



## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Forty-eighth Session  
OFFICIAL RECORDS

Monday, 30 March 1970,  
at 3.25 p.m.

NEW YORK

*President:* Mr. J. B. P. MARAMIS (Indonesia).

## AGENDA ITEM 2

Development of natural resources (*continued*):

- (a) Report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Survey Programme for the Development of Natural Resources (E/4797, E/4801 and Add.1);  
(b) Natural resources satellites (E/4779 and Corr.1-3)

1. Mr. BLAU (United States of America) said that, although the question of natural resources was very complex, it appeared that in recent years agreement had been reached on a number of important points. For a start, it was generally recognized that the development of natural resources was closely linked to the over-all development of a country. Although often initially a source of foreign exchange, natural resources subsequently frequently provided the basis for the industrialization of a country and became an instrument for its general economic development. It was noteworthy that during the First United Nations Development Decade, most of the countries which had appreciably exceeded the 5 per cent growth target were countries which had developed their natural resources most rapidly. Secondly, there was general recognition of the role to be played by the United Nations system as a whole in the development of natural resources, whether agricultural (including fisheries and forests), water, energy or mineral resources. Since some fields were the more particular responsibility of specialized agencies (FAO, for example, in the case of agricultural resources), it was proper that the United Nations should concentrate its efforts primarily on non-agricultural resources. The interesting statement made at the 1664th meeting by the Director of the Resources and Transport Division had strengthened his conviction that the activities undertaken by the United Nations in that field, particularly as part of operational programmes, constituted one of the success stories of the United Nations in economic development.

2. Opinions continued to differ on a number of other points.

3. With regard to the Survey Programme for the Development of Natural Resources, he did not share the pessimism reflected in the report of the Secretary-General (E/4801 and Add.1), probably because he viewed the programme from a different angle. His delegation had never regarded it as an isolated programme of limited duration, but rather as an on-going activity for the purpose of systematically collecting information from all sources concerning the natural resources of the world. It had long thought that work of this nature should be carried out by the Resources and Transport Division. There was little point in attempting to make a global inventory of the resources of each

particular type. It would be preferable by far to rely for the specifically United Nations contributions on the organization of UNDP projects, either regionally or nationally. They would have the advantage of meeting the priority needs and desires of the countries or regions concerned. They would, therefore, be less likely to gather dust. The data provided by such projects would also increase the stock of information on natural resources collected from all sources by the United Nations system as a whole, as soon as the competent bodies, having taken account of the model in chapter six of the Capacity Study,<sup>1</sup> had decided on the course to follow in setting up an information system to give effective support to the United Nations development system.

4. With regard to the institutional questions referred to in document E/4801/Add.1, it was generally accepted that guidance for the work of any programme, including that in natural resources, should be provided by an intergovernmental body. There were, however, several possibilities in this particular case. At one extreme, it was possible for the Economic and Social Council and the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination to provide the necessary guidance. At the other extreme, there was the proposal in document E/4801/Add.1 that a functional committee composed of experts should be established, although the latter suggestion might create problems for delegations which already found it difficult to be represented in the various existing bodies. Perhaps an intermediate solution might be considered, based on the principle that the question of natural resources was part of the more general question of the application of science and technology to development. In that connexion, he recalled that the Director of the Resources and Transport Division had stressed the need for greater use of advanced techniques in detecting, exploring and exploiting natural resources as and when they grew scarce. Item 2 (b) on the agenda was a graphic illustration of this.

5. Consequently, and in view of the fact that the Council would take up the general question of science and technology and their application at its forty-ninth session, his delegation suggested that the Council should defer its decision concerning the setting up of an intergovernmental body to provide guidance in the work of developing natural resources. At its forty-ninth session, in the light of a study prepared by the Secretary-General on the basis of replies from Governments, the Council would have to take a decision concerning the establishment of an intergovernmental body responsible for science and technology. It could on that occasion return to the question of the development of natural resources and take the course of action suggested by the Secretary-General in paragraph 5 of the addendum to his report (E/4801/Add.1).

