

# United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-THIRD SESSION

Official Records



SECOND COMMITTEE, 1227th  
MEETING

Friday, 22 November 1968,  
at 10.55 a.m.

NEW YORK

## CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 37:</i>	
<i>United Nations Development Decade: report of the Secretary-General (continued) . . . . .</i>	1
<i>Agenda item 34:</i>	
<i>United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (continued):</i>	
<i>(a) Report of the Conference on its second session;</i>	
<i>(b) Report of the Trade and Development Board . . . . .</i>	2
<i>Agenda item 41:</i>	
<i>Resources of the sea: report of the Secretary-General (continued) . . . . .</i>	4
<i>Chairman: Mr. Richard M. AKWEI (Ghana).</i>	

## AGENDA ITEM 37

United Nations Development Decade: report of the Secretary-General (continued)\* (A/7203, chap. III; A/7251 and Corr.1, A/C.2/L.1018/Rev.1, E/4496, E/AC.54/L.25, E/AC.54/L.28, E/AC.54/L.29/Rev.1, E/AC.54/L.30, E/AC.54/L.31, TD/B/186/Rev.1)

1. The CHAIRMAN said that the sponsors had submitted a revised draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1018/Rev.1), taking into account the suggestions made at the 1225th meeting during the discussion of the question, and that they had no objection to the draft resolution being transferred to agenda item 12 (Report of the Economic and Social Council).

2. Mr. KASPRZYK (Poland), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said that the text had been redrafted in the light of the oral amendments submitted by various delegations and that all the suggestions made had been duly considered. He hoped that the draft resolution in its revised form would be adopted unanimously. He announced that six more delegations had joined the sponsors: Colombia, Rwanda, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Syria and Tunisia.

3. Mr. HASSAN (Sudan) said that the co-operative movement should be given a prominent place in the preparations for the second Development Decade. The experience gained by a number of countries, both developed and developing, in that field could be of great value to any country needing assistance.

4. Over the past half century, the Sudan had developed a large-scale co-operative movement comprising such

sectors of activity as agriculture, consumption, credit and so forth. The most notable experiment had been the Gezira scheme. That was a project covering 2 million acres, run on a partnership basis by the Government, some 75,000 tenant-cultivators—former nomadic tribesmen who had inhabited the area before the project had been set up—and the Gezira Board. The Government provided water and irrigation systems, fertilizers, pesticides and agricultural equipment. The tenant-cultivators formed the labour force and the Board was responsible for administration, social services, research and the marketing of the crops. The Government received 40 per cent of the net returns on the scheme; the tenant-cultivators, 46 per cent; the Board, 8 per cent; and the remaining 6 per cent was allocated to social development, local government and a tenants' reserve fund. The co-operative movement had transformed the way of life of the nomadic tribes in the region and had provided them not only with a steady income but with financial security through the reserve fund, as also with social and medical services, running water, housing, local councils and a tenants' union. The Gezira scheme had become the corner-stone of the national economy and similar projects had since developed in other areas of the country. The Sudan, whose environment and local conditions were similar to those of many neighbouring countries of Africa and West Asia, was in the best position to share its experience in the co-operative movement. Similarly, other African countries which, like the Sudan, had gained experience in that field could help other countries of the continent. The revised draft resolution, especially operative paragraph 2, was a step in the right direction and his delegation was therefore pleased to become a sponsor.

5. Mr. SCHMID (Austria) said that for the last century the co-operative movement had played an important part in the economic life of his country, particularly in the fields of consumption, agricultural production and credit. Austria had already made its experience available to a number of developing countries and was prepared to provide increasing assistance in that field in future, in accordance with the spirit of operative paragraph 2 of the revised draft resolution. He congratulated the sponsors of that draft resolution on their initiative and assured them of his delegation's support.

6. Mr. POSNETT (United Kingdom) thanked the sponsors of the revised draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1018/Rev.1) for having given due consideration to his delegation's suggestions in redrafting the text. He noted, however, that his proposal for the addition of a new preambular paragraph (see 1225th meeting, para. 30) had not been taken into account

\*Resumed from the 1225th meeting.

and that the revised text, like the original text, by merely requesting the International Labour Organisation, other specialized agencies concerned and the International Co-operative Alliance to render their assistance in the realization of the objectives of the resolution, seemed to ignore the assistance that the various agencies had already given in connexion with the co-operative movement. One way of improving the text in that regard would be to insert the words "continue to" between the words "to" and "render" in operative paragraph 3.

