it much more acceptable to Chile than the resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council for adoption. But the basic difficulty remained: population problems were being wrongly approached. International organizations concerned

with population questions tended to regard population growth as a consequence of under-development instead of looking to the cause of under-development itself. The developing countries knew that the real need was to attack the causes of under-development through an increase in trade and financial aid, greater access to modern technology and co-operation between developed and developing countries in all areas of technical assistance. The population growth problem was artificially emphasized by developed countries as an excuse for them to escape their obligations to the international community. Institutions such as IBRD seemed to have the same attitude. If those ideas became universally accepted, developing countries would find their eligibility for international finance or market access facilities depending on their success in lowering their population growth rates. Chile was resolutely opposed to attitudes of that kind and strongly supported what the Senegalese representative had said on the subject at the previous meeting. Because draft resolution A/C.2/L.1126 reflected a misguided approach to the problem and implied that economic assistance and population growth were incompatible, his delegation would be obliged to abstain in the vote.

21. Mr. MONCAYO (Ecuador) welcomed the recognition in operative paragraphs 2 and 3 of the draft resolution that population problems were matters of the internal competence of each State. But his delegation doubted the wisdom of proclaiming 1974 as World Population Year; it would be a pure formality, since no programme of action was being approved for that year. To make such a proclamation without backing it up by concrete action aimed at eliminating under-development was no real help to developing countries. Moreover, the way in which the third preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1126 was formulated suggested that population growth was an isolated problem or a problem of under-development as such. Although his delegation recognized the virtues of the draft, it could not completely accept it.

22. Mr. SULEIMAN (Libya) said that his delegation had spoken earlier (1326th meeting) of the need for the problems of under-populated developing countries to receive due attention. It had also stressed that the responsibility for demographic programmes lay with individual Governments and that the international community should focus attention on the seriousness of the population problem and assist countries to formulate policies appropriate to their needs. The draft resolution, and in particular its sixth preambular paragraph and its operative paragraphs 1, 2 and 3, reflected those views and his delegation would therefore support it.

23. Mr. CASTILLERO (Panama) said that his delegation would support the draft resolution because it reflected a constructive compromise and satisfactorily defined the relationship which should exist between international organizations and developing countries on population questions. Panama, a country with a rising population and steep economic growth, considered that its problems could be tackled from the standpoint of the draft resolution. The text rightly implied that not all developing countries were in the same position and that, because of differing national conditions and convictions, international organizations must adopt a prudent approach which respected national

sovereignty and sensibilities and avoided any undue pressure on States with regard to their population policies.

24. Mr. NDUNG'U (Kenya) said that draft resolution A/C.2/L.1126 seemed to find favour with many delegations. Kenya particularly welcomed its third preambular paragraph and its operative paragraphs 2 and 3, which clearly acknowledged the internal competence of States to formulate their own population policies and recognized that international action should be responsive to the specific needs of individual countries. His delegation would therefore support the draft resolution. However, the Senegalese representative had sounded a timely warning at the preceding meeting that it is necessary to protect and promote life rather than destroy it.

25. He proposed two amendments to the draft resolution consequent upon the change made by the Indian representative in the fifth preambular paragraph: in operative paragraph 2 the words "demographic sphere" should be altered to "population field" and in operative paragraph 6 the word "demographic" should be replaced by the word "population".

26. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) regretted that draft resolution A/C.2/L.1126 was not worded more strongly. He disagreed with the Chilean representative that the root of under-development lay elsewhere than in the population problem. Over-populated countries had to take steps to control unmanageable population levels. Many African, Latin American and Asian countries needed some form of population control; in that connexion, it was encouraging to note that it had been decided, at a meeting held within the framework of ECA, to establish a system of periodic population programming to enable African countries to keep abreast of the expansion anticipated in the Second Development Decade. Other useful initiatives were the future African and world population conferences. Population problems underlay all environmental and social action, so it was wrong to place the emphasis elsewhere. The third preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1126 was worded in such a way as not to imply any obligation on States to follow a particular population policy. The draft was mild enough to be acceptable to countries which considered that their populations were not growing fast enough to meet their development needs. Its operative paragraphs found favour with his own delegation even if they were not exactly what it would wish to see in a resolution on population, bearing in mind the emphasis the report of the Commission on International Development<sup>1</sup> had placed on the solution of the population problem. Greece would therefore support the proposal in the draft resolution.