<sup>1</sup> *A Study of the Capacity of the United Nations Development System* (United Nations publication, Sales No.: E.70.I.10).

6. Mr. PRAGUE (France) pointed out that his delegation was on the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Survey Programme for the Development of Natural Resources and had therefore already had the opportunity of expressing its views on all aspects of the matter. Like several other delegations, the French delegation thought that it was too early to take a final decision on the institutional aspects of the problem and, more specifically, on the Secretariat's proposal to establish a functional committee or to extend the terms of reference of the *Ad Hoc* Committee. In the first place, it would be useful to wait until the CPC, which had placed that item on the agenda for its next session, had taken a stand on the matter. Furthermore, since the Council was soon to undertake a general review of the institutional problems created by the activities of the United Nations in the field of science and technology, his delegation felt that it was not expedient to prejudge the outcome of that general review where natural resources were concerned.

7. He was sorry that the Secretariat had not commented in greater detail on the proposals in document E/4801/Add.1. Moreover, since that report had only just been issued in French, his delegation could hardly define its position on it for the time being. His first reaction, however, was one of surprise. The Secretary-General had been requested to submit to the Economic and Social Council more information on measures for rationalizing the activities of the United Nations in the field of natural resources, in addition to that contained in document E/4801, so that the Council could choose from among a number of possible solutions and was not compelled to follow the easiest and most usual procedure, i.e., to establish a new committee. However, document E/4801/Add.1, was in essence only a proposal to establish a new body, and it even made some rather detailed suggestions concerning its terms of reference. Such a proposal was not what the Council had expected from the Secretary-General, and his delegation could not refrain from expressing its disappointment in that regard.

8. Finally, in document E/4801/Add.1, the Secretary-General also spoke of a sessional committee of the Council to deal with problems relating to science and technology. If that idea was adopted, the problem of the establishment of a functional committee on natural resources would probably appear in a different light. He would therefore be grateful if the Secretariat would clarify its position on that matter.

9. In conclusion, the French delegation thought that at the present stage the Council was not really in a position to take a decision on the matter under discussion in view of the fact that it had not yet undertaken the general review of the institutional problems relating to science and technology.

10. Mr. DUBEY (India) pointed out how important the development of natural resources was for the economic and social development of the developing countries, and remarked that the United Nations had so far made an active and effective contribution to activities in that field. However, where the survey programme was concerned, he did not share the optimism of certain delegations. The failure of that proposal was another example of the difficulties encountered in trying to induce the United Nations to take constructive action for the economic and

social development of the developing countries. The survey programme had never been visualized as a programme of indefinite duration, but as a five-year programme. Two and a half years had elapsed since it had been instituted, and its scope, methods and financing were still under discussion. In fact, even the preliminary work which the Council had asked the Secretary-General to carry out, as mentioned in paragraphs 6 (a) and (b) of his report (E/4801), had not been completed. That situation was clearly due to insufficient financial resources. It had been stated, in paragraph 13 of the report (E/4797), that the *Ad Hoc* Committee had recognized that, under the currently prevailing circumstances, it was unlikely that the programme under consideration could be financed as had been originally envisaged. The "currently prevailing circumstances" referred to were most regrettable. That statement actually covered up the refusal of certain countries to agree that the programme, or even the preliminary work which was vital for its success, should be financed from the regular budget of the Organization. It was well known that such an attitude made it impossible for the Council to consider any programmes on their merits.

11. Problem of resources could not be solved by turning over the programme to UNDP. UNDP could not finance such a programme without receiving from governments requests for specific projects. The Economic and Social Council should not prejudge the action the UNDP Governing Council might take on individual projects. Moreover, it was not for the former to make a general decision as to whether UNDP should, in certain cases, relieve recipient Governments of the obligation of making a counterpart contribution and a contribution to local expenses. The Administrator of UNDP already had such a general authority. It was for the Administrator and the Governing Council to take decision on specific projects in the light of particular circumstances.

