



President: Mr. Rachid DRISS (Tunisia).

AGENDA ITEM 8

Natural resources (concluded):

(a) Report of the Committee on Natural Resources (concluded)* (E/4969, E/4989, chap. VI, sect. C; E/L.1399, E/L.1411 and Add.1, E/L.1413, E/L.1414, E/L.1415)

1. Mr. FAROOQ (Pakistan) observed that document E/L.1411/Add.1 stating the administrative and financial implications of draft resolution E/L.1411 gave no indication of the financial implications of the periodic report which would have to be prepared pursuant to part G of the draft, concerning permanent sovereignty over natural resources.
2. Mr. BENOIT (Chief, Financial Policy and Institutions Section, Division of Public Finance and Financial Institutions) said that the wide-ranging report called for in paragraph 131 of the report of the Committee on Natural Resources (E/4969) would require a great deal of research. For that reason, it had been envisaged that the proposed report would cover a limited number of countries at a time—five in Africa, five in Asia and five in Latin America. Virtually none of the information required was available in existing published material and intensive on-the-spot research by staff members would thus be necessary. At the time of the adoption of General Assembly resolution 2692 (XXV), the Secretary-General had not been requested to prepare a report and, therefore, no financial provision had been made for that purpose. The Division of Public Finance and Financial Institutions, which would be responsible for drawing up the report, had no funds at its disposal to defray the cost involved and an additional allocation of \$20,000 would be required to prepare the report in the form proposed by the Committee on Natural Resources.
3. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said with reference to part D of the draft resolution (E/L.1411) that he thought the Secretary-General, in co-operation with the agencies concerned, should be able to accomplish the task of defining more clearly the objectives and purposes of the proposed international water conference without the advice and assistance of an *ad hoc* group of experts, the convening of which would cost an estimated \$12,000.
4. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) endorsed the comments of the USSR representative. He also wished to point out that the views of a larger number of government experts concerning such a conference could be ascertained at the next session of the Committee on Natural Resources at no cost whatsoever to the United Nations.
5. Mr. AYOUB (Tunisia), referring to parts C and G of the draft resolution, said he wondered whether endorsement by the Council of decisions taken by the Committee on Natural Resources was necessary to enable funds for the implementation of those decisions to be provided. Was that procedure customary or did it apply solely to that Committee? Moreover, it did not seem appropriate for the Council to consider the financial implications of convening an *ad hoc* group of experts, as referred to in operative paragraph 2 of part D of the draft resolution, since that paragraph recommended only that the Secretary-General should convene such a group "if necessary". Thus the decision would be taken by the Secretary-General himself.
6. Mr. AHMED (Secretary of the Council), noting that estimates of expenditure were provided in accordance with rule 34 of the Council's rules of procedure, said that document E/L.1411/Add.1 contained a statement of the financial implications of convening an *ad hoc* group of experts simply because such a possibility was provided for in part D of the draft resolution.
7. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya) said that an international water conference would enable the developing countries to learn a great deal about the latest technological advances in water resources development. The conference held in 1967 had not been as representative as some had wished and it would therefore be extremely useful if another was held in 1975. Accordingly, his delegation could not accept the first of the amendments proposed by Brazil and the USSR in document E/L.1413.
8. Mr. FAROOQ (Pakistan) supported that view. It was not enough to affirm that water resources development was a matter that should be dealt with at the country and regional levels. The eight years between 1967 and 1975 were bringing many new developments which would have to be considered. Moreover, it was his understanding that the programme for the 1967 conference had not been drawn up with the assistance of intergovernmental bodies, as would be the case if part D of the draft resolution was adopted.
9. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) noted that the Committee on Natural Resources had failed to come to a decision as to whether it was necessary to convene an international water conference. Most delegations had either opposed the idea or expressed some doubts about it. The next step, therefore, should be to ascertain the views of all States Members of the United Nations. A number of speakers had said that the question of water resources development should be dealt with at the national or, at the very most, the regional level. He wished to stress that the amendment in question would be without prejudice to the final decision on the matter—it merely asked for a consolidated document containing the views of Member States and various intergovernmental bodies.

* Resumed from the 1764th meeting.

10. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that in principle there was no conflict between the provisions of the draft resolution and the first amendment proposed in document E/L.1413. His country was greatly interested in the question of international co-operation in water resources development and it had no desire to prevent an international water conference from being held. The purpose of the amendment was to ensure that the views of Governments and of WHO and WMO, in addition to the bodies mentioned in the draft resolution, would be taken into account. If the amendment was adopted, the preparation for such a conference would thus be much more thorough.

11. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said he hoped that the Brazilian and USSR delegations would not press their proposals (E/L.1413). The sponsors of the draft resolution were in no way prejudging the question of the desirability of convening an international water conference. They were merely requesting the Secretary-General to prepare a report on the matter. It was unnecessary to consult Governments at the present preliminary stage, since the report would be considered by the Committee on Natural Resources, the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly.

12. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya) noted that the second of the New Zealand amendments in document E/L.1414 was concerned with the position of UNDP in relation to the draft resolution before the Council. He read out a statement made by a representative of UNDP during the 1758th meeting of the Council according to which the Administrator had indicated that it would be possible to work out details of the arrangements necessary to implement the proposal for advisory services to the satisfaction of all concerned. The Administrator had also expressed confidence that the arrangements could be made between the Secretariat of the United Nations and that of UNDP. It was clear from the statement that UNDP was prepared to co-operate in the matter and there was accordingly no need for the amendment in question.

13. Mr. GATES (New Zealand) said that, in submitting the amendments in document E/L.1414, his delegation had in no way intended to delay the establishment of the special natural resources advisory services. Rather, it had hoped that associating the Governing Council of UNDP with the arrangements to be made would enable the services to become operational on the best possible terms. In its view, they should not become operational until the relevant arrangements had been considered by UNDP.

14. Mr. SKATARETIKO (Yugoslavia) said that operative paragraph 2 of part B as it stood was sufficient to ensure the harmonious functioning of the advisory services, since it recommended that the Secretariat and UNDP should work out the relevant arrangements. There was no need for further discussion of the question; the Council should decide the issue forthwith if delay was to be avoided.

15. Mr. MILTON (United Kingdom) said that his delegation welcomed the second New Zealand amendment as an attempt to place the proposal concerning natural resources advisory services in an appropriate wider framework. The implications of the proposal to establish advisory services were too important, in the context of country pro-

gramming, to be left for settlement through intersecretariat arrangements. The Governing Council of UNDP should be given an opportunity to express its views, especially as by far the greater proportion of experts who would be involved in providing the services would come from UNDP projects. The first New Zealand amendment, however, went rather farther than his delegation was prepared to go in approving the establishment of the services at the present stage.

16. Mr. LENNON (United States of America) associated his delegation with the remarks of the New Zealand and United Kingdom representatives. He noted that the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination had also come to the conclusion that it would be desirable for the Administrator and Governing Council of UNDP to participate in any arrangements to be made. It would be regrettable if that Committee, responsible as it was for co-ordination, was over-ruled by the Council. With reference to the first New Zealand amendment, he said that he would not be in favour of deciding even in principle to establish the services before the relevant arrangements had been concluded.

17. Mr. FAROOQ (Pakistan) agreed with the Yugoslav representative that the provisions of the draft resolution concerning arrangements to be worked out by the United Nations Secretariat and UNDP were adequate as they stood. The Council should not anticipate complications in that connexion; its approach should be optimistic. It should not hesitate to take immediately a decision on the question, which was most important.

18. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the amendments to draft resolution E/L.1411 submitted in documents E/L.1413, E/L.1414 and E/L.1415, in that order.

The amendments in document E/L.1413 were adopted by 16 votes to 7, with 1 abstention.

19. Mr. MILTON (United Kingdom) requested separate votes on each of the New Zealand amendments in document E/L.1414.

The amendment in paragraph 1 of document E/L.1414 was rejected by 13 votes to 4, with 7 abstentions.

The amendment in paragraph 2 of document E/L.1414 was adopted by 16 votes to 6, with 3 abstentions.

The amendment in paragraph 3 of document E/L.1414 was rejected by 8 votes to 7, with 10 abstentions.

The amendment in document E/L.1415 was adopted by 10 votes to 6, with 9 abstentions.