27. Mr. GOBBA (United Arab Republic) said that the draft resolution was in keeping with the principles decided on for the International Development Strategy after long discussion and did not impose any new concepts on States. It left countries free to adopt such proposals for action by the United Nations system as they saw fit in the light of their individual situations. The United Arab Republic would certainly have to take action to control its rapidly

growing population. His delegation was fully aware that international assistance on population questions should not be allowed to stand in the way of economic co-operation between developed and developing countries to solve the latter's long-term problems.

28. Mr. BOUKLI-HASSEN (Algeria) said that his delegation could not support the draft resolution because it did not sufficiently recognize the exclusive competence of States to formulate their own population policies nor the fact that not all countries had a population growth problem. Nor did it take adequate account of the position of countries, particularly those with unexploited resources, where a high rate of population growth, far from acting as a deterrent to economic expansion, could in fact encourage it. The efforts of the United Nations system should be concentrated on economic and social development through the rational exploitation of national resources by means of modern technology. Because the emphasis of the draft resolution lay elsewhere, Algeria would be unable to vote in favour of it.

29. Mr. ARUEDE (Nigeria) said that his delegation applauded the efforts of the sponsors of the draft resolution to formulate a text which reflected the views expressed in the Committee. Nigeria found it satisfactory and would support it. Operative paragraph 2 was particularly acceptable since it was fully in keeping with Nigeria's voluntary approach to the problem and its view that the ultimate responsibility for a country's population policy lay with its Government. Action by the international community should be strictly limited to facilitating the implementation of countries' decisions. In Nigeria's experience, the size of the family was closely connected with the level of education of the parents; those industrial countries concerned about rising populations would therefore do well to intensify their aid programmes in areas such as rural education. Education was the key to the population problem.

30. Mr. SAM (Ghana) welcomed draft resolution A/C.2/L.1126 as a considerable improvement on the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council for adoption. His delegation appreciated the importance of family planning and population control, which were closely connected with economic development. The new draft seemed to emphasize over-population at the expense of under-population and Ghana therefore hoped that the programme which the Secretary-General would be requested to prepare under operative paragraph 3 would take good account of countries such as those in West Africa which needed larger populations to make their economies viable. Ghana had adopted a population policy appropriate to its own circumstances.

31. Mr. FRANCO HOLGUIN (International Bank for Reconstruction and Development) said that the report of the Commission on International Development had recognized at the outset that demographic conditions in the less developed countries were extremely varied. It had therefore recommended that developing countries should identify their own population problems, recognize the relevance of population growth to their development plans and adopt measures suited to their situation. It also recommended that bilateral and multilateral organizations should call, in

<sup>1</sup> Commission on International Development, *Partners in Development* (Praeger Publishers, Inc., New York, 1969).

aid negotiations, for an adequate analysis of population problems and on their bearing on development programmes. The Bank itself considered such problems as one of the elements affecting development potential which it evaluated in the course of a continuing dialogue on economic policies and on the direction of the development effort with the member country. The report of the Commission on International Development had made it clear that aid givers should not insist on a suitable population policy as a precondition for aid, and the Bank Group fully agreed. It did not make satisfactory population policies a condition of its loans; nevertheless, it was fully aware of the seriousness of the problem in several parts of the world, and was ready to help Governments requiring assistance. The first loan for dealing with population problems had been granted to Jamaica in 1969, and a number of other requests had been received and were under active consideration; the Bank intended to increase its ability to meet requests in that area.

32. Mr. DIXIT (India) said he could, on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1126, accept the suggestion of the representative of Kenya that "demographic sphere" in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution should be replaced by "population field"; however, the word "demographic" should be retained in operative paragraph 6, where it was deliberately used in a more restricted technical sense.

33. He wished to point out to those delegations which had complained that the third preambular paragraph gave a distorted picture of the International Development Strategy that the paragraph also contained the words "in those countries which, in accordance with their concept of development, consider that their rate of population growth hampers their development"; it was clear that there was no infringement of national prerogatives.

