



ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Forty-eighth Session
OFFICIAL RECORDS

Thursday, 2 April 1970,
at 11.10 a.m.

NEW YORK

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

AGENDA ITEM 8

**ELECTIONS (E/4777, E/4803, E/L.1299/REV.1 AND
ADD.1-4, E/L.1301 AND ADD.1-3)**

1. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia), speaking on behalf of the group of African countries, proposed that the Council should postpone the election of members of the Governing Council of UNDP until the resumed forty-eighth session. Representatives of the African countries were still engaged in consultations with regard to candidatures for election to membership of the Governing Council.

2. Mr. AKWEI (Ghana) and Mr. ZAKHAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported that proposal.

3. The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would assume that the Council agreed to postpone the election of members of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme until the resumed forty-eighth session.

It was so decided.

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; E/L.1306, E/L.1308);
(b) Natural resources satellites (E/4779 and Corr.1-3; E/L.1307)

4. Miss DARLING (United Kingdom) said that draft resolution E/L.1307, of which her delegation was a sponsor, referred to a subject of increasing importance. The third preambular paragraph reflected the view, expressed by several delegations, that, although full benefit would not be derived from resource satellite data for ten or fifteen years, the necessary preparatory work for that purpose should be undertaken immediately. The fourth preambular paragraph recognized the Council's competence in the matter of natural resources satellites.

5. Operative paragraph 1 did not represent an endorsement of the contents of the Secretary-General's report (E/4779 and Corr.1-3) but merely expressed appreciation of the work he had done. Operative paragraph 2 acknowledged the interest of other United Nations bodies in natural resources satellites and the need to keep them informed of developments. In adopting operative paragraph 3, the Council would not endorse but would merely take note with interest of the Secretary-General's sugges-

tion concerning the establishment of a small *ad hoc* panel of experts to refine and elaborate the tentative recommendations contained in the annex to the report.

6. The PRESIDENT announced that Italy had joined in sponsoring draft resolution E/L.1307.

7. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that, although the Council had been unable to agree on the substance of the question of natural resources satellites, adoption of the draft resolution under consideration would be the logical outcome of its discussions. The Council was not sufficiently prepared to deal with the question at the present stage and should take it up again at the forty-ninth session, as the draft resolution provided.

8. The tentative recommendations referred to in operative paragraph 3 had aroused criticism rather than interest. He therefore proposed that the words "Takes note with interest of" in operative paragraph 3 should be deleted and that the remainder of that paragraph and operative paragraph 4 should be combined.

9. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) supported that amendment.

10. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) said that his delegation supported the draft resolution, whose most important feature was its expression of interest in a new technological development. The United Nations had an important role to play in connexion with natural resources satellites, but it must be remembered that their development was still at an experimental stage. He therefore proposed that consideration of the Secretary-General's suggestion should be postponed until the fiftieth session of the Council, especially since the agenda for the forty-ninth session was a heavy one.

11. Mr. DUBEY (India) said that the French representative had apparently misunderstood operative paragraph 3, which was not intended to express endorsement of or even interest in the recommendations set forth in the annex to the report. The words "with interest" related only to the Secretary-General's procedural suggestion for elaborating the recommendations and not to the recommendations themselves. He requested the French representative to reconsider his amendment.

12. To postpone consideration of the question for a whole year, as the representative of Tunisia had proposed, would be to waste valuable time. All that the Council was being asked to do at its forty-ninth session was to decide whether a small panel of experts should be convened—a matter which could be disposed of in a few minutes.

13. Mr. ZAKHAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation supported the French proposal to combine operative paragraphs 3 and 4.

14. He proposed that the reference in the first preambular paragraph to General Assembly resolution 2600 (XXIV), which had been opposed by eight delegations in the Assembly, including some members of the Council, should be deleted. The words "and appreciates the initiative taken by him" in paragraph 1 should also be deleted because, in preparing the report, the Secretary-General had merely acted in response to a Council resolution.

