

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-THIRD SESSION

Official Records



SECOND COMMITTEE, 1245th
MEETING

Wednesday, 11 December 1968,
at 3.25 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 34:</i>	
<i>United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (concluded):</i>	
(a) <i>Report of the Conference on its second session;</i>	
(b) <i>Report of the Trade and Development Board</i>	
<i>Adoption of part II of the Committee's draft report</i>	1
<i>Agenda item 36:</i>	
<i>United Nations Capital Development Fund . . .</i>	1
<i>Agenda item 42:</i>	
<i>External financing of economic development of the developing countries: report of the Secretary-General (concluded)</i>	5
<i>Agenda item 41:</i>	
<i>Resources of the sea: report of the Secretary-General (continued)</i>	9

Chairman: Mr. Richard M. AKWEI (Ghana).

AGENDA ITEM 34

United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (concluded):

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

ADOPTION OF PART II OF THE COMMITTEE'S DRAFT REPORT (A/C.2/L.1043/ADD.1)

1. Mr. CHRISTIANSEN (Norway), Rapporteur, presented part II of the Committee's draft report on agenda item 34 (A/C.2/L.1043/Add.1).

The draft report (A/C.2/L.1043/Add.1) was adopted.

AGENDA ITEM 36

United Nations Capital Development Fund (A/7203, chap. XII, sect. B; A/7272 and Add.1 and 2, A/C.2/L.1038, A/C.2/L.1045, DP/L.82, E/4545)

2. Mr. MASSIBÉ (Chad) recalled that on 13 December 1966 the General Assembly had adopted resolution 2186 (XXI) establishing the United Nations Capital Development Fund. Two years later, the lively controversies that had attended the birth of that organ had lost none of their intensity. The recent discussions in the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the Economic and Social Council and the Trade and Development Board had once again shown the extreme rigidity of the position of the developed countries, on the one hand, and of the developing countries on the other.

3. The United Nations Capital Development Fund was the only international financing institution that was established on a truly universal basis. That special characteristic should certainly help to strengthen its financial structure and to make it the natural channel for an ever-increasing flow of aid to the developing countries. The Fund could if necessary serve as a centre for the co-ordination of aid to the developing countries.

4. In his statement at the second Pledging Conference on the United Nations Capital Development Fund, the Secretary-General had rightly pointed out that, now that the Fund had been set up by a General Assembly resolution, its financing should be a matter of serious concern to all Member States. The most important question that remained was whether Member States were animated with a sufficiently ardent spirit of mutual aid to respond in that way to the challenge to the international community.

5. All the recent resolutions and recommendations of the Governing Council of UNDP, the Economic and Social Council and the Trade and Development Board had requested the Administrator of UNDP to continue his efforts to enable the Fund to start operating as soon as possible. There was no need to reconsider a point which had already been discussed, namely, that the minimum level of resources suggested by the Administrator of UNDP did not take into account the needs of the most deprived of the developing countries, the possibilities of promoting a number of small agricultural and industrial enterprises, or the circumstances in which the Fund had been established.

6. His delegation suggested that a technical committee should be set up to determine, on the basis of the existing pre-investment and technical assistance files, both in the Secretariat and in UNDP, the projects that might be financed by the Fund. The Committee could consist of a representative of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs, a representative of the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and a representative of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO). Other members could serve on the committee on a temporary basis, as the need arose.

7. The question of the United Nations Capital Development Fund came into the more general context of the financing of the economic development of the developing countries. At the forty-fifth session of the Economic and Social Council, the delegation of Chad had introduced the resolution concerning the convening of a panel on foreign investment (see Council resolution 1359 (XLV)). It was glad to learn that the preparatory work for the convening of the panel, at Amsterdam,

was proceeding well.^{1/} It hoped that for that purpose business circles in the developed countries would collaborate closely with the Secretary-General in order to ensure that the panel would produce concrete, realistic and promising proposals. He would point out, in that connexion, that the Government of Chad had established extremely favourable conditions for foreign private investment. The economic, financial and social policy of the Government of Chad had always been directed towards seeking the greatest and most honest co-operation between foreign investors and Chad nationals.

8. As the second United Nations Development Decade drew near, it was becoming increasingly important that the developing countries should speak out strongly to request the developed countries to provide more substantial official aid on conditions that took into consideration the degree of development of the receiving countries and the prospects concerning the position of their currency reserves. Special attention should be given to small agricultural and industrial projects, for which there was at the moment practically no possibility of finance. There should be more concern for the economic, cultural and social infra-structure of the poorest countries. All those were fields with which the United Nations Capital Development Fund might concern itself. His delegation had full confidence in all the Member States and was convinced that an acceptable solution would be found which would enable the Fund to satisfy, at least in part, the hopes that the under-developed countries placed in it.

9. Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta) submitted the draft resolution on the United Nations Capital Development Fund (A/C.2/L.1038) on behalf of the sponsors. He wished first of all to associate himself with the representative of Chad, who had appealed to the developed countries to cease their hostility towards the United Nations Capital Development Fund. The Fund was all the more necessary since the developing countries were finding it more and more difficult to obtain access to the capital market. The countries which had been opposed to the Fund at the time of its creation were still hostile to it and those which had been preparing to join the advocates of the Fund had not yet taken the decisive step. He hoped that they would all come to realize that the developing countries had not been wrong to persist in their efforts.

10. In the draft resolution, the sponsors really did no more than note a regrettable, but true, situation. The first preambular paragraph recalled the General Assembly resolutions (2186 (XXI) and 2321 (XXII)) concerning the Fund. The second preambular paragraph took note of the decision of the Governing Council of UNDP at its sixth session (see E/4545, para. 267) requesting the Administrator to continue his efforts to enable the United Nations Capital Development Fund to commence operations.

11. The sponsors considered that the Administrator of UNDP should endeavour as far as possible to identify the projects which could benefit from direct investment from the United Nations Capital Development Fund. That was explained in operative paragraph 1, which in fact merely asked for a purely

administrative operation. Operative paragraph 2 made a timely and pertinent reference to the arguments put forward when the Fund had been established, at the twenty-second session of the General Assembly and in the Economic and Social Council. With regard to operative paragraph 3, at the twenty-second session of the General Assembly the developing countries had thought that, in view of the limited resources available to the Fund, it would be better not to set up the Executive Board or appoint a Managing Director at that time. At the present session the requisite conditions for that action were still lacking. Lastly, operative paragraph 4 followed logically on operative paragraph 3. The sponsors hoped that at the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly the developed countries would show some understanding towards the developing countries and that it would then be possible to set up the Executive Board and appoint the Managing Director of the Fund.

12. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to the note by the Secretary-General (A/C.2/L.1045) on the administrative and financial implications of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1038.

13. MR. SAHLOUL (Sudan) said that he saw two encouraging developments in the second Pledging Conference on the United Nations Capital Development Fund: the contributions announced had amounted to a total of \$1,356,716 as against the \$1,319,910 pledged at the first Conference, and thirty-one countries had pledged contributions as compared with twenty-two in 1967 (see A/7272/Add.2). Moreover, \$250,000 of the amount pledged was in convertible currencies and ten more countries had promised to announce the amount of their contributions in the near future.

14. The developing countries which had attended the Pledging Conference had noted that the developed countries of both groups continued to boycott the Conference, with the exception of the Netherlands, whose support of the idea of a third element in UNDP had been a major inducement for the developing countries to try to reach a compromise with the developed countries.

15. His delegation felt that the Committee should address itself to the practical aspects of the administration and operation of the Fund. The contributions announced at the second Conference had put it in a better position to start operating. It might perhaps be useful to extend the provisional arrangements, set out in General Assembly resolution 2321 (XXII), for the administration of the Fund for another year, since working arrangements would have to be developed between the Fund and UNDP. The Administrator of UNDP might perhaps be kind enough to acquaint the Committee with the reasons which had prevented him from making those arrangements. Similarly, the Secretary-General could perhaps give the reasons why the financial regulations of the Fund had not yet been drafted.

16. His delegation had always been of the opinion that the Fund should undertake projects of small and medium size especially in industry and agriculture. It had welcomed the statement by the Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs at the second Pledging Conference on the United Nations Capital

^{1/} See document E/4600.

Development Fund to the effect that the Fund could be used to finance small-scale industrial and agricultural projects. It might also be conceivable for the Fund to finance pilot plants in some of the productive regions of the developing countries in order to demonstrate the feasibility of setting up profitable industries in those regions. The pilot plants might eventually be enlarged from local resources, which might also be used to expand the productive capacity of the small or medium-sized industries already in operation in some developing countries. His country had, in the past few years, set up a number of small industrial projects, which ranged in cost between \$1.5 million and \$2.5 million and had been financed by the USSR and Yugoslavia. There had recently been some thinking about expanding the productive capacity of some of those plants, and the contemplated expansion could be financed from the resources at the disposal of the Fund. In view of those considerations, his delegation could not agree with the proposal of the Administrator of UNDP that the Council might wish to consider setting a minimum level for the resources of the United Nations Capital Development Fund at \$10 million before it would authorize the initiation of joint operations (see A/7272, para. 4). The Sudanese delegation certainly did not object to the idea of joint operations with the regional development banks and other international financial institutions. It did, however, object to the operations of the Fund being delayed until such time as the level of resources reached \$10 million. In such an event, no country could be persuaded to allocate resources year after year to a Fund which had not begun to operate.

17. Many representatives had pointed out that a large part of the resources pledged so far had been in non-convertible currencies. Developing countries could naturally not be expected to make their pledges in convertible currencies which would be used to procure equipment from those countries which had continued to boycott the Fund. It might, in fact, be better if the developing countries continued to make their contributions in local currencies, since that would have the obvious advantage of increasing the flow of manufactured goods between the developing countries themselves and of accelerating the process of interdependence between their respective economies. It was not sufficiently realized that the industrial capacity of many of the developing countries exceeded that of some of the countries of Western Europe. That being the case, the fact that a large portion of the resources of the Fund was in local currency should be considered an advantage rather than a disadvantage.

18. The position of the developing countries had been very well summed up at the fifth session of the Governing Council of UNDP by the representative of Pakistan (see E/4451, para. 271). According to that representative: the Administrator of UNDP should consult with the regional development banks and other international financial institutions on the possibility of joint ventures; he should ask the countries which had announced contributions how their pledges ought to be used and what capital equipment they could supply; he should discuss with the donor countries the possibility of joint ventures with bilateral programmes; he should try to identify a number of Special Fund (UNDP) projects which required modest follow-up investment; and

he should consider the possibility of using the resources of the United Nations Capital Development Fund for financing, wholly or in conjunction with the Special Fund component of UNDP, pilot plants and demonstration projects. It might have been expected that some action would have been taken on at least some of those proposals, but such had not been the case. The Sudanese delegation had already indicated that it was inclined to support the continuation of the provisional arrangement for another year. If that arrangement should not be enough to induce the Administrator of UNDP or the Secretary-General to initiate the operations of the Fund, then the General Assembly might perhaps consider taking one of the following courses: proceed with the election of the members of the governing board of the Fund, the appointment of the Executive Director and the allocation of the necessary resources from the regular budget for the administrative expenses; or put the present arrangements between the Fund and UNDP on a permanent basis and appoint a Co-administrator for the operations of the Fund; or transform UNDP into a fund for capital investments and assign to it the resources presently at the disposal of the United Nations Capital Development Fund.

19. The developing countries had not pressed for any of those three courses because they believed that the operations of the Fund could be initiated on a slow and gradual basis within the modest resources available to it.

20. While they disagreed with the developed countries on the attitude of those countries towards the Fund, they did appreciate their difficulties. They had been heartened by the decisions of Canada, Italy and Sweden to proceed with the payment of their shares to the International Development Association (IDA) without waiting for the implementation of the second replenishment plan. It was because of such a positive and constructive attitude that they hoped a constructive dialogue might be initiated between them and the developing countries on the practical means of initiating the operations of the United Nations Capital Development Fund.

