



CONTENTS

Agenda item 32:

Question of the reservation exclusively for peaceful purposes of the sea-bed and the ocean floor, and the subsoil thereof, underlying the high seas beyond the limits of present national jurisdiction, and the use of their resources in the interests of mankind: report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction Report of the First Committee

Page

1

Agenda item 22:

Fourth International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy: report of the Secretary-General

5

Agenda item 35:

Comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all their aspects: report of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations Report of the Special Political Committee

7

Agenda item 38:

United Nations Industrial Development Organization: report of the Industrial Development Board (*continued*) Report of the Second Committee (part II)

Agenda item 47:

General review of the programmes and activities in the economic, social, technical co-operation and related fields of the United Nations, the specialized agencies, the International Atomic Energy Agency, the United Nations Children's Fund and all other institutions and agencies related to the United Nations system Report of the Second Committee

11

1. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on the draft resolutions recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 13 of its report [A/7834].

2. I invite the Assembly to vote first on draft resolution A.

Draft resolution A was adopted by 65 votes to 12, with 30 abstentions [resolution 2574 A (XXIV)].

3. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will vote on draft resolution B.

Draft resolution B was adopted by 109 votes to none, with 1 abstention [resolution 2574 B (XXIV)].

4. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will vote on draft resolution C. The Fifth Committee has submitted a report [A/7857] on the administrative and financial implications of that draft resolution.

Draft resolution C was adopted by 100 votes to none, with 11 abstentions [resolution 2574 C (XXIV)].

5. The PRESIDENT: I call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote on draft resolution D.

6. Mr. PHILLIPS (United States of America): The United States delegation is opposed to draft resolution D and will vote against it, and I should like to explain again the reasons for our position.

7. First of all, the draft resolution proceeds on a premise which is unsound and self-defeating: that the development of sea-bed exploitation, and accordingly the development of the technological capacity for such exploitation, should be retarded. What has struck us as doubly surprising about that proposition is that it is put forward in connexion with an item the very existence of which is due in substantial measure to the conviction that all mankind stands to benefit by the promotion of the exploitation of sea-bed resources. The question is, therefore, whose interests, if anybody's, would such retardation serve? This is the question to which we have as yet heard no adequate answer. We are aware, of course, that a rather simplistic picture has sometimes been painted of developed maritime Powers monopolizing sea-bed technology and rushing greedily to exhaust sea-bed resources before the international community can establish a régime to regulate their exploitation. To knowledgeable people, however, this picture is defective in at least two respects. First, to the extent that the technology of sea-bed exploitation exists at all, it exists only in embryonic form. If its development does not move forward to the point where commercially viable exploitation of sea-bed resources is possible on a significant scale,

President: Miss Angie E. BROOKS (Liberia).

AGENDA ITEM 32

Question of the reservation exclusively for peaceful purposes of the sea-bed and the ocean floor, and the subsoil thereof, underlying the high seas beyond the limits of present national jurisdiction, and the use of their resources in the interests of mankind: report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/7834)

Mr. Barnett (Jamaica), Rapporteur of the First Committee, presented the report of that Committee.

Pursuant to rule 68 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the report of the First Committee.

there will be no exploitation of sea-bed resources and no benefit to anyone, developed or developing, coastal or landlocked, east or west, north or south.

8. Secondly, as far as my delegation is aware, there is simply no possibility of one country or group of countries having exclusive use of sea-bed exploitation technology, any more than one country or group of countries has exclusive use of the technology of exploiting resources on land. If there are individual countries having special reasons for preferring a retardation of sea-bed exploitation, reasons not generally applicable and perhaps not generally understood, then it would be useful to have those considerations explained. Until convincing reasons are presented, however, we respectfully suggest that, at a time when the demands of economic development are being pressed insistently upon the entire international community, any proposal which posits the desirability of retarding development in a potentially important field requires looking at with a very sceptical eye indeed.