15. Mr. DUBEY (India) said that the sponsors agreed to the deletions proposed by the representative of the Soviet Union.

16. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that from the French text of paragraph 3 it would appear that the Council was to take note with interest of both the suggestion of the Secretary-General and the recommendations in the annex to the report. He therefore felt obliged to press his proposal.

17. Noting the Tunisian representative's proposed amendment to paragraph 4, he said that in addition to the reason given by that speaker there was a further reason for postponing consideration of the Secretary-General's suggestion until the fiftieth session. In paragraph 2 the Secretary-General was requested to bring his report to the attention of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space and the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development. Those bodies would not be able to submit comments to the Council in time for the forty-ninth session. However, in order to avoid losing a year's time he suggested that the Council might continue its discussion of the question at both the forty-ninth and the fiftieth sessions, if members of the Council so desired.

18. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) observed that the entire question of natural resources satellites was not really ripe for discussion at the present stage and that no new factors would have arisen by the forty-ninth session of the Council. However, he saw no reason why the Council should not discuss the item at that session if it wished.

19. Mr. DUBEY (India) said that it was not the intention of the sponsors that the whole question of natural resources satellites should be disposed of once and for all at the forty-ninth session. Paragraphs 3 and 4 merely referred to the Secretary-General's suggestion that an *ad hoc* panel of experts should be convened in order to study the tentative recommendations; they did not include observations on the substance of either the report or the recommendations. With regard to paragraph 2, although the comments of the bodies in question might be helpful they would not affect the way in which the Council was to dispose of the Secretary-General's suggestion referred to in paragraph 3. He appealed to delegations to take that point into consideration.

20. Mr. FRANZI (Italy) said that he fully understood the misgivings of delegations which felt that discussion of the subject was premature. However, the inclusion in the agenda of the forty-ninth session of the Council of an item under which the Secretary-General's suggestion would be discussed did not mean that the whole matter would necessarily be disposed of at that time. At the beginning of that session a decision could be taken on whether the item should remain on the final agenda.

21. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) said that the great merit of the draft resolution was that it spared the Council a lengthy and controversial discussion. He agreed with the representative of the USSR that the reference to General Assembly resolution 2600 (XXIV) should be deleted. He could understand the point of view of those delegations which felt that the question would not be ready for discussion by the forty-ninth session of the Council but if it was repeatedly postponed it would never be considered. His delegation would therefore like to take it up at the forty-ninth session. He also supported the USSR representative's proposal to delete the reference in paragraph 1 to the initiative taken by the Secretary-General. Such initiative was in some cases very useful, but it was inadvisable for the Secretary-General to take the initiative with respect to controversial questions. Lastly, he supported the French representative's proposal that paragraphs 3 and 4 should be combined.

22. Mr. DUBEY (India) said that the sponsors had no objection to combining paragraphs 3 and 4, so that operative paragraph 3 would read:

"3. *Decides* to consider further, at the forty-ninth session, the suggestion of the Secretary-General regarding the arrangements to be made for refining and elaborating the tentative recommendations in the study contained in the annex to the report."

23. Mr. VIAUD (France) suggested that the Secretariat should make it quite clear, when it issued the final agenda for the forty-ninth session, that it was the suggestion of the Secretary-General and not the annex to the report that would be considered.

24. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on draft resolution E/L.1307, as amended.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

25. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft resolution E/L.1308.

26. Mr. DUBEY (India), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, said that originally the survey programme was supposed to be implemented through the regular budget of the United Nations, but owing to the attitude of certain countries with respect to budgetary matters, the proposal was unfortunately being considered in a different context and recent discussions had mainly been on the question of turning the whole programme over to the UNDP. However, that procedure was open to a number of objections: firstly, the UNDP Secretariat was not prepared to undertake such a task; secondly, serious reservations had been expressed as to the concept of the so-called global projects; thirdly, it would not be proper for the Council to request UNDP to waive counterpart funds for all projects in the field of natural resources surveys. The co-sponsors of the draft resolution have, therefore, adopted a pragmatic approach, according to which the United Nations would continue to be responsible for the preparatory work for the survey programme. In paragraph 1, the Secretary-General was asked to continue the preparatory work, which would include elaboration of methodology,

exploration of possibilities of surveys and negotiations leading to crystallization of projects at the regional and sub-regional levels, such as the ones being formulated for Africa and Latin America. UNDP would contribute to projects only after they had reached the operational stage, as indicated in paragraph 2.