21. His delegation was of the opinion that the Secretary-General and the Administrator of UNDP should proceed with the necessary action to make the Fund operational. To that end, the Secretary-General should approach those Governments that had announced pledges and should make the necessary arrangements for those pledges to be paid; he should address a note to the Governments which had promised to indicate their pledges at a later date, with a view to finding out the exact amounts they wished to pledge; and he should proceed with the drafting of the financial regulations of the Fund, it being possible for the financial rules and regulations of the United Nations to be applied in the meantime. The Administrator of UNDP should, for his part, address a note to the Governments of the Member States informing them of the initiation of the Fund's operations, its objectives and the resources at its disposal. Furthermore, the substantive machinery of UNDP, in co-operation with the regional development banks and other multilateral institutions, should be in a position to process any requests for projects which might be forthcoming from member

countries. The Sudanese delegation was of the opinion that if that procedure was followed, it might at last be possible for the operations of the Fund to be initiated. Further delay might lead to a situation of maximum confrontation from which none of the parties involved was likely to benefit.

22. His delegation was happy to be a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1038 and hoped that it would be supported by a majority of the Committee.

23. Mr. LUBBERS (Netherlands) said that his delegation had always taken a real interest in the United Nations Capital Development Fund and had co-sponsored General Assembly resolution 2321 (XXII). His delegation approved of the basic purpose of the draft resolution under consideration (A/C.2/L.1038), and if it had consisted solely of operative paragraphs 3 and 4, his delegation would have been quite willing to be a sponsor. As presently worded, however, the draft resolution did not adequately stress the decisions previously taken by various organs. After all, the most important decision of all was the one which had been taken by the Governing Council of UNDP at its sixth session (see E/4545, para. 267) and not resolution 1350 (XLV) of the Economic and Social Council or resolution 42 (VII) of the Trade and Development Board (see A/7214, part two, annex I). Furthermore, the decision of the Governing Council that was mentioned in the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution had not been reproduced in its entirety. Also, Economic and Social Council resolution 1350 (XLV) merely endorsed the aforementioned decision of the UNDP Governing Council. It would be preferable if, in the preamble, the sponsors merely took note of the resolutions of the Economic and Social Council and the Trade and Development Board, and if, in the operative part, they recommended that the General Assembly should endorse the decision of the UNDP Governing Council.

24. In any event, his delegation would not press those suggestions and would vote in favour of the draft resolution.

25. Mr. BLAU (United States of America) recalled that his delegation had voted against General Assembly resolutions 2186 (XXI) and 2321 (XXII) because it had felt that, whatever were the merits of the idea of establishing a United Nations Capital Development Fund when it was first broached, it was no longer justifiable in view of the existence of IDA and the regional development banks. Since the twenty-second session of the General Assembly, the question had again been raised in the Governing Council of UNDP and the Economic and Social Council. On those occasions, his delegation had not participated in the vote on resolutions on the Fund because by so doing it would have been participating in the arrangements of a body to which it made no contribution and in which it had no interest.

26. His delegation had objected to article IV, paragraph 2, of the resolution establishing the United Nations Capital Development Fund (General Assembly resolution 2186 (XXI)), which constituted a deplorable exception to all known precedents. The Committee was now asked to face the practical implementation of that provision in the statement of financial and adminis-

trative implications of the draft (see A/C.2/L.1045). His delegation protested strongly against having to make a contribution to the administrative expenses of a body in which it was not interested and whose resources were negligible and consisted mainly of non-convertible currency. It could see no advantage in keeping the Fund in existence. It could not accept the financial implications of the draft resolution and would vote accordingly.

27. Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta) expressed amazement at the magnitude of the financial implications of the draft resolution (see A/C.2/L.1045). The activities provided for in the draft resolution could very well be carried out by the existing staff of UNDP and the Secretariat. He would welcome clarification on that point from the Secretariat.

28. The sponsors had not had time to confer on the comments of the Netherlands representative (see para. 23 above). However, in his view, the draft resolution was, in fact, a faithful reflection of previous decisions in the matter. He therefore believed that there was no reason for changing it.

29. Mr. LUBBERS (Netherlands) said that he would not press his suggestions and shared the view of the Upper Volta representative. He did not understand the need for the amounts indicated in the statement of financial implications. His delegation had always hoped that the Special Fund component of UNDP would be gradually transformed into an investment fund. It had likewise stressed the need to extend special fund projects through investments. There existed within UNDP a group for the study of follow-up investments. Since such a group existed, his delegation did not see why the Secretariat should require the services of additional staff whose remuneration would have to be borne by the regular budget of the United Nations.

30. Mr. HEURTEMATTE (Associate Administrator, United Nations Development Programme) said that, when the Administrator of UNDP had been instructed to take over the custody of the United Nations Capital Development Fund for the year 1968, he had been obliged to act in accordance with the existing basic legislation contained in General Assembly resolution 2186 (XXI), as well as with the decisions of the Governing Council of UNDP regarding the use of UNDP funds. The Administrator of UNDP had no competence or authority to act contrary to the existing legislation which has governed his stewardship of the United Nations Capital Development Fund during 1968. That was why he felt obliged to submit to the Secretariat a statement of financial implications (see A/C.2/L.1045, annex) for the specific administrative services which differed fundamentally from those normally discharged by the UNDP staff, but he had intentionally reduced his estimate of additional identifiable expenditures to the barest minimum of \$40,000 which was far less than the \$335,000 initially estimated, with greater accuracy and study, by the United Nations Secretariat, to cover the nucleus of staff and related expenses in 1968. For the Administrator to be authorized to use UNDP resources, he would have to await fresh instructions along that line from the Governing Council of UNDP which was to meet shortly. The Sudanese representative, among others, had expressed the wish that the United Nations Capital Development

Fund should start its operations and the financing of specific projects as soon as possible. Here again, the Administrator would not be able to take such action until he had received specific instructions from the Governing Council of UNDP.

31. Mr. BLAU (United States of America) requested that draft resolution A/C.2/L.1038 should be put to the vote.

32. Mr. LUBBERS (Netherlands) thanked the Associate Administrator of UNDP for his clarifications and asked whether the possibility of needing fresh instructions from the Governing Council of UNDP meant that the statement of financial implications (A/C.2/L.1045) was withdrawn.

33. Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta) said that his delegation did not expect the Governing Council of UNDP to take a decision on the financial implications of the draft resolution. It was therefore for the General Assembly to decide the matter.

34. Mr. LUBBERS (Netherlands) said it was his understanding that the statement of financial implications (A/C.2/L.1045) still stood. His delegation objected to the financial implications but would nevertheless vote in favour of the draft resolution.

35. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1038.

At the request of the Sudanese representative, the vote was taken by roll call.

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cyprus, Dahomey, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Kuwait, Laos, Liberia, Libya, Malawi, Maldive Islands, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda.

Against: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Belgium, Canada, France, Japan, Luxembourg, Portugal, South Africa.

Abstaining: Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Mongolia, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Romania, Sweden.

The draft resolution was adopted by 68 votes to 9, with 18 abstentions.

36. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) recalled that his delegation had voted against General Assembly resolutions 2186 (XXI) and 2321 (XXII). It had likewise voted against the draft resolution and reserved its

position concerning the financial implications and its right to state its position in the Fifth Committee and in the Governing Council of UNDP.

37. Mr. FIGUEREDO PLANCHART (Venezuela) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it was desirable that the United Nations Capital Development Fund should begin to operate without delay. It especially approved of operative paragraph 4. It was essential that the resources should come mainly from the developed countries.

38. Mr. BRADLEY (Argentina) said that his delegation, which was a co-sponsor, wished to express its reservations concerning the financial implications.

39. Mr. ALI (Iraq) regretted that his delegation had been absent and unable to participate in the vote, because it would have voted in favour of the draft resolution.

AGENDA ITEM 42

External financing of economic development of the developing countries: report of the Secretary-General (concluded)* (A/7203, chap. V; A/7253, A/C.2/L.1021/Rev.1, E/4438, E/4446 and Corr.1, E/4495, E/4512, E/4539, E/4565)

40. Mr. EL-ATTRASH (Syria) introduced the revised draft resolution on external financing of economic development of the developing countries (A/C.2/L.1021/Rev.1). Agreement had been reached on certain paragraphs only after lengthy consultations. The United Republic of Tanzania should be added to the list of sponsors. A few changes were to be made with the agreement of the sponsors. In sub-paragraph (f) of the sixth preambular paragraph the words "the confidence in the ability of international organizations to render their tasks in a continuing and steady manner" should be deleted and replaced by the words "their ability to render their tasks satisfactorily and, in certain instances, hampers their functioning in a continuing and steady manner". In the fourth line of operative paragraph 1, the final "s" of the word "resources" should be deleted. As compared with the original draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1021), the revised text entailed some changes in sub-paragraph (d) of the sixth preambular paragraph, which had been expanded so as to make it more explicit. In operative paragraph 1, the recommendation regarding the aid volume target of 1 per cent in decision 27 (II),^{2/} adopted by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) at its second session, had been reproduced in toto. In operative paragraph 2, the word "deadline" had been deleted. In operative paragraph 4, the words "to take practical steps" had been replaced by the words "to exert maximum efforts". Finally, the words "whenever possible" had been added in paragraph 6.

41. Mr. BLAU (United States of America) thanked the sponsors for having taken account of some of the remarks made by his delegation. There were, however, some passages that it could still not accept. With regard to sub-paragraph (c) of the sixth preambular

*Resumed from the 1238th meeting.

^{2/} See Proceedings of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, Second Session, vol. I, Report and Annexes (United Nations publication, Sales No.: E.68.II.D.14), annex I, p. 38.

paragraph, in particular, it should be remembered that for a long time the United States Government had transferred large amounts which constituted completely untied aid. Since the beginning of the 1960s, balance-of-payments difficulties and the need to safeguard the world's main reserve currency, United States aid had been, for the most part, tied. But, however unfortunate it might be, the recipients' choice was not between tied and untied aid, but between tied aid and no aid at all. Sub-paragraph (c) did not take account of the fact that several aid-giving countries had tried to reduce the proportion of tied aid, and his delegation could not therefore support it.

42. Commenting on operative paragraph 2, he said that 1972 could not be accepted as the target year for the attainment of the aid volume target. His delegation's opinion had not changed since the second session of UNCTAD. The form of government in the United States made it impossible to enter into long-term commitments.

43. His delegation also requested the sponsors to withdraw operative paragraph 3, which referred to a second target within the first. The United States economy was based on private enterprise, and foreign investment was, of course, a function of the private sector. Many developing countries were passing from the stage of building infra-structure to that of industrial development. His Government could scarcely intervene in that field, since it did not have the necessary industrial information. It would be necessary, therefore, to rely on transfers from the private sector.

44. Operative paragraph 5 seemed acceptable. As it had indicated during the general debate, his delegation regretted that it had proved impossible to adopt legislative measures to replenish the resources of the International Development Association (IDA). It was to be hoped that Congress would be in a position to take the necessary action as soon as possible in 1969. Finally, with regard to operative paragraph 6, it was extremely difficult for Congress to assume long-term commitments which went beyond the limits of a financial year.

45. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) said that he did not intend to request a separate vote on each paragraph. But his delegation could not accept operative paragraph 2 and go beyond what it had accepted at the second session of UNCTAD. It was not desirable to impose a fixed time-limit. If a separate vote was requested, his delegation would vote against that paragraph.

46. His delegation could accept operative paragraph 3, since it did not propose any fixed time-limit, but it was not ready to accept in principle a fixed target for the transfer of official resources.

47. Operative paragraph 6, as amended, seemed acceptable: it now took account of the difficulties that would face the United Kingdom Government in assuming long-term commitments. The draft resolution might have been improved if it had mentioned the responsibility of the developing countries.

48. Mr. RANKIN (Canada) said that his delegation accepted the draft as a whole, but could not endorse operative paragraph 2 in that it set a time-limit. His

Government regretted that the draft did not take account of the diversity of legislative situations in the developed countries. A formula such as "reach the target as soon as possible", for example, might be used, and he hoped that the sponsors would see fit to modify the wording along those lines.