12. As for the institutional arrangements, document E/4801/Add.1 made an unimpeachable case, on technical ground, for an intergovernmental committee on natural resources. The main arguments were that it would lead to the strengthening and expansion of United Nations activities in this field, it would assist in the adoption of an integrated approach and it would keep governments of developing countries informed of new developments in technology for the development of natural resources so that these countries could avoid wastage and ensure the most rational development of their natural resources.

13. As regards the reference in paragraph 5 of document E/4801/Add.1 to the possible restructuring of the intergovernmental machinery of the United Nations, his delegation could not comment on it, as it was not aware that such a proposal had been made. Nevertheless, it was in a position to say that, in its view, the solution of establishing a sessional committee seemed quite inappropriate and inadequate. A sessional committee was appropriate for once-a-year general debate; what was required was technical discussion in depth on a continuing basis. Moreover, the Indian delegation did not think that the question of intergovernmental machinery for natural resources should be considered in the context of any proposal for over-all institutional arrangement for the application of science and technology to development. Natural resources constituted a

very special subject with its own political, technical, legal and financial aspects, and should be given careful attention by a specialized body. Some representatives had expressed the view that it might not be possible to send representatives to an intergovernmental body of a technical nature, but the Indian Government had always assigned properly-qualified experts to technical bodies when it felt that the questions to be considered were of paramount concern to the international community.

14. Mr. LEGNANI (Uruguay) agreed with other delegations that the implementation of the programme for the development of natural resources was of primary importance for the over-all process of development, and more specifically for that of the developing countries. But, as was pointed out in paragraph 31 of the report of the Secretary-General (E/4801), some Governments had failed to demonstrate interest in the programme, perhaps because they had not understood it. Therefore the objectives of the programme should be more widely disseminated. However, the same paragraph showed that it was easier to convince Governments if the explanations were given on the spot, and if each Government was shown the advantages which it could derive from the programme. His delegation felt that greater progress could be made if the survey programme were to take account of the specific problems and needs of each country.

15. With regard to the establishment of a new body, he considered that the intergovernmental body suggested by the Secretary-General in the addendum to his report (E/4801/Add.1) would be very suitable, with the terms of reference proposed in that document, for organizing the relevant development activities on a world-wide scale. It would, however, be advisable to bear in mind the reservations entered by the representative of Argentina, who had stressed the dangers of duplication with other bodies which were to be established and had felt that it would be better to postpone the decision until later, when the report of the Secretary-General on the restructuring of the United Nations system would be available.

16. Mr. ZAKHAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered that the Council should examine in greater detail the institutional provisions which it might ultimately decide upon. At its second session the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Survey Programme for the Development of Natural Resources had felt that it was premature to consider the future institutional arrangements concerning the creation of an intergovernmental committee. Furthermore, the majority of its members had expressed the view that the CPC and the Economic and Social Council should instead consider the matter in due course (see E/4797, para. 14). His delegation suggested that the Council should endorse that conclusion and make it one of its decisions at the current session. Subsequently the CPC could study the matter and submit observations in co-operation with the specialized agencies concerned and other bodies, for example, the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development. The Council would then have all the necessary information for taking a decision.

17. Mr. NAITO (Japan) recalled that Japan, which was one of the countries least endowed with mineral resources,

had to import most of the raw material for its industries. It was therefore very much interested in the activities of the United Nations in the development of natural resources and was taking part, through the provision of experts or finance, in a number of ECAFE projects, such as the Mekong Project, the joint prospecting of offshore resources in the Western Pacific and the typhoon control project. His Government had also co-operated in 1969 in organizing the symposium on the development of deltaic areas.