34. Mr. BRILLANTES (Philippines) withdrew amendment A/C.2/L.1115 to the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council which had not been incorporated into draft resolution A/C.2/L.1126.

35. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1126, as orally amended by the sponsors.

*At the request of the Guatemalan representative, the vote was taken by roll-call.*

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

*In favour:* Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Burma, Canada, Ceylon, China, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cyprus, Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Ghana, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Libya, Malaysia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa.

*Against:* Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mali, Mongolia, Poland.

*Abstaining:* Swaziland, Togo, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Algeria, Argentina, Brazil, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Israel, Ivory Coast, Lebanon, Liberia, Madagascar, Malta, Mexico, Morocco, Nicaragua, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Spain.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 53 votes to 9, with 33 abstentions.*

36. Mr. MILTON (United Kingdom), speaking in explanation of vote, said that although his delegation still felt that the draft resolution placed somewhat too much stress on the World Population Year itself, it had voted in favour of it as a demonstration of its support for United Nations population activities in general.

37. Mr. QUARONI (Italy), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution in spite of its doubts as to the advisability of population activities at a world level, since it would prefer programmes to be conducted more on a regional and national basis. It attached special importance to the reference in the draft resolution to General Assembly resolution 2211 (XXI), which in its last preambular paragraph recognized the sovereignty of nations in formulating and promoting their own population policies, with due regard to the principle that the size of the family should be the free choice of each family.

38. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that, had he been present for the vote on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1126, his delegation would have voted for it.

39. The CHAIRMAN said he assumed the Committee, having adopted draft resolution A/C.2/L.1126, agreed to take no action on the resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council for adoption in its resolution 1485 (XLVIII).

*It was so decided.*

40. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, with regard to the Secretary-General's report, the Committee should recommend that the General Assembly take note of the report of the Secretary-General on the world population situation (E/4778).

*It was so decided.*

41. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to examine the questions of the exploitation and conservation of living marine resources and international co-operation on questions related to the oceans.

42. Mr. SULEIMAN (Libya) noted that in its resolution 2413 (XXIII) the General Assembly had invited Governments of Member States to increase international co-operation in the field of development and exploitation of

living marine resources. The Committee had before it the Secretary-General's report on the subject (E/4842) prepared in collaboration with the Director-General of FAO. The Committee also had before it the Secretary-General's report on international co-operation in questions relating to oceans (E/4836), prepared pursuant to General Assembly resolution 2414 (XXIII).

43. If useful results were to be obtained from the exploitation of the resources of the sea for the benefit of mankind, the various activities must be co-ordinated and duplication of effort must be avoided. For example, there were more than twenty intergovernmental fishery bodies in operation, apart from the five established within the framework of FAO. The Committee on Fisheries of FAO had adopted measures for effective co-operation and co-ordination among those bodies, and his delegation believed that that Committee could play a major role in facilitating the transfer of knowledge and technology from developed to developing nations in connexion with fisheries, a subject which was of great importance to the developing world.

44. It was clear from the report (E/4842) that there were many specialized agencies and intergovernmental organizations which had some connexion with the exploitation of the living resources of the sea, and which could assist the developing countries in the exploration and exploitation of those resources. Significant results had already been achieved. From 1958 to 1965, food production from the sea had increased at an annual average rate of 7 per cent, rising in 1968 to an estimated 64 million tons, an encouraging figure in view of the fact that the total demand for fish was projected at 74 million tons for 1975 and 107 million tons for 1985.

45. In its resolution 1537 (XLIX), the Economic and Social Council had requested the Secretary-General to submit a brief report on the manner in which international co-operation relating to the seas might be strengthened. In preparing that report, the Secretary-General could draw on the vast and varied experience of many nations and international organizations. Oceanographic activities, in spite of their rapid development, had produced only a fraction of the scientific knowledge necessary for the exploration and exploitation of the seas and oceans in the interests of mankind. The efforts so far made must be continued and co-ordinated. The Long-Term and Expanded Programme of Oceanographic Research<sup>2</sup> would be extremely important in that context; his delegation therefore welcomed the steps being taken to implement the Programme, and the co-operation between the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission of UNESCO and other organizations within the United Nations system. Scientific co-operation was the basic factor in encouraging the exploration and exploitation of the marine environment for the benefit of all mankind.