49. Mr. MARTIN WITKOWSKI (France) paid a tribute to the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1021/Rev.1 for the spirit of conciliation which they had shown with regard to the arguments put forward by certain members of the Western group, especially his delegation, concerning the original text. His delegation had been particularly concerned to see that the negotiations were brought to a successful conclusion, since the French Government was extremely active in the matter of external financing of economic development in the developing countries. The revised text was completely acceptable to his delegation, which would have no hesitation in voting for it. He wished, however, to make two comments in explanation of his vote, with regard to the sixth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 6. In sub-paragraph (d) of the sixth preambular paragraph, the General Assembly noted with concern that, if current trends of borrowings and repayments continued, net lending would become negative by 1970. He pointed out that the statistics of French experts did not coincide with those of the United Nations experts on that extremely technical point of projected debt servicing in the developing countries. He had, therefore, certain reservations concerning the accuracy of that assertion. In operative paragraph 6, the General Assembly requested Member States to give, whenever possible, long-term pledges. His delegation was prepared to accept that wording, but he pointed out that, even when France financed operations extending over several years, for example, in its pledges to IDA, the corresponding credits were still included year by year in the State budget and still required yearly parliamentary approval.

50. Mr. OLSEN (Denmark) said that his delegation would vote for the draft resolution as a whole, but would abstain on operative paragraph 2 if it was put to a separate vote. In 1967, Denmark had adopted a plan for attaining the aid volume target of 1 per cent of its net national income by 1972, by means of annual increases of 25 per cent. His Government was studying the possibility of increasing the volume of that assistance still further by calculating on the basis of gross national product rather than net national income. It was not, however, prepared to commit itself to attaining the UNCTAD target of 1 per cent of its gross national product by 1972, and his delegation would prefer a more flexible position to be taken in operative paragraph 2.

51. Mr. BILLNER (Sweden) recalled that at the second session of UNCTAD his delegation had accepted UNCTAD decision 27 (II) and the idea of fixing 1972 as the target year for the attainment of the aid volume target. Since then, the Swedish Parliament had adopted a number of important decisions on the scope and nature of its development aid. It had been decided that Sweden would reach the target of 1 per cent by 1974-1975 with official aid alone. With regard to the acceptance of the year 1972, he pointed out that the statistics established in Sweden on the volume of aid took account only of long-term official appropriations.

Moreover, the gross national product, as calculated in Sweden, was 7 per cent higher than that defined by UNCTAD. Finally, it was difficult to estimate the future trends of private capital flows in Sweden.

52. Nevertheless, in view of the decision taken in May 1968 by the Swedish Parliament to institute a three-year plan for development aid, and in view of current trends in private capital flows, he considered that there was every reason to believe that Sweden would attain the 1 per cent aid volume target, as defined by UNCTAD, by 1972.

53. His delegation would, therefore, vote for the draft resolution.

54. Mr. LUBBERS (Netherlands) thanked the sponsors of the revised draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1021/Rev.1) for the understanding they had shown in reformulating their original text. The revised version was entirely acceptable to his delegation. It was well known that the acceptance of 1972 as the target year for the attainment of the aid volume target created no problems for his Government.

55. He called the Committee's attention to the fact that the text made several references to UNCTAD decision 27 (II). That decision was addressed more particularly to the developed countries, but, as stated at the beginning of operative paragraph 1, the Conference had agreed that economic development entailed mutually reinforcing efforts by developing and developed countries. The text before the Committee should be interpreted in the same spirit.

56. He noted that, in sub-paragraph (a) of the sixth preambular paragraph, it was stated that in recent years there had been a trend of decline in the transfer of resources as a proportion of the gross national products of developed countries. In his view, it would be more realistic to put that sentence in the present, since there had been an alarming accentuation of the trend since 1967. In addition, he shared the doubts expressed by the French representative regarding the accuracy of the statistics used as a basis for affirming, in sub-paragraph (d) of that same paragraph, that, if current trends of borrowings and repayments continued, net lending would become negative by 1970. It might be better to say "in the 1970s" or "by about 1975". Those were, however, only suggestions, and his delegation was prepared to vote for the text in its present form.

57. Mr. KAHILUOTO (Finland) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution but wished to make some reservations regarding operative paragraph 2. It had already drawn the Committee's attention to the fact that the possibility of increasing the volume of aid varied from country to country. Some developed countries, including Finland, were large-scale importers of capital and should therefore be given more time than economically more advanced countries to achieve the desired target. The Finnish Government had accepted the aid target set by UNCTAD in its decision 27 (II) and was now studying the possibility of increasing the amount of its development aid, but it was not in a position to accept a definite date.

58. Mr. SCHMID (Austria) recalled that his delegation had often explained the reasons why Austria had not

yet been able to attain the 1 per cent aid target. Everyone was aware that Austria was not among the richest of the developing countries; it was a small landlocked country, a large-scale importer of capital and, by reason of its history, ill-prepared to increase the volume of its development aid. The 1 per cent target did not mean the same for all developed countries. The Austrian Government was making every effort to ensure that its aid should reach the target accepted by a large majority of the members of the international community, but it could not at present guarantee that it would do so. The constitutional provisions in force did not allow it to make commitments of that kind. It was therefore in a spirit of co-operation, but only to the extent of his country's material possibilities, that the Austrian delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole. In view of the explanations he had given, however, it could not support operative paragraph 2 and would be forced to abstain on that paragraph if it was put to a separate vote. The Austrian delegation no longer had any difficulty in accepting operative paragraph 6 in view of the insertion of the words "whenever possible". In that form, the paragraph took account of the situation of countries such as Austria which had no constitutional provisions which allowed them to make long-term pledges.

59. He congratulated the sponsors of the revised draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1021/Rev.1) and thanked them for having taken the suggestions put to them into account. He hoped that the present text would be approved by the Committee.

60. Mr. DECASTIAUX (Belgium) noted that the revised text of the draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1021/Rev.1) was far better than the earlier version. It nevertheless called for some comments. Firstly, the Belgian delegation shared the view of the French delegation regarding sub-paragraph (d) of the sixth preambular paragraph on assessments of the trend in the transfer of resources and in the reverse flow: those were statistical matters and data varied from one document to another. It must be remembered that the situation in that sphere was extremely changeable; instead of making definite statements, it might be better to note that trend in rather vaguer terms.

61. He wished to make more serious reservations regarding operative paragraph 2, relating to the acceptance of a target year for the attainment of the aid volume target. The Belgian delegation had already stated its position on that matter when it had accepted UNCTAD decision 27 (II): the Belgian Government could not commit itself to any specific date, and it was with that in mind that it would vote on operative paragraph 2, if that paragraph was put to the vote separately.