9. Thirdly, the tendency of this draft resolution is to encourage national action which will make the issues now entrusted to the Sea-Bed Committee for negotiation and solution progressively more difficult to solve. The draft resolution has been presented to us as a call for national self-restraint intended to prevent unilateral action which would be prejudicial to the solution of issues currently before the Committee. My delegation would not question the sincerity of those intentions, and, in any case, motives are not the issue. What is the issue are practical consequences. In practical effect this draft resolution is likely to encourage some States that may feel it useful or necessary to engage in exploration or exploitation of sea-bed resources to move towards unjustifiably expansive claims of national jurisdiction solely in order to remove those exploitation activities from the scope of the prohibition contained in the draft resolution and thus render them, in their view, legitimate. It is not enough to say that the prohibition which the draft resolution contains is without binding legal effect; that is the case with almost any General Assembly resolution, and it certainly is the case for any General Assembly resolution purporting to prescribe standards of conduct for States in the oceans. The point is that such a resolution by the Assembly may be taken by some to raise the question of the legitimacy of exploitation undertaken in certain areas of the sea-bed which, in view of the very substantial investment of capital that such exploitation, or even exploration, may require, might well be sufficient to generate an unjustifiably expansive claim of national jurisdiction as a precautionary protective measure.

10. These are the reasons why the United States delegation urged in the First Committee, as we do again here, that a quite different approach to the matter of exploitation of sea-bed resources should be taken, pending the establishment of the international régime, if the common purposes which all of us are pursuing through the Sea-Bed Committee are effectively to be served.

11. Our objective should not be for the Sea-Bed Committee to utter prohibitions against sea-bed exploitation and the development of sea-bed technology, for these utterances will be self-defeating if they in fact retard exploitation and self-defeating for different reasons if they do not.

The objectives should be, rather, to ensure that any such activities which do take place do not prejudice or otherwise make more difficult the solution of issues currently under examination and negotiation in the Sea-Bed Committee.

12. Finally, not the least regrettable aspect of the draft resolution before us is that its adoption would represent a breakdown, on a matter of basic importance, of those processes of co-operation and consensus which are necessary if any genuine accomplishment is to result from our joint labours on the sea-bed issues in the United Nations. It was barely two years ago that the United Nations took on itself the job of creating ways to regulate the use of sea-bed resources. It was clear at the time that this task was as complex and ambitious as any job of law-making and institution-building that the Organization had undertaken, and the chances of success as uncertain. It was a task which was sure to tax very heavily the resources of the whole membership for wisdom, imagination and self-restraint. Above all, it was clear that if there was an urgent need to move forward, there was an equally compelling need to move forward together, lest we fail to move forward at all. We doubt that any delegation really believes that any genuine accomplishment can be made on the sea-bed except by building a very substantial consensus among the membership.

13. Thus, it would be a serious regression from the progress we have made so far, if the United Nations were now to signal that it is willing to make fundamental decisions on sea-bed issues through a politics of confrontation and paper majorities. Such a signal can only undermine that foundation of national confidence upon which the United Nations work on the sea-bed must proceed if it is to come to anything. We earnestly suggest, therefore, that the interests of all of us concerned with this important work would be far better served by the rejection of the present draft resolution.

14. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (*translated from Spanish*): I have already had an opportunity in the First Committee of explaining the fundamental objective of draft resolution A/C.1/L.480/Rev.1 and Add.1 and 2, the text of which is identical with that of draft resolution D submitted to the General Assembly by the First Committee [A/7834, para. 13]. Ever since this subject first came up for consideration in the General Assembly in 1967, all our work has been based upon the premise that the exploitation of the resources of the sea-bed and the ocean floor, and the subsoil thereof, beyond the limits of national jurisdiction, should be carried out in the interests of all mankind, irrespective of the geographical location of States and taking into account the special interests and needs of the developing countries.

15. To this end it is imperative for the Committee on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor to come to an agreement on the establishment of an international régime that shall include appropriate international machinery to make such exploitation possible. Hence, draft resolution D, submitted by the First Committee, is limited, in the interests of all mankind, to making explicit what basically is only the necessary corollary of the principles which were clearly accepted by the General Assembly when it adopted the actual title of the agenda item and which, moreover, were

expressly included by the General Assembly in previous resolutions such as resolution 2467 A (XXIII). That necessary corollary, I repeat, is stated in the operative paragraph of draft resolution D in the words:

“... pending the establishment of the aforementioned international régime:

“(a) States and persons, physical or juridical, are bound to refrain from all activities of exploitation of the resources of the area of the sea-bed and ocean floor, and the subsoil thereof, beyond the limits of national jurisdiction;

“(b) No claim to any part of that area or its resources shall be recognized.”