7. Mr. BOZA (Peru) said that the sponsors had shown a great spirit of understanding in revising the draft resolution to take into account the amendments which had been proposed. His delegation would consequently like to become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

8. Mr. VARELA (Panama) said that he was pleased to see that the amendment he had proposed, as also those proposed by the representatives of France and Somalia, had been incorporated in the revised draft resolution and that operative paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 had been revised accordingly. His delegation would therefore be happy to support the revised draft resolution.

9. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines) said that the changes which the sponsors had made in the revised draft resolution had greatly improved the text. Nevertheless, he had a slight amendment to suggest to operative paragraph 3, namely, the addition of the words "and other non-governmental organizations concerned" after "the International Co-operative Alliance". He further suggested that the words "the objectives of the present resolution" in the English text should be replaced by "the objectives of this resolution".

10. Mr. AHMED (Pakistan) thanked the sponsors of the revised draft resolution for the understanding they had shown in agreeing to submit it under item 12 of the agenda. That having been agreed upon, his delegation would like to join the sponsors.

11. Mr. KASPRZYK (Poland) thanked the representative of the United Kingdom for the amendment he had proposed to operative paragraph 3, which greatly improved the wording. With regard to the amendment proposed by the Philippines whereby non-governmental organizations would be mentioned in paragraph 3, his delegation would be willing to support it but would like to know what organizations might be concerned and whether they could really assist the developing countries in the matter. He therefore asked the representative of the Philippines whether he wished to press his proposal. His suggestion that the words "the present" should be replaced by the word "this" in the English text of operative paragraph 3 was well taken.

12. Mr. EL-ATTRASH (Syria), speaking as a sponsor of the revised draft resolution, thanked the United Kingdom delegation for its amendment, which he had no difficulty in accepting. His delegation could not, however, accept the Philippine proposal for the addition of the words "and other non-governmental organizations concerned" in operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution since such an amendment would have political implications. His delegation therefore

appealed to the Philippine delegation not to press that proposal.

13. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines) said that there were certain non-governmental organizations which might be concerned with the co-operative movement. He added that he was not at all motivated by political considerations when he submitted his amendment as had been inferred from the remarks made by the representative of Syria. Nevertheless, he would not press his proposal if the sponsors objected to it.

14. Mr. ASANTE (Ghana) said that his delegation was prepared to support the revised draft resolution with the inclusion of the United Kingdom amendment and the second Philippine amendment, which concerned the English text only.

15. Mr. HASSAN (Sudan) said that he agreed to the amendments that had been made.

16. Mr. LECOURTIER (France) said that he agreed to those amendments and thanked the sponsors for having taken into account the amendments submitted by his delegation.

17. Mr. UBILLOS (Uruguay) requested that the fact that his delegation had congratulated the sponsors of the draft resolution on their initiative should be recorded. His delegation would have great pleasure in voting in favour of the revised draft resolution.

18. Mr. VARELA (Panama) supported by Mr. AHMED (Pakistan), proposed that, in the amendment proposed by the representative of the United Kingdom to operative paragraph 3, the words "continue to render their assistance" should be replaced by "to render increased assistance".

19. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the revised draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1018/Rev.1), as orally amended.

*The revised draft resolution, as amended, was adopted unanimously.*

#### AGENDA ITEM 34

United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (continued)\* (A/7176/Rev.2, A/7203/Add.1, A/7214, A/7256, A/C.2/L.1010, A/C.2/L.1011, TD/97, TD/L.37/Add.11):

- (a) Report of the Conference on its second session;
- (b) Report of the Trade and Development Board

20. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to paragraphs 17 and 18 of the report of the Trade and Development Board on its seventh session (see A/7214, part two, chap. I) which concerned the relationship of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) to the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), and to the note by the Secretary-General (A/7256), in which resolution 44 (VII) of the Board on technical assistance in trade and related fields appeared as an annex and, a statement by the Secretary-General of UNCTAD regarding that resolution, appeared as an appendix.

21. Mr. ASANTE (Ghana) said that he would like his delegation's reservations with regard to the statement which appeared as an appendix to document

\*Resumed from the 1216th meeting.