62. The addition of the words "whenever possible" in operative paragraph 6 improved the original text appreciably, and he wished to thank the sponsors for inserting them. For reasons of constitutional and public tax law, he was unable to state that his Government would ever be able to make long-term pledges.

63. Lastly, he wondered whether the word "réalisée" in the French text of operative paragraph 5 was to be interpreted as meaning "entreprise" or "accomplie".

64. Mr. ABE (Japan) said that he had no difficulty in accepting operative paragraph 1, on the understanding that the observations made by his delegation at the second session of UNCTAD regarding decision 27 (II) were still valid. His delegation was not, however, in a position to accept operative paragraph 2, since it was unable to commit itself to a target date for the attainment of the aid volume target. Its position on that question had not changed since the Conference. Nor could it agree to operative paragraph 3, since it did not think that the target for official financial resources transfers could be dissociated from the total aid volume target. As regards operative paragraph 4, his delegation accepted that paragraph on the understanding that the position taken by his delegation on that matter at the second session of UNCTAD was unchanged. He also accepted operative paragraph 5, with the reservation that the ratification of the second replenishment of IDA resources would in all cases be subject to the approval of the competent legislative bodies. Lastly, his delegation agreed to operative paragraph 6 provided that that paragraph did not entail any budgetary commitment that fell under the competence of legislative bodies.

65. It was in the light of those observations that the Japanese delegation's position on the revised draft resolution as a whole would be determined when the vote was taken.

66. Mr. CHRISTIANSEN (Norway) said that his delegation would be obliged to abstain on operative paragraph 2 of the revised draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1021/Rev.1) if it was put to a separate vote. Norway had recently decided to increase the volume of its aid so as to reach the target of 1 per cent of net national income in 1973, official financial resources representing 75 per cent of the total volume. In view of the structure of the Norwegian economy, the difference between the gross national product and the net national income was greater than in other countries, so that acceptance of the aid volume target of 1 per cent of gross national product would constitute a heavier commitment for Norway than for any other country. In addition, a substantial proportion of Norwegian development aid was in grants. Lastly, Norwegian private investment would probably be rather limited, since Norway was a large-scale importer of capital.

67. Although it would be obliged to abstain on operative paragraph 2 if that paragraph was put to the vote separately, the Norwegian delegation would nevertheless be able to vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

68. Miss O'LEARY (Ireland) said that her delegation would vote in favour of the revised draft resolution as a whole, but could not support operative paragraph 2 since it could not agree to the establishment of a target date for the attainment of the aid volume target. With regard to operative paragraph 6, she pointed out that under the Irish budgetary system expenditures were determined in the budget year by year and that consequently her delegation's vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole should not be interpreted as a commitment on the part of her Government to make any long-term pledges.

69. The CHAIRMAN asked the sponsors of the revised draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1021/Rev.1) whether they thought that they should revise the text further in the light of the comments made by a number of delegations.

70. Mr. EL-ATTRASH (Syria) said that the sponsors had been fully aware of most of the reservations expressed on certain paragraphs of the draft resolution and had tried to reach a compromise as far as was possible. In sub-paragraph (c) of the sixth preambular paragraph, to which the United States representative had objected, the sponsors were not trying to put the blame on certain countries. They were aware that the increase in the degree of tying aid resulted mostly from balance-of-payments difficulties. The sponsors had agreed on the present text of sub-paragraph (d) and (f) of that paragraph out of a concern for clarity. The phrase quoted from the Secretary-General's note (see E/4539, para. 7) in sub-paragraph (d) of that paragraph repeated an idea that had appeared in the study on the UNCTAD secretariat on growth, development finance and aid.^{3/} The sponsors would be unable to accept further compromises on operative paragraphs 2 and 3. They felt that it was extremely important to set a target date for the attainment of the 1 per cent aid volume target and that a rewording of operative paragraph 2 might weaken the scope of the draft resolution as a whole and cause disagreement among its sponsors. The same applied to operative paragraph 3, since the sponsors considered that certain basic needs of the developing countries could only be met by official financial resources transfers. The sponsors, aware of the fiscal or constitutional limitations of many developed countries, had agreed to insert the words "whenever possible" in operative paragraph 6. He requested that the draft resolution should be put to the vote.

71. Mr. BLAU (United States of America) asked for separate votes on operative paragraphs 2 and 3.

72. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on operative paragraphs 2 and 3 on the revised draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1021/Rev.1), as a whole, as orally revised.

Operative paragraph 2 was adopted by 69 votes to 5, with 16 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 3 was adopted by 79 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.

The revised draft resolution, as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 87 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

73. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had abstained for reasons which it had repeatedly explained in the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council, and UNCTAD. The draft resolution took a discriminatory stand with regard to certain developed countries, inasmuch as it treated the developed countries as a single bloc, an approach which was not in accordance with the facts.

^{3/} Document TD/7 and Corr.1.

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, A/C.2/L.1034, A/C.2/L.1035/Rev.1, E/4449 and Add.1 and 2, E/4487 and Corr.1-6 and Add.1)

74. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on a point of order, pointed out that a most serious mistake had been made in the Russian text of the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1035/Rev.1; Southern Yemen had been replaced by South Viet-Nam. That was a quite inadmissible mistake and he requested that the Russian text of the draft resolution should be withdrawn, all copies of it destroyed and a new document issued. His delegation hoped that such deplorable errors would not recur.

75. The CHAIRMAN assured the USSR representative that, as he had requested, the incorrect Russian text would be withdrawn and a revised text distributed.

76. Mr. KASSUM (Secretary of the Committee) apologized for the mistake in the Russian text of the draft resolution; he would see that a corrected version was issued.

77. Mr. DENORME (Belgium), introducing the revised draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1035/Rev.1), read out the list of the eighteen sponsors. He believed attention should be drawn to two important points before embarking on any detailed discussion of the text of the draft resolution.

78. First, the question arose whether the Committee should conclude its consideration of agenda item 41 by approving a substantive or a procedural resolution. In that connexion, a summary of the history of item 41 might be helpful. In its resolution 2172 (XXI) of 6 December 1966, the General Assembly had requested the Secretary-General to undertake a comprehensive survey of activities in marine science and technology, a survey which was to be carried out by a small group of experts, in co-operation with the specialized agencies and inter-governmental organizations concerned and with the Governments of interested Member States. The report of the Secretary-General containing the survey and paragraphs (E/4487 and Corr.1-6 and Add.1) so requested, had been formally submitted to the Assembly by a note of the Secretary-General (A/7245). The Committee now had to recommend to the General Assembly what action should be taken on the survey and to indicate how the specific proposals made by the Secretary-General should in its view be dealt with.