27. Mr. RODRIGUEZ (Observer for the Philippines) said that he wished to make a brief statement on the draft resolution under discussion, particularly in view of the draft resolution submitted by his delegation at the second session of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Survey Programme (E/4797, annex IV). The draft resolution E/L.1308 took into account most of the ideas of the *Ad Hoc* Committee and seemed to offer a practical means of solving the problem of financing the survey programme. He therefore hoped that the Council would adopt it unanimously.

28. Mr. FRANZI (Italy) congratulated the sponsors on the draft resolution and the Philippine delegation, which had been a source of inspiration. He wished, however, to make several comments. Firstly, drawing attention to the fifth preambular paragraph, which referred to the "lack of financial resources", he said that the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee had shown that the insufficiency of the progress made had also been due to a lack of requests from developing countries. Secondly, the operative part of the draft made no reference to the *Ad Hoc* Committee, which had clearly been of assistance to the Secretariat. He therefore proposed the addition of the following operative paragraph:

"Authorizes the Secretary-General to reconvene the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Survey Programme for Natural Resources if necessary."

Lastly, he felt that the Administrator and the Governing Council of UNDP should take a more liberal view of counterpart and local cost contributions, particularly in the case of regional projects, for which it was at times difficult to obtain those two types of funds. He therefore supported operative paragraph 2.

29. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that his delegation interpreted the words "in appropriate cases" in paragraph 2 to mean that the Governing Council and the Administrator of UNDP would be free to decide when the circumstances of a particular country or the nature of a particular project warranted the waiving in whole or in part of counterpart and local cost contributions. His delegation agreed that such requirements might be waived in cases where such action was warranted, and he was confident that the Governing Council and the Administrator would faithfully carry out the Council's wishes in that regard. On that understanding, he supported operative paragraph 2 and the draft resolution as a whole.

30. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) said that his delegation, too, supported the draft resolution as a whole. The point raised by the Italian representative with respect to the fifth preambular paragraph might be met by the inclusion of the word "mainly" between the words "owing" and "to". He wondered whether the words "during the Second United Nations Development Decade" in the fourth preambular paragraph were realistic considering the statement

by the Director of the Resources and Transport Division that it would be at least ten to fifteen years before benefits could be reaped from the survey programme. His delegation supported the French representative's interpretation of paragraph 2. In deserving cases, the UNDP could waive its requirements for counterpart funds and local cost contributions as it did in the case of certain other requests. He doubted the need for the addition of the paragraph proposed by the Italian representative since the *Ad Hoc* Committee was already in existence and the Secretary-General had the power to reconvene it whenever necessary.

31. Mr. HALL (Jamaica) said, with reference to the Italian amendment calling for an additional paragraph, that no action could be taken with respect to the *Ad Hoc* Committee until the Council had decided whether it would establish a functional committee on natural resources, as proposed in draft resolution E/L.1306, since the new body would supersede the *Ad Hoc* Committee.

32. Mr. AKWEI (Ghana) supported the draft resolution as modified by the United Kingdom representative's amendment to the fifth preambular paragraph. He felt that the phrase "in appropriate cases" in paragraph 2 met the concern expressed by the French and United Kingdom representatives because it clearly left UNDP wide latitude in deciding when counterpart and local cost contributions should be waived. He agreed with the Jamaican representative that the question of the future of the *Ad Hoc* Committee would depend on the action taken with respect to the establishment of a new functional committee as proposed in E/L.1306.

33. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) observed that the draft resolution suffered from certain defects common to many other United Nations resolutions: needless reiteration and a propensity to emphasize the obvious. Whatever reasons might be given in the fifth preambular paragraph for the insufficient progress made in the implementation of the survey programme, the draft resolution, if adopted, would not produce new funds or induce countries to make requests for projects which they did not want. In view of the limited funds available to UNDP itself, he questioned the usefulness of that paragraph. Similarly, he saw no need for the additional paragraph proposed by the Italian representative, for unless the *Ad Hoc* Committee was rendered obsolete by the adoption of draft resolution E/L.1306, the Secretary-General would have the power to reconvene it. It was not necessary to interpret paragraph 2 in the sense indicated by the French representative because UNDP already had the power to waive counterpart and local costs requirements, and the paragraph merely gave the impression that the Council was applying pressure. The words "taking into account any further action by the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council in this regard" in that paragraph were superfluous because UNDP could hardly take account of action that had not yet been taken; it would indeed be a new departure in drafting resolutions to anticipate the future. For all those reasons, he felt that paragraph 2 could be deleted.

34. Mr. BARNEA (Director, Resources and Transport Division) said that, if the draft resolution was adopted, the Secretariat would appreciate guidance on the extent of the *Ad Hoc* Committee's control over projects financed by

UNDP. The Committee had learned that if UNDP financed a project, it acquired control over it; that was why it had requested a reassessment of its terms of reference.

35. With regard to paragraph 2, he recalled that in paragraph 15(a) of its report (E/4797) the *Ad Hoc* Committee had requested that the Council should urge UNDP to give the fullest consideration to the financing of both the formulation and execution of the survey programme on the basis of project requests. The draft resolution would, however, restrict UNDP financing to the execution of requests and would not cover travel and other costs connected with the formulation of such requests, which would therefore have to be borne by the United Nations. When the survey programme had originally been approved, the Fifth Committee had approved three posts together with travel funds; the adoption of the draft resolution would mean that the travel funds would be abolished and the Secretariat would have to finance such travel costs.

36. Mr. KASSUM (Secretary of the Council) said that the financial implications to which Mr. Barnea had referred and which arose in connexion with paragraph 1 of the draft resolution would amount to \$9,000 for the travel and subsistence of staff connected with the preparatory work relating to the implementation of the survey programme.

37. Mr. ZAKHAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, to make the fifth preambular paragraph correspond more closely to paragraph 2, the words "from voluntary sources of funds" should be inserted after the words "financial resources".

38. Mr. DUBEY (India), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution, said that the sponsors accepted the United Kingdom representative's suggestion to delete the words "during the Second United Nations Development Decade" from the fourth preambular paragraph as well as his suggestion to add the word "mainly" between the words "owing" and "to" in the fifth preambular paragraph. They could not accept the USSR representative's amendment to the latter paragraph because they felt that the lack of financial resources impeded not only the implementation of the survey programme but also planning, negotiation and the laying of the groundwork. The latter activities were supposed to be financed out of regular budget, which had not been forthcoming. As regards the

financing of projects in the field of natural resources, there was a decrease in the number of projects being approved by UNDP. The sponsors had included the words "in appropriate cases" in paragraph 2 to meet the very concern which had just been expressed by the French and United Kingdom representatives and, although they realized that UNDP already waived certain requirements in some cases, they felt that the point should be stressed.

39. The Greek representative's criticism of the defects of the draft resolution would apply with equal validity to 95 per cent of the resolutions of the United Nations. Progress in the United Nations was made only by inches and by stressing the obvious. The difference of view over the words "further action" was the difference between a pessimist and an optimist: he himself was an optimist; he was sure that there would be further action and that it would be positive.

40. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the draft resolution E/L.1308 with the two amendments proposed by the United Kingdom and accepted by the sponsors.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 24 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

41. Mr. FRANZI (Italy) said that he had not pressed his proposal for the addition of a new paragraph because he had found the Jamaican representative's argument persuasive. He understood, however, that, irrespective of any action taken on draft resolution E/L.1306, the *Ad Hoc* Committee would continue in existence until it was replaced or reconstituted.

42. Mr. ZAKHAROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had abstained in the vote because the sponsors had not accepted his amendment to the fifth preambular paragraph.

43. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that his delegation, too, had abstained because the operative paragraphs of the draft resolution seemed to be legislating where no legislation was necessary; because paragraph 2 anticipated the future; and because the decision once taken might well be reversed by a contradictory decision on draft resolution E/L.1306.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.