18. In view of the importance it attached to the development of natural resources, his Government regretted that the documents had been circulated too late for it to be able to study them fully. The delay was certainly due to the fact that the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Survey Programme had only completed its work at the beginning of March. In any case it would be difficult for his delegation to make a final decision for the time being.

19. A preliminary reading of the reports of the *Ad Hoc* Committee and of the Secretary-General revealed that very complicated matters of organization and financing were involved. As Japan was not a member of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, his delegation would be grateful for further enlightenment concerning the recommendations submitted. Indeed, it would only be possible to take an informed decision after a thorough consideration of the role which the United Nations system would play in the development of natural resources.

20. Since the question of natural resources survey satellites was also very complex, the Japanese Government had not yet had time to study the report in detail. His delegation would therefore confine itself to drawing the Council's attention to General Assembly resolution 2600 (XXIV), which stated that the question of survey satellites should primarily be taken up by the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. He inquired whether the representative of the Secretary-General could say how the co-ordination between the Committee and the Council on that matter was arranged.

21. Mr. CREMIN (Ireland) agreed with the comment in the Secretary-General's report (E/4801) that natural resources would play a key role in the developing countries. He therefore regretted that only forty-two of them had replied to the Secretary-General's communication.

22. Ireland, which was a small country, was not directly concerned with the question of satellites for surveying natural resources. However, it considered that the subject opened up vast possibilities.

23. With regard to future institutional arrangements concerning the establishment of an intergovernmental committee, his delegation agreed with other delegations that it was premature to take a decision while questions of reorganization were pending, such as that of UNDP as a result of the Capacity Study, and that, moreover, the views of the other bodies and specialized agencies concerned would have to be sought. Nevertheless the matter should remain under consideration.

24. Miss DARLING (United Kingdom) thought that it was not quite true to say that the programme had failed, even if

its basic concept would have to be revised realistically. The best formula would be for the countries to submit requests to which the usual UNDP criteria for project selection would be applied.

25. Her delegation also felt that it was premature to take a decision concerning new institutional arrangements. That item was included in the agenda of the CPC and the consideration of the "Capacity Study" was not yet complete. Her delegation was fully aware of the importance of the programme, but nothing would be gained by taking a decision immediately. She hoped that more ample and specific information would be available concerning the financial implications of the establishment of a new body, particularly with regard to staffing requirements.

26. Mr. ABDELMOUTI (Chad) supported the Secretary-General's proposal to establish a technical intergovernmental committee which would be placed under the authority of the Economic and Social Council and would deal with activities relating to the development of natural resources.

27. Until recently, his Government had been convinced that Chad had no natural resources. However, since the discovery of copper and underground water resources in Upper Volta, and since a foreign company had requested a permit for petroleum exploration in Chad, it was taking an increasing interest in the work and activities of the United Nations in the field of natural resources, particularly that of exploration. It was regrettable that most studies and reports, even the most recent of them, asserted that certain countries had no mineral resources without realizing that, in the colonial period, exploration had been limited to the coastal areas and that, with modern technological progress, resources could be found practically everywhere. His Government was contemplating a mineral resources prospecting project and had asked for experts from the Resources and Transport Division to go to that country and help it prepare a suitable programme.

28. For a country like Chad, the prospects for development largely depended on natural resources. His country therefore hoped that the United Nations activities in that area would be expanded and strengthened, and it considered that the Council should establish an intergovernmental committee at the current session which would enable States to participate in practical programmes for natural resources exploration. His delegation was glad to note that the Secretariat was collecting information on the natural resources of various countries and that it knew of Chad's geothermal resources, which constituted a potential for that country not only from the point of view of water supply and power resources, but also for the infrastructure required for a tourist centre. His delegation had also been glad to hear that, in the opinion of United Nations experts, Chad probably had groundwater resources, which would enable it to undertake animal husbandry programmes.

29. Chad had announced its readiness to take part in the first survey programme in West Africa and hoped that the Economic and Social Council would strongly recommend that UNDP should finance the survey programme for the development of natural resources without the Governments involved being required to make any contribution in cash.