20. Mr. LENNON (United States of America) asked for separate votes on each part of draft resolution E/L.1411.

21. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya) said that the sponsors of the draft resolution had accepted a proposal by the representative of Lebanon that the first preambular paragraph of part D should be deleted. They would also be willing to accept a suggestion by the representative of France that the word "its" should be inserted after "such a

manner as to ensure that” in operative paragraph 1 of part F.

22. Mr. PRAGUE (France) said that, in a discussion with the sponsors of the draft resolution, he had asked what interpretation should be given to operative paragraph 1 of part F and, in particular, whether the work programmes referred to were those of the Committee on Natural Resources or those of the Resources and Transport Division. He had been told that the reference was to the work programme of the Committee. To clarify the text, therefore, he had made the suggestion to which the representative of Kenya had referred. The sponsors had not accepted more substantive amendments proposed by his delegation, which had accordingly not pressed them.

23. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said that the French representative's suggestion concerning operative paragraph 1 of part F was actually a substantive amendment which, under rule 63 of the rules of procedure, would be out of order if introduced at that juncture. The work programmes referred to were in fact all United Nations programmes in the field of natural resources, including those of Secretariat units.

24. Mr. SKATARETIKO (Yugoslavia) requested a roll-call vote on each part of draft resolution E/L.1411, and on the draft resolution as a whole.

Part A

Norway, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Sudan, Tunisia, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Brazil, Ceylon, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Ghana, Haiti, Indonesia, Italy, Jamaica, Kenya, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malaysia, New Zealand, Niger.

Against: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Hungary.

Abstaining: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, France, Greece.

Part A was adopted by 21 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions.

Part B

Kenya, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Kenya, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malaysia, New Zealand, Niger, Pakistan, Peru, Sudan, Tunisia, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Brazil, Ceylon, Congo (Democratic Republic of), France, Ghana, Haiti, Indonesia, Italy, Jamaica.

Against: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Greece, Hungary.

Abstaining: Norway.

Part B, as amended, was adopted by 21 votes to 5, with 1 abstention.

Part C

New Zealand, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Sudan, Tunisia, United States of America, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Iran, Congo (Democratic Republic of), France, Ghana, Haiti, Indonesia, Italy, Jamaica, Kenya, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malaysia.

Against: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Greece, Hungary.

Abstaining: Brazil.

Part C was adopted by 22 votes to 4, with 1 abstention.

Part D

France, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: France, Ghana, Greece, Haiti, Hungary, Indonesia, Italy, Jamaica, Kenya, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malaysia, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Sudan, Tunisia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Ceylon, Congo (Democratic Republic of).

Against: None.

Abstaining: Brazil.

Part D, as amended, was adopted by 26 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

Part E

France, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: France, Ghana, Greece, Haiti, Indonesia, Italy, Jamaica, Kenya, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malaysia, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Sudan, Tunisia, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Brazil, Ceylon, Congo (Democratic Republic of).

Against: Hungary, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstaining: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Part E was adopted by 23 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.

Part F

Jamaica, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Jamaica, Kenya, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malaysia, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Sudan, Tunisia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United

Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Brazil, Ceylon, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Ghana, Haiti, Hungary, Indonesia, Italy.

Against: None.

Abstaining: France, Greece.

Part F, as amended, was adopted by 25 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

Part G

Kenya, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Kenya, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malaysia, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Sudan, Tunisia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Brazil, Ceylon, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Ghana, Haiti, Hungary, Indonesia, Italy, Jamaica.

Against: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: New Zealand, France, Greece.

Part G was adopted by 22 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions.

25. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on draft resolution E/L.1411 as a whole, as amended.

Indonesia, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Indonesia, Italy, Jamaica, Kenya, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malaysia, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Sudan, Tunisia, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Ceylon, Congo (Democratic Republic of), France, Ghana, Haiti.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Brazil, Greece, Hungary.

The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 21 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

26. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had supported the United States amendment (E/L.1415) to part F because rule 34 of the rules of procedure laid down that a separate estimate of the cost involved in any proposal should be circulated to members of the Council. It had voted against part E, which was contrary to the rules of procedure in several respects, and it regretted that the sponsors had been unable to delete the reference to paragraph 94 of the report of the Committee on Natural Resources (E/4969), because it was fundamentally in favour of the proposal. It had also voted against part B because it felt that the special natural resources advisory services would disorganize the established practice with regard to the employment of experts. It

was in favour of a revolving fund for natural resources exploration, but had had to vote against part C because of the unsatisfactory procedure that was proposed.