46. Any recommendations by the Secretary-General concerning marine co-operation should stress the need for all countries to join in a common effort to promote co-operation and co-ordinate their activities both at the national and the international levels with due regard to the possibilities

of regional arrangements on a bilateral or multilateral basis. National oceanographic activities should be co-ordinated with those of international organizations and institutions. The activities of the various existing intergovernmental organizations should also be co-ordinated, with due regard to the important role which could be played by regional organizations, and private activities should be co-ordinated with international, regional and global activities.

47. Systematic dissemination of information should be encouraged by the establishment of an appropriate system to promote study and research and make their results available to all nations, private institutions and individuals. Adequate programmes to popularize marine science should be established, while programmes for technical assistance should be initiated to assist developing countries in increasing their capabilities, expanding their capacities and enabling them to share in the experience gained by the advanced countries with regard to marine science.

48. Pollution and other hazards of marine environment, especially radio-active contamination, should be avoided through appropriate national and international measures. Due regard should also be given to the conservation of living marine resources. It had recently been stated that, contrary to the general belief, 90 per cent of the world's oceans were a biological desert, and that the remaining 10 per cent which supported life was probably already being fished at maximum efficiency. If that was true, appropriate measures must be taken to protect the living resources of that 10 per cent and to utilize them effectively for the benefit of mankind as a whole.

49. Mr. STELLINI (Malta) stressed the importance which his delegation attached to the implementation of Economic and Social Council resolution 1537 (XLIX). The background review requested in paragraph 1 of the resolution should, if thoroughly prepared, prove extremely helpful to Member States, particularly to developing countries which encountered great difficulties in assembling facts on the rapid developments taking place in relation to the seas and oceans and their exploitation. It was to be hoped that the review would enable States to fit the facts together in such a manner as to provide a basis for rational decision-making at a political level. States would also be enabled to examine the nature of the international co-operation needed to avert a serious crisis with regard to ocean space. The rapid intensified use of the seas and oceans made it imperative to adopt new forms of international co-operation, and his delegation hoped that the proposed review would consider that question very carefully.

50. Another purpose of Council resolution 1537 (XLIX) was to obtain a competent and impartial examination of the nature of current activities within the United Nations system related to the seas and oceans and of the adequacy of existing international machinery. The aim would be to strengthen the system so that its component elements could guide the changes which were taking place into constructive channels. The United Nations system must become more responsive to the realities of the contemporary situation, particularly the new and complex problems caused by scientific and technological advances which were undermining the foundations of the present régime of the seas.

<sup>2</sup> See A/7750, annex.

51. Ideally, his delegation hoped that the review would contain a whole range of suggestions and recommendations firmly based on ascertained needs for international co-operation in ocean space in the light of the rapidly changing situation. They would cover desirable changes in the United Nations system, its policies, activities and machinery and new forms of international co-operation. The purpose would be to strengthen the capability of the system to assist Member States in the peaceful, equitable and rational development of ocean space in all its dimensions. His delegation therefore earnestly hoped that all States would assist the Secretary-General in the preparation of his report by submitting any proposals they wished to make for strengthening international co-operation in the marine environment, in accordance with paragraph 3 of the Economic and Social Council resolution.

52. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, with regard to the exploitation and conservation of living marine resources, the Committee should recommend that the General Assem-

bly take note of the relevant section of the report of the Economic and Social Council (E/8003 and Corr.1, chap. III, sect. B) on the report of the Secretary-General and the Director-General of FAO on the exploitation and conservation of living marine resources (E/4842), submitted pursuant to the General Assembly resolution 2413 (XXIII) of 17 December 1968.

53. He also suggested that, with regard to international co-operation on questions related to the oceans, the Committee should recommend that the General Assembly take note of the report of the Secretary-General on international co-operation on questions related to the oceans (E/4836), prepared in pursuance of General Assembly resolution 2414 (XXIII) of 17 December 1968.

*It was so decided.*

*The meeting rose at 6 p.m.*