30. Mr. KITI (Kenya) noted that, contrary to what had always been said, his country actually possessed many types of natural resources, but that for various reasons, in particular the lack of financial resources, they had not yet been explored. There seemed to be petroleum along the coast and geothermal resources in the mountainous areas. Moreover, UNDP had approved a project in that latter field. Kenya had also begun prospecting in the field of hydro-energy resources with assistance provided under bilateral agreements. Those agreements raised a number of difficulties which would not exist if the assistance were being provided at the international level, within the framework, for example, of UNDP. The success of exploration in some countries had given rise to great hopes in neighbouring countries. Therefore, in spite of the difficulties encountered, United Nations efforts in that field should be continued. As far as Kenya was concerned, the term "natural resources" should have a wider meaning and should cover, for example, fauna and flora, or the country's climate, which constituted true natural resources contributing to the development of tourism.

31. His delegation hoped that UNDP would pay particular attention to the recommendation in paragraph 15 of the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee (E/4797), in accordance with which UNDP should consider the waiving of counterpart funds and local cost contributions in appropriate cases.

32. With regard to the institutional arrangements, it appeared that no one had yet expressed serious opposition to the idea of transforming the *Ad Hoc* Committee into an intergovernmental functional body. The argument which had been put forward was simply that more time was needed to reach a decision. Kenya felt that a decision should be taken as soon as possible and that the *Ad Hoc* Committee should be reorganized as a functional committee. There were several reasons why such action should be taken. The original report (E/4801) had been drawn up by a small group of consultants, which meant that few Member States had participated in its preparation. Moreover, in the case of a question of such vital importance Governments should participate actively in all the work relating to it, particularly the fixing of priorities, and such participation was possible only at the level of an intergovernmental committee. In short, there should be a body which could take decisions, formulate general policies and settle the differences of opinion which might arise between UNDP and the Resources and Transport Division regarding, for example, project priorities.

33. It was true that that question would be on the agenda of the CPC as well as on that of the Council's forty-ninth session. Nevertheless, it would be advisable for the Council to consider now the nature of the committee to be established and especially the relationships which would exist between that committee and the CPC. His delegation felt that those two bodies should have complementary functions: the committee would formulate policies and guidelines and CPC would exercise supervisory and coordinating functions.

34. His delegation had the same objections as the Indian delegation to the suggestion in paragraph 5 of document E/4801/Add.1, that all items pertaining to the physical aspects of nature and its economic development should be

grouped within a single committee of the General Assembly. It was true that the number of bodies should be reduced, but certainly not at the expense of effectiveness and productivity. Bodies which had to deal with too many questions always tended to confine themselves to generalities.

35. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said that non-agricultural natural resources were especially important to developing countries, enabling them to change their economic and social structure, to increase their foreign exchange earnings, to transform their subsistence economies into modern economies and to make decisive progress in economic development, provided they had the necessary financial and technical resources. Therefore, the operational activities of the United Nations and international co-operation in that field were of vital importance to them.

36. The developing countries' need for international assistance had greatly increased. Unfortunately, the financial resources of the United Nations in that field had not increased at the same rate. Fully aware of that discrepancy, the Economic and Social Council had adopted resolutions 1316 (XLIV) of 31 May 1968 and 1426 (XLVI) of 6 June 1969 in which it had requested increased resources for the exploration and utilization of natural resources, and had recommended that UNDP should continue to give high priority to requests from developing countries for financing projects for the investigation and utilization of their natural resources. However, those resolutions had had no effect on the budget estimates for 1970. The lack of financial resources was clearly the reason why it had not been possible to launch the survey programme for the development of natural resources, approved by the Council in its resolution 1218 (XLII) of 1 June 1967. According to the report of the Secretary-General (E/4801), what the survey programme required was a total financial commitment spread over a number of years. His delegation wished to make it clear that it would not approve such an approach unless concrete and solid commitments ensured the completion of the programme. Unfortunately, such commitments had not been undertaken and there was nothing to indicate that they would be undertaken in the near future.

