

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FOUR HUNDRED AND FORTY-EIGHTH MEETING

Held on Thursday, 23 May 1968, at 11 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. BILLNER

Sweden

/...

INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION IN CARTOGRAPHY (E/4456 and Corr.1. E/4477, E/CONF.52/4, E/CONF.53/3, E/AC.6/L.378, E/AC.6/L.382) (concluded)

The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee must take a decision on draft resolution E/AC.6/L.378, taking into account the various amendments proposed. It must first give its opinion on the amendment in paragraph 1 of document E/AC.6/L.382, submitted by the United Kingdom, as amended on the proposal of Argentina, the text of which read:

"Recognizing that to some extent co-operation has already been extended by developed countries to developing countries in this field".

Mr. POSNETT (United Kingdom) proposed that the phrase "to some extent" should be replaced by the words "in some cases".

Mr. SANCHIS MUÑOZ (Argentina), Mr. FIGUEREDO-PLANCHART (Venezuela), Mr. LOPEZ URZUA (Guatemala) and Mr. ZORRILLA (Mexico), sponsors of the draft resolution, accepted the United Kingdom representative's proposal.

Mr. DUBEY (India) expressed some reservations concerning the change proposed by the United Kingdom representative. He thought that it affected not only the form but the actual substance of the paragraph, since it did not take into account either the varying extent of existing co-operation, or the fact that it was only extended by some developed countries.

Mr. ROUAMBA (Upper Volta) said that he was doubtful about the substance of the United Kingdom amendment and questioned the advisability of including the new paragraph in the preamble to the draft resolution. While he could see that there might be some satisfaction in recognizing what already had been done in that sphere, he was afraid that such an amendment would weaken the effect of operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution which stated its main objectives.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that at a previous meeting the Philippine delegation had proposed a minor amendment, namely, the deletion of the word "unquestionable" in the first line of the third preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. If there was no objection to that amendment or to the two amendments consisting, respectively, in the addition of a sixth preambular paragraph to the draft resolution and in the rewording of operative paragraph 1, he would invite the Committee to take a decision on draft resolution E/AC.6/L.378.

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.

/...

Mr. BLAU (United States of America) observed that the United States Government, from its wide experience of co-operation with developing countries in the field of aerial photography and photogrammetry, under bilateral agreements, had noted that difficulties sometimes arose when the results of aerial surveys were requested for use for projects undertaken within the framework of UNDP or other United Nations organizations, and that those difficulties were frequently due to a lack of co-ordination at the national level in the services of the developing countries concerned. He questioned whether resolution E/AC.6/L.378 could lead to any solution of such problems. Moreover, he could not assume any financial obligations for the United States Government which could only be determined by individual bilateral arrangements.

Mr. ZORRILLA (Mexico) said that his delegation and the delegations of the other sponsors of the draft resolution, in a spirit of conciliation and in order to reach general agreement more rapidly, had accepted the various amendments proposed to the draft resolution; however, he thought that the changes which had been introduced were unnecessary since they were implicit in the original text. In fact, the latter, far from having been improved by the various amendments, was in certain respects weaker both in form and in substance.

DEVELOPMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

- (b) NON-AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES (E/4478 and Corr.1 and Add.1 and 2, E/AC.6/L.379/Rev.1 and Add.1) (continued)

The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that at its previous meeting it had adopted the following new preambular paragraph to draft resolution E/AC.6/L.379/Rev.1:

"Recalling General Assembly resolution 2158 (XXI) of 25 November 1966, reaffirming the inalienable right of all countries to exercise permanent sovereignty over their natural resources".

Mr. GREGH (France) proposed a new version of operative paragraph 2, which would read as follows:

/...

(Mr. Gregh, France)

"Invites the Secretary-General to prepare, in the light of the experience of countries with different socio-economic systems, a general study of the methods and scope of planning for the development of non-agricultural resources as an integral part of their national development plans;"

He hoped that the Committee would decide in favour of that text.

Mr. VASA (Iran), Mr. ROUAMBA (Upper Volta) and Mr. VARELA (Panama) supported the French representative's proposal.

Mr. GREGH (France), referring to the objections which some delegations had raised at the previous meeting, proposed that operative paragraph 6 should be reworded to read:

"Requests the Secretary-General to develop as far as possible, both within the regular budget of the United Nations and within the technical assistance and pre-investment programmes, the advisory and technical services in the field of development of non-agricultural resources".