27. Mr. AYOUB (Tunisia) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it felt that the time had come for the Council to take action.

28. Mr. PRAGUE (France) explained that his delegation had abstained in the vote on part A of the draft resolution on the ground that, if the Committee on Natural Resources was to hold more frequent meetings, its agenda should also be lightened. It had voted in favour of part E in the belief that the Committee should concentrate on the three main natural resources referred to in the preambular paragraph. He regretted that his amendment to part F had not been accepted, because as it stood operative paragraph 1 was open to two interpretations and did not make clear the primary role of the Committee on Natural Resources, which was to exercise responsibility over all natural resources activities in the United Nations system. He had therefore abstained in the vote on that part of the draft. With regard to part G, on which he had also abstained, he restated his delegation's belief that the Committee on Natural Resources was not qualified to take up matters with political implications.

29. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on part C because it disagreed with the procedure proposed and felt that the Council should take a decision at its fifty-first session after the Governing Council of UNDP had stated its views. It had abstained on part D and on the draft resolution as a whole because it disapproved of the untimely proposal for an international water conference. Nevertheless, he wished to reaffirm his delegation's full support for parts A, B, E, F and G.

30. Mr. DØRUM (Norway) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on part B because, as it had stated in the Committee on Natural Resources, the establishment of special natural resources advisory services was premature. UNDP should first state whether it would support the proposal. Although the draft resolution as a whole still contained some unsatisfactory provisions, he had been able to vote for it because of the amendments that had been adopted.

AGENDA ITEM 11

Science and technology (*continued*):

(a) Future institutional arrangements for science and technology (*continued*)* (E/4959, E/4989, chap. VII; E/L.1400, E/L.1407 and Add.1)

31. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil), introducing draft resolution E/L.1400, said that, although the application of science and technology to development was only one aspect of the United Nations role in the field of science and technology, it unquestionably deserved priority; hence the second preambular paragraph. The purpose of recalling paragraph 4 of the Council's resolution 1544 (XLIX) in the last preambular paragraph was to draw attention to the

* Resumed from the 1756th meeting.

need for the Council to begin moving ahead. With regard to the operative part, he explained that paragraph 1 should be read in conjunction with paragraph 3. The proposed new standing committee would have to adopt a global approach, and that was why the words “at a general and planning level” had been used. Because the purely developmental aspects of the application of science and technology had to be viewed together with the sectoral activities of the specialized agencies and with UNCTAD’s activities in relation to the transfer of operative technology, the sponsors felt that the new body should be at the level of the General Assembly. Another reason was that although the phenomena of science and technology were essentially non-political, solutions to the problems involved required political decisions. In that connexion, he recalled that the United States representative to the Second Committee had recognized that fact in his statement in the Committee.¹ The past 25 years had witnessed a democratic evolution in accordance with which the Assembly had increasingly affirmed its responsibilities. It was thus no accident that UNCTAD and UNIDO, for example, were General Assembly bodies. That process of democratic evolution could not and should not be reversed; it reflected a need for action, which required a process of negotiation that only the

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fifth Session, Second Committee*, 1347th meeting, paras. 15 to 22.

General Assembly could provide. The Council, for its part, was an inadequate forum for negotiation. However, operative paragraph 2 of the draft took into account the view of those who believed that the Council had a role to play in the sphere of science and technology, and as in the case of the reports of UNDP, UNCTAD and UNIDO, the Council would have an opportunity to take measures at its own level when it was considering the reports of the new standing committee.

32. Operative paragraph 4 was taken from a draft circulated informally by the United States delegation when the subject had first been considered; there seemed to be general agreement on the need for the assistance of experts to complement the activities of the proposed intergovernmental body. The sponsors envisaged *ad hoc* panels of experts, but it would be for the General Assembly to decide on that matter.

33. The reiteration in operative paragraph 5 of the need for additional resources was included because the sponsors wished to make it clear that they did not envisage the future activities of the United Nations in the field of science and technology as a mere academic exercise.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.