37. The Secretary-General said that he was inclined to recommend that the survey programme should be reconsidered or abandoned as such, unless assured financing on a substantial scale. The speaker hoped that the situation would improve and that the Council would give serious consideration to the recommendation of the *Ad Hoc* Committee that UNDP should assume responsibility for financing the programme. His delegation hoped that that recommendation would gain the full support of the Council and, in addition, that the Council would urge UNDP to take complete charge of financing the regional or country survey projects, in view of the inadequacy of the financial resources of many developing countries, which found it difficult to pay counterpart contributions or make cash contributions to local operating costs.

38. The representative of UNDP had stated that if UNDP consented to finance the survey programme, its Governing Council would retain control of it. In that case, the *Ad Hoc* Committee would be left without responsibilities. According to its terms of reference, the *Ad Hoc* Committee was to

undertake a review of the preparatory work for the execution of the survey programme, its analysis and an assessment of the ways and means of financing it. Yet the developing countries were concerned not only with the survey programme but with the whole question of the development of natural resources. It was therefore necessary that there should be a central body to review the work programme and activities related to the development of non-agricultural natural resources and to make recommendations to the Council. Such a body could also review the policies and procedures relating to operational activities in that field and make recommendations with a view to improving them for the benefit of the developing countries and strengthening the existing organs engaged in such activities. His delegation therefore supported the recommendation that the Council should reassess the terms of reference of the *Ad Hoc* Committee. In that connexion, he found it regrettable that the legislative directives so far given to the Secretariat were fragmentary and without any provision for long-term programming to ensure greater efficiency in their execution. He accordingly hoped that the Council would establish better co-ordination in the field of natural resources between legislative and executive organs. He observed with regard to that point that the reports of the Secretary-General and the *Ad Hoc* Committee provided the Council with an opportunity to decide on a question whose consideration had been too long delayed.

39. Apart from urging the reassessment of the *Ad Hoc* Committee's terms of reference, his delegation hoped that the Council would consider increasing its membership—a step which was the more necessary in that a strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade was in course of preparation and that modern techniques were opening new possibilities for the development of natural resources.

40. Mr. SKATARETIKO (Yugoslavia) said that on the eve of the launching of the Second United Nations Development Decade it was important that the problems relating to the development and rational use of natural resources should be resolved, having regard to their key role in the developing countries. His delegation shared the views expressed by the Secretary-General in his report (E/4801), but considered that the real reason why the problems facing the United Nations in its activities had not been studied at an earlier stage should be identified. However that might be, it would associate itself with the efforts of all delegations which were ready to adopt specific measures to give a new impetus to activities in that field. It also agreed with the Brazilian representative's observations concerning the need to establish an intergovernmental body which would enable the United Nations to overcome its difficulties in the field of natural resources.

41. A complete reappraisal of activities in that field should be undertaken on a priority basis and should be accompanied by the formulation of broader programmes. That task could be entrusted to the proposed committee, thus enabling United Nations operations in the field of natural resources to take their proper place in the general context of the Second Development Decade. It should not be forgotten, however, that any international action which might be contemplated must correspond to the wishes of the Governments concerned. In giving full support to the Secretary-General's proposal for the establishment of a

functional committee, his delegation considered that, at the same time, there must be a more precise definition of guidelines for the reformulation of the work programme of the United Nations in the field of natural resources. It was important to adopt clear conclusions and recommendations without delay to facilitate the solution of existing difficulties.