The new wording would have a twofold advantage. First, the word "priority", which had been objected to by a number of delegations, would be deleted and the emphasis placed on the need for the competent services to develop the technical and advisory services to the maximum. It would also avoid any allusion to the financial and personnel support necessary to develop the services - a need implicit in the idea of development.

Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) shared the misgivings of other delegations with regard to paragraph 6 of draft resolution E/AC.6/L.379/Rev.1. Apart from the fact that the procedure adopted for the wording of that paragraph was not consistent with the Council's usual procedure, the draft gave the impression that priority was being given to non-agricultural natural resources. The Council adopted resolutions, according to the matter under discussion, which seemed to give priority to population questions, housing and building or any other question dealt with in the resolution concerned; all United Nations bodies acted in the same way, with the result that it was impossible to know which field really had priority. He felt that the French delegation's proposed amendment had the advantage of improving the wording of paragraph 6, and that, as

/...

(Mr. Lobanov, USSR)

a general rule, questions of priority should be studied thoroughly by the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination.

With regard to the increase of resources and personnel under the United Nations regular budget, he reiterated his delegation's view that budgetary funds should be used for the financing of administrative activities and not for technical assistance activities. In view, furthermore, of the United Nations limited resources, there could be no question of increasing staff at the present time. Any stepping up of activities should be financed from existing funds or from reserves.

However, since the implementation of paragraph 6 of draft resolution E/AC.6/L.379/Rev.1 did not require the use of new resources, his delegation would not oppose its adoption.

Mr. ROUAMBA (Upper Volta) thought that the word "develop" proposed in the French amendment failed to convey adequately the idea of the necessary financial and personnel support mentioned in paragraph 6 of the draft resolution. His delegation would not oppose the adoption of the French amendment, but it would prefer a word less restrictive of the scope of paragraph 6.

His delegation had no objection to the deletion of the words "give priority to", and agreed with the Under-Secretary-General that the establishment of priorities was a matter for the Committee for Development Planning.

Mr. SANCHIS MUÑOZ (Argentina) proposed the replacement of the word "develop" by the word "strengthen", to accord with the view expressed by the representative of Upper Volta.

Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) hoped that the sponsors of the draft would take the Upper Volta and Argentine representatives' remarks into account. His delegation, like that of the Upper Volta, thought that emphasis ought to be placed on the need to improve the quality of advisory and technical services in the field in question, and it hoped that that consideration would be reflected in the text adopted. In that connexion, he would like the Under-Secretary-General and the sponsors of the draft resolution to state their interpretation of the provisions of paragraph 6; was it proposed, as might seem to be the case at first sight, that the Secretariat should be given a free hand in the matter, to the possible detriment of other priorities?

/...

The CHAIRMAN proposed that action on draft resolution E/AC.6/L.379/Rev.1 should be postponed until a final text had been prepared.

It was so decided.

QUESTION OF A MEETING OF SPECIALISTS IN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (E/4484)

Mr. de SEYNES (Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs) introduced document E/4484 concerning the convening of a meeting of specialists in economic development.

In its resolution 1261 (XLIII), requesting the Secretary-General to submit a report on that matter, the Economic and Social Council had given no clear directives regarding the kind of meeting, the agenda and the participation it had in mind. The sponsors of the draft resolution had been prompted by different motives and had not all had the same objectives; the Secretariat had nevertheless inferred that there had been general agreement on the need to do everything possible in order to bring about a better understanding of economic problems and to mobilize public opinion and influence government circles in favour of a second Development Decade.

Because of those considerations the Secretariat had been obliged to prepare a series of quite varied proposals; the document before the Committee embodied those proposals and examined various possible types of meetings designed to serve, in one way or another, the draft resolution's general objectives. It offered the Economic and Social Council quite a varied choice, on the basis of which it could indicate more exactly how it thought the task should be approached.

Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thanked the Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs for his statement and asked what conclusions had been reached in that connexion by the Working Group of the Committee for Development Planning which had met at Geneva the previous year.

Mr. de SEYNES (Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs) recalled that the Working Group had met essentially to undertake technical surveys and to make projections. It had, it was true, also studied the question of a meeting of specialists, but quite superficially. The Working Group had taken the general view that the United Nations already had enough specialists and technical

/...

(Mr. de Seynes, Under-Secretary-General
for Economic and Social Affairs)

know-how for it not to be absolutely necessary to convene such a meeting in order to formulate the objectives of the second Development Decade, but that the meeting might nevertheless have the effect of mobilizing world opinion in support of the Decade's objectives.