79. The second important question was whether the Second Committee should take a decision on the Secretary-General's proposals before the First Committee had completed its consideration of agenda item 26 on the peaceful uses of the sea-bed and ocean floor beyond the limits of national jurisdiction. Although some delegations felt that the Second Committee should wait until the First Committee had voted on the numerous draft resolutions on that related item, the sponsors believed that, since the Secretary-General's report had been prepared at the request of the Second Committee before the sea-bed item had even been considered by the General Assembly, that Committee should not delay in making its decision known.

80. The next matter to be considered was the kind of action the Committee might recommend to the General Assembly. The original sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1035 had believed that, since the Secretary-General's report (E/4487 and Corr.1-6 and Add.1) had been duly studied by the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly, there was no reason why a decision should not be taken on the various proposals of the Secretary-General. The long consultations that had been held meanwhile with a large number of delegations interested in the problem had shown how useful a further and more detailed consideration of that important report at a future session of the Council could be. In particular, it was clear that some delegations had had certain doubts, even fears, regarding the exact scope of the long-term programme of oceanographic research, and that they had not felt that the formulation of the programme and the co-ordination of its activities should be assigned to any organ, even one with the high standards and scientific reputation of the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) until they had further information on the matter.

81. He would outline the important features of the revised text (A/C.2/L.1035/Rev.1). The preambular part reaffirmed several of the preambular paragraphs of General Assembly resolution 2172 (XXI), and a new operative paragraph 2 had been added in which the Economic and Social Council was requested to review further the report at its forty-seventh session, taking into account any views expressed in the meantime.

82. The operative paragraphs were divided into three parts. Operative paragraph 1 in the first part took note with appreciation of the report of the Secretary-General (E/4487 and Corr.1-6 and Add.1), which would serve as a basic document for concerted international action for the further development of marine science and technology and would ensure that duplication and overlapping in that area were avoided. Nevertheless, the subject matter was so vast and complex and its importance so great that time should be allowed for all the competent bodies to study it in detail and for the Governments of Member States to express their views on problems that deserved to be given thorough consideration.

83. The second part, embracing operative paragraphs 3 and 4 dealt with the Secretary-General's proposals regarding the long-term programme of oceanographic research, which had been provisionally approved by the Economic and Social Council in resolution 1381 (XLV). The Assembly endorsed the concept of the programme, although its scope did not yet appear to have been defined strictly enough to enable the General Assembly to take a decision on its formulation immediately. In operative paragraph 4, the Assembly requested the Secretary-General to present to the Economic and Social Council at its forty-seventh session a comprehensive outline of the scope of the long-term programme, taking into account such scientific recommendations as might be formulated by IOC within its terms of reference and in co-operation with other interested international organizations.

84. Finally, the third part of the revised draft resolution reviewed the other proposals made in the Secretary-General's report, namely, the recommendations relating to international co-operation in marine science and technology in general.

85. Operative paragraphs 5 to 8 covered particular areas of marine science and technology, such as educational and training programmes, fisheries, marine pollution, meteorology, in which the various organizations concerned had already been active and had initiated adequate programmes.

86. Operative paragraphs 9 and 10 invited the Secretary-General to continue his efforts in three spheres: co-operation with the United Nations Development Programme, with a view to extending technical assistance services to the Governments of Member States which might request them in relation with the development of mineral resources of their continental shelf areas; the collection and dissemination of available information regarding the resources of the sea-bed and ocean floor beyond the limits of national jurisdiction and of techniques appropriate for their development; and provision of any assistance which the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction might request for the solution of related issues. The establishment of that Committee was provided for in a draft resolution before the First Committee (A/C.1/L.425/Rev.1).^{4/}

87. Finally, operative paragraph 11 requested the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session a report on the progress achieved in the implementation of the resolution.

88. In conclusion, he said he was aware that he had not replied to all the observations made on the original draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1035) and had not even explained the provisions of the revised text in detail. He was therefore at the disposal of the Committee if it should desire any further information. He thanked those delegations which had taken an active and constructive part in the preparation of the revised text and had asked him to introduce it on their behalf. Those delegations and his own were submitting, in all confidence, a text to the vote of the Committee, which, while it was open to further improvement, represented the result of earnest efforts to reconcile many divergent opinions.

89. He assured the Committee that the sponsors were still prepared to welcome further suggestions, and expressed the hope that the revised draft resolution would prove generally acceptable.

90. Mr. KASSUM (Secretary of the Committee) said that under rule 154 of the rules of procedure the Secretary-General had prepared an estimate of an anticipated expenditure arising from the adoption of the revised draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1035/Rev.1). Consultations with the agencies concerned and meetings of experts would have to be arranged. It was estimated that travel costs and the participation of the Secretariat

staff in the work contemplated in the revised draft resolution would entail additional expenditure of \$2,300.

91. Mr. WARSAMA (Somalia) thanked the representative of Belgium for his excellent statement. He wished to ask for clarification of some points in the revised text of the draft resolution, which, although clearer than the original version, was still contradictory and vague in some respects. The fifth preambular paragraph, for instance, which stated that the General Assembly had given preliminary consideration to the Secretary-General's report entitled "Marine science and technology: survey and proposals" (E/4487 and Corr.1-6 and Add.1), contradicted operative paragraph 1, in which the Assembly took note with appreciation of that report. In his delegation's view, it was incorrect to say that the General Assembly had given "preliminary" consideration to the report. Moreover, the chronological sequence of the activities mentioned in operative paragraphs 4 and 5 was uncertain. In operative paragraph 5, UNESCO and its Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission were recommended to consider strengthening the existing marine educational and training programmes and initiating new programmes in connexion with the implementation of the long-term programme of oceanographic research, whereas in operative paragraph 4 the Secretary-General was requested to present to the Economic and Social Council at its forty-seventh session a comprehensive outline of the scope of that long-term programme. The text of operative paragraph 8, too, could be improved by replacing the last words of that paragraph beginning with "and to co-operate closely ..." by the words "in close co-operation with other interested organizations"; moreover, the statement in that paragraph that the co-operation in question would relate to the meteorological aspects of ocean science was, in his opinion, redundant. In operative paragraph 9 the specific invitation to the Secretary-General to co-operate with UNDP with a view to extending technical assistance services was inappropriate, in view of the existence of the regular programme of technical assistance. Finally, he asked what was the meaning of the words "related issues" in operative paragraph 10.