42. Another question upon whose solution the outcome of United Nations efforts would depend was that of the financing of projects. The Director of the Resources and Transport Division had pointed out to the *Ad Hoc* Committee that the rapid growth of mineral exploration in some of the industrialized countries had had serious implications for the developing countries. The steadily declining proportion of natural resources projects by comparison with the total number of projects approved by UNDP was a matter of concern. His delegation attached special significance to the role of UNDP, which, in its view, should undertake the financing of the survey programme on the basis of requests from countries or regions so that they would be in a better position to supplement the programme. United Nations activities in the field of natural resources had resulted in the identification of resources of considerable economic significance in a number of countries. That result demonstrated the ability of the Resources and Transport Division to carry out complex operational activities of a practical nature, and his Government agreed that priority should be given to such activities.

43. He shared the Kenyan representative's views and considered that the CPC could in no circumstance act as a body responsible for formulating general policies. With regard to the question of the proliferation of bodies, his delegation maintained the position which it had adopted during consideration of the question of tourism. An argument such as that of "proliferation" was not valid in itself and to advance it in opposing the establishment of a new body amounted, in fact, to denying any possibility of development to an organization such as the United Nations.

44. Mr. DE SEYNES (Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs) said that the ideas put forward in paragraphs 5 and 6 of document E/4801/Add.1 were not proposals by the Secretary-General; they were the logical and natural sequel of some proposals submitted by Governments. The idea of grouping together all items pertaining to physical resources had grown up in the wider context of the discussion on the perpetuation of the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development and it was the delegations themselves who had suggested entrusting those matters to a special governmental committee. If then the proposal concerning the General Assembly were to receive the support of the majority of Governments, parallel action should be taken within the Economic and Social Council, which would then be the only organ empowered to consider all questions relating to development. Such arrangements did not, however, preclude the possibility of setting up a specialized committee on natural resources or in any other field nor the existence of a committee dealing specifically with questions of outer space; the primary consideration when setting up new bodies should, in his opinion, be their viability.

45. In discussing tourism and natural resources, the Council was considering areas which were of crucial importance to the success of the Second Development Decade and to the development of the less advanced countries over the next ten years. The information submitted by the Director of the Resources and Transport Division suggested that the problems involved were highly practical and fell within the framework of modern technology.

46. The experience of very few countries could be cited as example where, as in the Ivory Coast, agricultural production had increased annually by more than 4 per cent over the last twenty-five years. Loyalty to the ideal of accelerated growth implied using all the means available to develop non-agricultural resources and allowing greater scope for activities designed to develop mineral and energy resources and tourism. Few activities were so plainly international as those concerned with exploiting non-agricultural natural resources, since they required such large-scale investment that they could not be undertaken only by the countries concerned. It was therefore astonishing that no intergovernmental body was more directly involved in that sphere.

47. In March 1966 the Secretary-General had proposed to the Council the five-year survey programme for the development of natural resources. The proposal had from the outset been called unrealistic. At the time it had been made, the annual cost was estimated at \$2 million. If activities were considered from the point of view of their profitability, it could hardly be said that the programme suggested by the Secretary-General had been lacking in realism. It had been prompted mainly by the idea that modern technology would provide an opportunity for re-examining the conclusions of previous studies. Another reason was that, in view of the polarization in some areas of capital for the exploration and exploitation of natural resources, it appeared desirable to extend to certain countries which were debarred from those activities some form of almost free service under the auspices of the United Nations. It was quite apparent that the UNDP did not provide a very satisfactory solution to that problem and, while its services might be used, other arrangements should also be made. Such considerations remained as valid today as in 1966 and were perhaps even more so now that in the light of the Capacity Study the review of UNDP activities was on the agenda.

48. It was understandable that some delegations were not yet able to take a position on whether a new body should be set up; it was also clear that the Secretariat needed to continue its activities in the realm of natural resources and tourism with directives from some form of governmental body.