A/7256, and which seemed to have been made as a result of certain unacceptable pressures, to be noted in the record. His delegation did not think that that statement should be included in the official documents of the Second Committee. It proposed that the Committee should adopt the draft resolution recommended by the Trade and Development Board in its resolution 44 (VII) continued in the annex to document A/7256 and should mention in its report that it had taken note of the statement made by the Secretary-General of UNCTAD.

22. Mr. AHMED (Pakistan) said that his delegation welcomed the recommendation made by the Trade and Development Board in its resolution 44 (VII) that the General Assembly should give UNCTAD the status of a participating organization of UNDP; it was a decision which followed logically from General Assembly resolutions 1995 (XIX) and 2297 (XXII).

23. The Pakistan delegation was aware of the fact that the Board's resolution 44 (VII) was based on a compromise which was explained in the statement of the Secretary-General of UNCTAD (see A/7256, appendix). It was not usual for resolutions submitted to the General Assembly for adoption to be accompanied by annexes giving the text of statements made in subsidiary organs. At its twenty-first session, in considering the draft resolution concerning the establishment of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), the General Assembly had experienced certain difficulties in defining the role which that organization should play with regard to training. After extensive consultations, a compromise solution had been reached but it had not been felt necessary to annex the text of that solution to the General Assembly resolution 2152 (XXI) establishing UNIDO. For those reasons, the Pakistan delegation supported the proposal of the representative of Ghana; furthermore, it proposed that the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution to be submitted to the General Assembly for adoption should be deleted and that the Rapporteur should mention in the Committee's report that the Committee had taken note of the statement of the Secretary-General of UNCTAD, which would be reproduced in the report itself.

24. Mr. VARELA (Panama) supported the proposals of the representatives of Ghana and Pakistan.

25. Mr. CHTOUROU (Tunisia) said that he too thought that it was unusual and inadvisable to annex statements to draft resolutions. He saw no need to include in the Committee's report the text of the statement made by the Secretary-General of UNCTAD or to delete the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution: it would be sufficient to delete the letter "a/" at the end of that paragraph together with the corresponding foot-note.

26. Mr. VIAUD (France) pointed out that the debate which had taken place during the seventh session of the Trade and Development Board had been a difficult one but it had eventually been successful as a result of the compromise which had been reached. The appendix to the draft resolution containing the statement by the Secretary-General of UNCTAD was intended to enlighten the General Assembly with regard to

the difficulty of the negotiations. It had never been suggested, however, that that statement should form an integral part of the draft resolution. The French delegation had no objection to the text of that statement being included in the Committee's report, but it considered it essential that the second preambular paragraph should be retained, for otherwise it might complicate the task of those who might later take an interest in the proceedings of the Board and it might introduce an element of doubt about the terms of the compromise reached at Geneva.

27. Mr. COX (Sierra Leone) supported the proposal of the representative of Tunisia. It did not seem to him necessary to include in the report the text of the statement in question, since he thought that the documentation of the United Nations was already sufficiently voluminous.

28. Mr. POSNETT (United Kingdom) shared the views expressed by the representatives of Tunisia and Sierra Leone.

29. Mr. BLAU (United States of America) said that he too thought that the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution should be retained, although it was not necessary to include the text of the statement made by the Secretary-General of UNCTAD as an appendix to the draft resolution.

30. Mr. ABE (Japan) said that the existence of the statement by the Secretary-General of UNCTAD could not be ignored. The Japanese delegation, however, would have no difficulty in supporting the proposal of the representative of Ghana since it was quite clear that, if the General Assembly adopted operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, it adopted the recommendations formulated by the Trade and Development Board in its resolution 44 (VII), and those recommendations included a reference to the statement made by the Secretary-General of UNCTAD. For the same reasons, he thought that the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution could be deleted. He urged, however, that the statement should be mentioned in the Committee's report.

31. The CHAIRMAN said that there appeared to be no objection in principle to the statement of the Secretary-General of UNCTAD being mentioned. The difficulty lay in the method of doing so. On that point, there appeared to be a majority in favour of retaining the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution and deleting the text of the statement itself from that resolution.

32. Mr. ASANTE (Ghana) said that his delegation supported the recommendation of the representative of Pakistan that the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution should be deleted, but it would respect the wishes of the majority on that point. He could not help wondering, however, what validity the statement of the Secretary-General of UNCTAD would have once he had resigned.

33. Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta) and Mr. SAHLOUL (Sudan) supported the proposal of the representative of Pakistan that the second preambular paragraph should be deleted, but recommended that the report should indicate that the Committee had been aware of the statement in question.

34. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should adopt the draft resolution subject to the deletion of the letter "a/" at the end of the second preambular paragraph, which would automatically result in the deletion of the foot-note and of the statement attached as an appendix.

35. Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta) said that he thought that there had been a formal proposal to amend the text of the draft resolution and that no one could decide by intuition that the Committee was divided into a majority and a minority. His delegation would like to have a fuller debate.

36. Mr. VIAUD (France) explained that, if such was the wish of the Committee, his delegation would have no difficulty whatsoever in supporting the proposal that both the statement of the Secretary-General of UNCTAD and the second preambular paragraph should be deleted. It had been out of courtesy to the delegations which wanted to pay a well-deserved tribute to the Secretary-General of UNCTAD that the French delegation had recommended the retention of the second preambular paragraph, a recommendation which did not, however, correspond to the position upheld by France.

37. Mr. ASANTE (Ghana) said that he recognized the importance that certain delegations attached to the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, which had been the basis for their support of Trade and Development Board resolution 44 (VII). The Ghanaian delegation did not question the intentions expressed by the Secretary-General of UNCTAD in his statement. As a member of the Board, his delegation thought that that statement was one of the essential elements of the compromise which had been reached and which was binding on all members of the Board. It was quite unnecessary, however, to annex the text of the statement to the draft resolution.

38. Mr. VARELA (Panama) explained that his delegation had supported the Pakistan proposal that the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution should be deleted, in the hope that such a procedure would enable unanimity to be achieved in the Committee. His delegation, however, was not inflexible on that point. If the Committee decided to retain the second preambular paragraph, his delegation saw no objection to the statement of the Secretary-General of UNCTAD not being included in the Committee's report.

39. Mr. TOBON VILLEGAS (Colombia) said that, in his view, it would be advisable for the Committee to adopt the draft resolution as it stood, on the understanding that the foot-note reference a/ in the second preambular paragraph would be deleted and that the statement by the Secretary-General of UNCTAD would be mentioned in the Committee's report.

40. The CHAIRMAN observed that he could not very well rely on intuition in conducting the discussion. He had merely made a suggestion and had invited the Pakistan representative to make his own comments. Since there had been no reaction and no formal proposal, he suggested that the Committee should adopt the draft resolution, recommended by the Trade and Development Board (see A/7256, annex), as it stood, on the understanding that the foot-note reference a/ in the second preambular paragraph,

the corresponding foot-note and the appended statement made by the Secretary-General of UNCTAD would be deleted.

*The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted without objection.*

#### AGENDA ITEM 41

Resources of the sea: report of the Secretary-General (continued) (A/7203, chap. VI. sect. B; A/7245, A/7264, A/C.2/244, E/4449 and Add.1 and 2, E/4487 and Corr.1-5 and Add.1)

41. Mr. KROYER (Iceland), noting that his delegation had been a co-sponsor of General Assembly resolution 2172 (XXI) on the resources of the sea, thanked the United States delegation for having taken the initiative in bringing the question to the attention of the General Assembly. Only a fraction of the resources of the sea had hitherto been utilized, and an international effort must be made to explore and map those resources. The survey undertaken by the Secretariat with the assistance of a Group of Experts, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 2172 (XXI), had resulted in a remarkable report entitled "Marine science and technology: survey and proposals" (E/4487 and Corr.1-5 and Add.1).

42. It appeared that one of the most important uses of the ocean might be as a source of protein for human food. Given the limited possibilities for increasing agricultural production, a substantial increase in world production of fish protein seemed essential. Present catches could be doubled or even quadrupled; in fact, they had increased by 50 per cent during the past three years, rising from 40 million tons in 1964 to 60 million tons in 1967. However, more needed to be known about the marine environment in order to avoid overexploitation and the resultant depletion of certain species.