16. In other words, the basic and indeed sole objective is to ensure that while the Committee on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor is deliberating on the establishment of the international régime, States and persons, physical or juridical, shall not take advantage of the inevitable delay to appropriate the resources of the region or exploit them for their own benefit. For we all remember the statement made by Mrs. Myrdal, the distinguished representative of Sweden, in the First Committee, in which she said:

“... while we deliberate, developments may take a course of their own. The risk that, as time passes, national property rights become acquired ‘by use, occupation or other means’ must not be overlooked. Commercial interests are clamouring vociferously for go-ahead signals; their technical press can provide any number of quotations to that effect. Military interests seem to be no less eager. Powerful techniques are already in the hands of a few countries. . . . It thus becomes urgent for us to act immediately in order to forestall any regrettable developments.”¹

17. The obligations of States and persons, physical or juridical, mentioned in the draft resolution are, of course, applicable only to those areas which lie outside national jurisdiction. Furthermore, the draft resolution does not undertake to decide how far the area extends or what are the limits of national jurisdiction. These ambitious tasks which, we trust, will be fulfilled in the not-too-distant future by applying the procedure set forth in resolution A, which we have just adopted, are entirely separate from draft resolution D. The latter’s modest, but no less important and perhaps more urgent, aim is merely what I said it was a few moments ago and can be summed up as follows: to take the precautionary measures which are urgently required in order to ensure that the common heritage of mankind shall remain intact until it can be exploited for the benefit of mankind.

18. Mr. ARAUJO CASTRO (Brazil): The delegation of Brazil strongly urges the General Assembly to vote in favour of draft resolution D, recommended for adoption by the First Committee [A/7834, para. 13].

19. The operative paragraph of this draft resolution contains a declaration to the effect that States and persons

are bound to refrain from all activities of exploitation of the resources of the area of the sea-bed and ocean floor and the subsoil thereof beyond the limits of national jurisdiction, pending the establishment of an international régime, and to the effect that no claim to any part of that area or its resources shall be recognized. It is our firm belief that that declaration is a natural follow-up of what was stated in resolution 2467 A (XXIII) of 21 December 1968, to the effect that the exploitation of the sea-bed and the ocean floor and the subsoil thereof beyond the limits of national jurisdiction should be carried out for the benefit of mankind as a whole, irrespective of the geographical location of States, and taking into account the special interests and needs of the developing countries.

20. If the exploitation is to be carried out for the benefit of mankind as a whole, irrespective of the geographical location of States, and taking into account the needs of the developing countries, it seems obvious to my delegation that such activities should be postponed until an international régime has been established.

21. In voting for the draft resolution we shall be adhering to the previous resolution of the General Assembly on this matter and reaffirming the principle of the common heritage of mankind with regard to the sea-bed and ocean floor beyond the limits of national jurisdiction. Therefore, we strongly urge the General Assembly to vote in favour of this draft resolution.

22. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now vote on draft resolution D. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Burundi, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic), Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Finland, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Rwanda, Singapore, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Sweden, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France, Ghana, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malta, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, South Africa, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Burma, China, Cuba, El Salvador, Greece, Indonesia, Iran, Israel, Ivory Coast, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Nigeria, Philippines, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Syria, Togo, Turkey, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta.

Draft resolution D was adopted by 62 votes to 28, with 28 abstentions [resolution 2574 D (XXIV)].

¹ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, First Committee, 1680th meeting, para. 53.*

23. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Malta for an explanation of vote.

24. Mr. PARDO (Malta): My delegation must confess to a feeling of some disappointment at the resolutions on the sea-bed item which have emerged as a result of the debate in the First Committee and which have now been adopted.

25. My delegation feels that the general trend of the debate was sufficiently positive in the First Committee to have produced some more realistic and perhaps better formulated resolutions than the ones actually adopted.

26. We were glad to support resolution B, which provides for the continuing work of the Sea-Bed Committee and we welcomed its unanimous adoption by the First Committee and virtually unanimous adoption by the General Assembly. We express the hope once again that, in accordance with paragraph 4, the Committee will be able to provide the twenty-fifth session with a comprehensive and balanced statement of principles and a draft declaration on which the General Assembly itself will be able to act at that session.

27. We have, however, reservations about the three other resolutions adopted. The draft resolution which my delegation introduced in the First Committee [A/7834, para. 4] not only recognized the common findings of the Sea-Bed Committee, but also sought to take the preparatory procedural steps without which we feel that the international community cannot satisfactorily settle the two basic problems which we face: the establishment of an equitable international régime and the precise determination of the area beyond national jurisdiction over which the régime would apply.