Mr. FIGUEREDO-PLANCHART (Venezuela) said that the Council had adopted resolution 1261 (XLIII), whose wording differed considerably from that of the original draft resolution, after a long debate and many consultations and unofficial negotiations. The difficulties inherent in any effort to reach a compromise may perhaps have prevented the Council from providing the Secretary-General with all the necessary guidelines for the preparation of the report requested of him. In the circumstances, it would be preferable to defer consideration of the question until the forty-fifth session. In the meantime, delegations which so desired could get in touch with the Secretariat. Unofficial contacts could also be made with delegations - particularly the Peruvian delegation - which at the forty-third session had supported the idea of convening a meeting of economic development specialists.

Mr. MEYER PICON (Mexico) said that the Committee for Development Planning took the view that an adequate fund of technological know-how and skills was already available in the United Nations system so that it was not absolutely necessary to convene such a meeting. His delegation had therefore voted in favour of Council resolution 1261 (XLIII), so that the Secretary-General could gather all the necessary information to determine whether it was desirable to hold such a meeting. The note by the Secretary-General (E/4484) confirmed his delegation's doubts on the matter; the note was brief and somewhat vague precisely because the Secretary-General had had difficulty finding work for the meeting of experts which was not already being done by United Nations bodies. There was, for example, the Committee for Development Planning, composed of eighteen experts, which had itself pointed out that in discharging its responsibilities, it had had the full support of the expertise available in the United Nations system (E/4484, para. 3). It was therefore not advisable to convene another group of experts to examine the same problems, which were already being dealt with by various departments of the Secretariat, by UNCTAD and by UNIDO.

/...

(Mr. Meyer Picon, Mexico)

Furthermore, the Mexican delegation could not accept the second sentence of paragraph 6, because it believed that, on the contrary, the developing countries were fully aware of the obstacles hampering their economic progress and knew quite well the underlying reasons for them. There was really no need to convene a meeting of experts to study those obstacles and their causes. The transfer of technology, financial support and access for the developing countries' raw materials and manufactured goods to world markets were more important objectives than those listed in paragraph 7. As regards the organization of the proposed meeting, the approach suggested in paragraph 12 would perhaps be the least objectionable. Referring to the last sentence of that paragraph, he observed that the idea of convening a meeting of experts who would call on the services of other experts did not seem very satisfactory. The large amount of documentation required and the resulting cost could easily be imagined. It was therefore inadvisable to convene the meeting. The Council should rather draw upon the work already done on a question which might obviously involve overlapping and duplication.

Mr. WINGSTRAND (Sweden) said that Mr. Wood, the former President of the World Bank, had suggested the convening of a meeting of experts similar to the one under consideration. If his successor decided to follow that suggestion, the Secretariat would have to remain in contact with the Bank in order to avoid two similar meetings. His delegation would like to know whether the Secretariat had consulted the World Bank on the matter.

Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) shared the concern that had been expressed, particularly by the Mexican delegation. In the light of the unanimous opinion of the Committee for Development Planning and the solid arguments of the Mexican representative, it was hardly desirable to convene such a meeting at the present stage. There was already adequate provision within the United Nations system - in, for example, UNCTAD, UNIDO and various departments of the Secretariat - to carry out all the work which would be entrusted to the meeting of experts. The Committee should simply take note of document E/4484.

Replying to a question by Mr. FIGUEREDO-PLANCHART (Venezuela), the CHAIRMAN interpreted the suggestion of the USSR delegation to mean that the

/...

(The Chairman)

Committee should defer its decision on the question until a later date, it being clearly understood, however, that the question was not being completely dropped.

Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) confirmed that interpretation.

Mr. MEYER PICON (Mexico) said that there would hardly be any justification for deferring consideration of the question until the forty-fifth session since so little time remained before that session.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should consider the problem at its next meeting.

It was so decided.

ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE TRANSFER OF OPERATIVE TECHNOLOGY TO DEVELOPING COUNTRIES
(E/4452 and Add.1 and 2, Add.3 and Add.3/Corr.1, Add.4 and 5; E/4461/Add.1, TD/37 and Corr.1, E/AC.6/L.377/Rev.1, E/AC.6/L.380/Rev.1, E/AC.6/L.386) (continued)

Mr. VASA (Iran) introduced draft resolution E/AC.6/L.380/Rev.1, in which his delegation had sought to take into consideration the comments and suggestions some delegations had made regarding the original version, and expressed the hope that the members of the Committee would approve the revised text.

Mr. GREGH (France) introduced an amendment (E/AC.6/L.386) to operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution E/AC.6/L.380/Rev.1. The purpose of the amendment was mainly to define more fully the scope of the consultations called for in the paragraph, as it was not well defined in the text proposed by the representative of Iran.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

/...