43. His country had been represented on the Group of Experts by the Director of the Marine Research Institute of Iceland, who was a specialist in marine biology. Iceland's interest in all matters relating to the ocean stemmed from the fact that its economy was mainly dependent on fishing. Fish products accounted for 90 per cent of the country's total exports. Iceland had power resources, which it intended to develop, but for a long time to come it would have to base its economic development on the resources of the sea. The relatively high standard of living enjoyed by its 200,000 inhabitants was a result of the high productivity of the country's fishermen. The Icelandic fishing fleet had 850 superbly equipped vessels and employed 6,000 fishermen, who represented 3 per cent of the population. Its annual production, which was in excess of 1 million tons, ranked eleventh in the world. The high productivity of Icelandic fishing was due to the proximity of rich fishing banks, the intensive exploration and research conducted by the country's marine biologists and its modern, well-equipped fleet and capable fishermen.

44. The Marine Research Institute of Iceland had been founded in 1937, initially as a section of the Research Institute of the University of Iceland. Since that time, his Government had supported a scientific programme of exploration of the marine areas surrounding the

island and of the North Atlantic in general. The purpose of the programme was to discover and explore new areas which were rich in fish but had not been extensively exploited and to watch for cases of overexploitation of certain species. Such work had made it possible to harvest the fishing grounds on a scientific basis and to adopt any necessary protective measures. There was still much to be done, however, in order to make those countries which maintained fishing fleets recognize the dangers inherent in overexploitation. Iceland was one of nineteen countries which devoted more than \$500,000 annually to marine research—a substantial sum when one considered the country's small population. Iceland's marine research was co-ordinated with that of other countries. With three and sometimes four research vessels, it had co-operated with Norway, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and several other Western and Northern European countries in joint research in the North Atlantic area. In an effort to increase its capabilities in that field, it had put two new, well-equipped research vessels into service. The availability of such facilities would make it possible to train greater numbers of specialists and technicians from other countries in marine research.

45. In recent years, a variety of new organizations had been created throughout the world for the purpose of promoting international co-operation in the field of oceanography. Increased co-operation was required in order to ensure a division of responsibilities among the various organizations and prevent duplication of efforts. A global approach to the problem was essential. His country was a member of several of the organizations mentioned in the Secretary-General's report and was therefore interested in the expanded programme of international co-operation for the exploration and use of the resources of the sea. It endorsed in general the Secretary-General's proposals contained in paragraphs 253 to 285 of the report (see E/4487 and Corr.5), although it had not had time to study them sufficiently and would be interested to hear other delegations' observations and suggestions on the subject. The UNESCO Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) had played an important role in stimulating and co-ordinating oceanic research; his Government was carefully studying recommendations for broadening the base of the Commission and the conclusions of the meeting of consultants convened by the IOC Bureau. Greater co-ordination was also essential in the development and conservation of living marine resources; the FAO

Committee on Fisheries had been established for that purpose.

46. Problems of a general legal nature relating to the development and exploitation of marine resources were the subject of special United Nations conferences based on preparatory work by the International Law Commission. However, there was one aspect of the question which was merely alluded to in the Secretary-General's report (E/4487 and Corr.1-5 and Add.1) and was of paramount importance to Iceland, namely the conservation of fishery resources. In recent years, representatives of his country had had occasion to emphasize, in the General Assembly and the Second Committee, the desirability of convening a new conference on the law of the sea in order to review existing regulations and conventions in the light of the rapid progress in fishery techniques and the growing danger of overexploitation to which it had given rise. The General Assembly showed great interest in the legal and jurisdictional problems relating to the resources of the sea. There had been a shift in the thinking of Governments and of their legal experts regarding the conservation of deep-sea fishery resources. In that connexion, the Canadian Minister of Fisheries had suggested in a recent statement that some new initiative was needed on the part of the littoral States concerned. Since their own fishing activity was affected by that of other States beyond the 12-mile limit, the littoral States had an abiding interest in the conservation of fish stocks in extra-territorial waters. Ten years earlier, his country had stood alone in calling attention to the problem, but today there was growing understanding of its views. The problems of conserving fishery resources were not only legal but also political and economic and were within the purview of the Second Committee. The latter should therefore act on the Secretary-General's proposals, but the General Assembly should first of all ask the Secretary-General for more detailed recommendations. The Committee should also undertake to establish the biological and economic facts pointing to the need for a review of existing international regulations relating to the conservation of living marine resources. It might be useful to ask the Secretary-General to collect information from Governments and to report on changes in national legislation regarding fishery limits since 1958. Such information would enable the General Assembly or a subsidiary body to make recommendations for the eventual revision of existing rules and conventions.

*The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.*