92. Mr. FIGUEREDO PLANCHART (Venezuela) thanked the sponsors for revising the draft resolution, which as a result was acceptable to his delegation. He wished, however, to reaffirm his delegation's reservations (see 1229th meeting, para. 11) concerning the summary contained in the Secretary-General's note (A/C.2/244), certain aspects of which required clarification, especially with respect to the role to be played by UNESCO.

93. Mr. SCHMID (Austria) congratulated the sponsors of the revised draft resolution on having succeeded in drawing up a balanced text. Nevertheless, that draft resolution would be even more comprehensive if it took account of the position of land-locked States. He accordingly suggested, on behalf of his own delegation and that of Afghanistan, that the phrase "irrespective of the geographical location of States" should be added in the fourth preambular paragraph after words "all mankind". That wording was in fact the same as that of the seventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/L.425/Rev.1, which the First Committee was considering under agenda item 26.

^{4/} See Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-third Session, Annexes, agenda item 26, document A/7477, para. 7.

94. Mr. DENORME (Belgium) thanked all the members who had commented on the revised draft resolution. In particular, he complimented the representative of Somalia on his penetrating analysis of the text, which consisted of five main points. With regard to the first point, he considered the use of the word "preliminary" in the fifth preambular paragraph completely justified, since the draft resolution proposed that consideration of the question should be continued and it was therefore logical to regard the consideration thus far given as preliminary. With respect to operative paragraph 5, the programme of oceanographic research was clearly a matter of concern not only to the United Nations but also, and more especially, to UNESCO and its Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission. It was also clear that, although no decisive action could be taken at present, part of the programme must be planned right away. It was for that reason that the Second Committee recommended that UNESCO should consider initiating new programmes in connexion with the long-term programme of oceanographic research. He had not yet had an opportunity to consult the other sponsors of the revised draft resolution regarding operative paragraphs 8 and 9, but he had no objection to the Somali delegation's suggestions. The Somali representative's comment on operative paragraph 10 was apparently due to a misunderstanding. The *Ad Hoc* Committee to Study the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction, which had been active during the past year, had clearly not been instructed to seek solutions, but rather to examine all the aspects of the question which the representative of Malta had requested to be put on the agenda of the twenty-second session of the General Assembly. The Committee whose establishment was envisaged in the draft resolution before the First Committee (A/C.1/L.425/Rev.1), would be asked to study ways of solving various problems; in the meantime, the Second Committee hoped to be able to count on the co-operation and assistance of the Secretary-General.

95. He thanked the representative of Venezuela for his comments and for his contribution to the preparation of the original draft. The amendment suggested by the representative of Austria was extremely interesting, and he saw no reason why it should not be incorporated in the fourth preambular paragraph.

96. Mr. FIGUEREDO PLANCHART (Venezuela) said that he was satisfied with the reply given by the representative of Belgium on behalf of the sponsors, but would like to make a slight change in the Austrian amendment. It would be preferable to say "irrespective of where people live" rather than "irrespective of the geographical location of States".

97. The CHAIRMAN agreed with the representative of Venezuela, and said he believed that that wording made the Austrian amendment more explicit.

98. Mr. ARORA (India) thanked the representative of Belgium for having played so active a part in preparing the draft resolution under consideration. He agreed with the replies he had given, on behalf of the sponsors, to the representatives of Somalia and

Austria. In his view, the wording suggested by Venezuela was acceptable but not entirely logical. The version submitted by Austria was identical with that which had been adopted in the First Committee after lengthy discussion, and it was acceptable to nearly all delegations. He therefore urged the representative of Venezuela to show a spirit of understanding and agree that the Austrian wording should be adopted without change.

99. Mr. FIGUEREDO PLANCHART (Venezuela) agreed to that suggestion.

100. Mr. PLEHN MEJIA (Mexico) thanked the representative of Belgium on behalf of the Committee. Although he felt that the oral amendments proposed would improve the text, he would like, if there were no objections, to consult his delegation before the voting, which could take place at the next meeting.

101. The CHAIRMAN replied that, since the representative of Venezuela had withdrawn his suggestion, there was no reason why the voting should be deferred.

102. Mr. DENORME (Belgium) pointed out that the amendment proposed by Austria had been used in a draft resolution (A/C.1/L.425/Rev.1) which had been sponsored by sixty-seven Member States, including Mexico.

103. Mr. PLEHN MEJIA (Mexico) thanked the representative of Belgium for his explanation. He recalled that at the beginning of the discussion he had expressed the hope that the First Committee would complete its work before draft resolution A/C.2/L.1035/Rev.1 was introduced to the Second Committee. Since that had not been possible, he would like to consult his delegation. He therefore hoped that the Committee would show understanding and allow him the necessary time. The position taken by his delegation did not mean that it was opposed to the draft resolution.

104. The CHAIRMAN recalled that it had been decided that the work of the Second Committee should be independent of that being done by the First Committee. However, if the sponsors of the revised draft resolution had no objection, the Mexican representative's request could be taken into consideration and the voting could be deferred until the First Committee had completed its work.

105. Mr. POSNETT (United Kingdom) said that the point at issue was one of principle; if the representative of Mexico was asking for time to consult his Government, his request should be granted.

106. Mr. ARORA (India) said that the sponsors understood the reasons invoked by the Mexican delegation and would not press for a vote during the current meeting.

107. Mr. LOBANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had taken a constructive attitude towards the revised draft resolution. He urged that the request of the representative of Mexico should

be granted and the voting deferred until the next meeting. The Mexican delegation must have had good reasons to request that the voting should be deferred. It might also have been unable to take note of all the amendments, or perhaps it had not received the text, as was officially the case for his own delegation.

108. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should vote on the revised draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1035/Rev.1) at the next meeting.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 7.20 p.m.