49. Mr. BLAU (United States of America) stated that he had not referred to his desire to arrest the proliferation of committees in expressing his wish to have the decision on setting up a new body deferred. The Council, in his opinion, should not take a rash decision; it should rather study all possibilities open to it, one of which, moreover, was on the agenda for consideration at its forty-ninth session. In this context, he considered that the Council should take into account that it was undesirable to increase unnecessarily the burden of delegations and the United

Nations. His delegation considered that the Secretary-General had been quite right to suggest other possibilities in paragraph 5 of his report (E/4801/Add.1). It was appropriate that he should suggest the need for intergovernmental guidance. It was, and he was sure the Under-Secretary-General would agree, for governments to decide on the form which that guidance would take, but it was right and proper for the Secretary-General to submit possible lines of action.

50. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) agreed entirely with the United States representative. The Secretary-General was not making proposals; rather, he was giving a series of alternatives. Governments were free to accept them or advance new ones. On the other hand, he wondered why the *Ad Hoc* Committee had waited three years before reviewing the question of the survey programme for the development of natural resources.

51. He agreed with the Brazilian delegation that the development of natural resources should not occur at the expense of the human environment. If no control was exercised, and if the possibility of eventual destruction was not taken into account, there was a risk of going against the very objectives of the Second Development Decade.

52. The report of the Secretary-General emphasized the need for an intergovernmental body which could give technical advice and guidance to the Economic and Social Council with respect to the planning and financing of programmes. Some representatives believed that UNDP fulfilled its task well and should be strengthened. In fact, UNDP was not in a position to proceed with a general survey, and the method recommended by the Secretariat might be the best.

53. With respect to the question of the proliferation of United Nations bodies, some delegations appeared ready to accept all, at any price. It was fitting not to act too quickly, but to take into account the possibilities of the delegations. Even if the new body being contemplated was to be made up of specialists on technical matters rather than diplomats who would not be qualified to advise the Council, it was important not to undertake a heavier task than could be accomplished and, before taking a decision, the question had to be examined from the viewpoint of Governments, delegations, the Secretariat, or even simply from the financial viewpoint.

54. Mr. SKATARETIKO (Yugoslavia), in reply to the representative of Greece, wished to clarify the position of his delegation. When the establishment of a new body was being considered, the first consideration must be that of its

necessity. Immediate resort to the proliferation argument put an end to all debate, and all possibilities of subsequent expansion of the United Nations were jeopardized. Both developed and developing countries were concerned with the financial implications of setting up a new committee, but they believed that the most important consideration was the need and the benefits to be derived from such a committee.

55. Mr. KITI (Kenya) also thought that the main thing was to determine whether the bodies envisaged would be useful to the United Nations. Some delegations tended to systematically oppose the establishment of new committees by immediately raising the proliferation argument. His delegation was aware of the increase in United Nations expenses and favoured control over the use of its resources, but did not think that programme development should be impeded on the pretext that the budget should be curtailed. The developing countries did not advocate thoughtless expenses, but they believed that there should be no hesitation about creating a new committee if that was necessary for programme expansion and if it could make the United Nations more useful.

56. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) recalled that his country held an intermediate position between developed and developing countries. In general, it appeared that the developed countries opposed the creation of new bodies, whereas the developing countries favoured it. In fact, such a distinction was not wholly accurate, since both were working towards a common development. However, he wished to emphasize that the question of need, raised by the representatives of Yugoslavia and Kenya, was mainly a subjective one. Some countries might consider it absolutely necessary to develop areas which other countries regarded as less important. In some cases—for example, Mauritania—private capital undertook the suitable exploitation of mineral resources. On the other hand, systematic exploitation of new mineral resources incurred the risk of bringing about considerable fluctuations in raw material prices.

57. Mr. BARNEA (Director of the Resources and Transport Division) pointed out that Mauritania had in fact asked the United Nations for assistance, since the income it derived from its resources was inadequate to meet its development needs; it had therefore had to request assistance to find new resources.

58. With respect to the question of prices of raw material, the United Nations was proceeding with extreme caution and taking demand forecasts carefully into account.

*The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.*