28. The need to settle these problems and the connexion between them have been recognized repeatedly, and we felt that the time had come to take the required first step in what must necessarily be a time-consuming process. Conscious as we are of the need to proceed with caution on the basis of a mere consensus on this matter, my delegation introduced in non-controversial language a draft resolution requesting the Secretary-General to seek the views of Member States on the desirability of convening an international conference at an early date to resolve these two interconnected problems, which must be resolved if an international régime for the sea-bed and ocean floor beyond national jurisdiction is to be established effectively and not on paper alone.

29. We were glad to accept amendments which might give better expression to our basic concept, and, in a spirit of compromise, we carried out intense consultations with the proponents of other amendments in an effort to negotiate a formula which would still command wide support. We were not successful in that effort. We very much regret that the majority of the First Committee and the majority of the General Assembly have consented to endorse in this purely procedural resolution (resolution A) what are basically the fears—unjustified we think—of a small group of countries. As a result, a draft resolution which could have received a virtual consensus, particularly on the part of maritime Powers, became the object of controversy. That weakens the force of the resolution.

30. Our objections, however, are not limited purely to that point. They also include the fact that from a formal

point of view the régime of the high seas, fishing and conservation of the living resources of the high seas are totally beyond the competence both of the Sea-Bed Committee and of the First Committee. From a substantive point of view it will obviously be far more difficult to arrange a conference that includes all those broad, complex and highly controversial objectives included in the resolution adopted by the Assembly than it would have been to arrange a conference limited only to defining the limits of national jurisdiction with regard to the sea-bed, reviewing provisions of the 1958 Continental Shelf Convention and giving international endorsement to a régime formulated by the Sea-Bed Committee. Also, even if a conference as envisaged in resolution A is eventually arranged it will be most difficult to reach agreement in that conference.

31. Thus, in effect, the majority of the General Assembly has pronounced itself against establishing a régime for the sea-bed unless the entire question of fishing and conservation of the living resources is also resolved. This, we fear, may make the entire effort of establishing an effective international régime for the sea-bed, which can be of benefit to all countries, unrealizable except on paper. My delegation could not subscribe to what is, in effect, a political manoeuvre.

32. Resolution C concerns international machinery. We abstained on that draft resolution in Committee and we did not vote for it here. Our objections are mainly, but not exclusively, related to the unfortunate formulation. An international machinery with regard to the sea-bed must be envisaged not as a burdensome, proliferating, bureaucratic organization, but rather as an efficient, flexible instrument of the international community with functions especially adapted to the marine environment.

33. During informal negotiations we put forward our point of view and suggested language that would have eliminated the impression that Member States desired a heavy, complex and somewhat theoretical bureaucratic organization. Unfortunately the sponsors refused to change even one word of their text. From a substantive point of view, the study requested of the Secretary-General will be oriented towards machinery for the exploration and exploitation of sea-bed resources. In our view this is unfortunate. Exploration and exploitation are but one part—albeit an important part—of all the activities that can be, and are being, undertaken on the sea-bed. Thus, a study on various types of international machinery with regard to the exploration and exploitation of resources will necessarily have to be followed by other studies with a wider scope and that means that less than optimal use of the resources at the disposal of the Secretary-General will be made and that there will be a waste of time to be calculated in months, if not in years.

34. We shall continue, therefore, to urge the concept of an international machinery covering all activities on the sea-bed and not just exploration and exploitation. In the meantime we trust that the Secretariat, despite the unfortunate formulation of its instructions, will succeed in producing a study which will be of value to all of us.

35. While not doubting the good intentions of the sponsors of resolution D, we are convinced that their

approach is not the right one. It is indeed an approach which my delegation, with others, investigated two years ago and which we discarded since we thought it would be either meaningless or discriminatory. In the case of resolution D it is both; meaningless, because in terms of international law we do not know where the limits of national jurisdiction are or where they should be, and discriminatory because in terms of national law it discriminates between States. Those States whose only criterion with regard to the extension of national jurisdiction over the sea-bed is the criterion of exploitability, will not be affected by this resolution since, as soon as an area of the sea-bed becomes technically exploitable it comes automatically under their national jurisdiction. Those States which have extended their national jurisdiction to vast distances from their coasts will find support in this resolution for the claims they have already made, while those States, such as mine, which have been modest in their claims and which have been respectful of the rights of others, find that their interests are ignored. This is intolerable. As far as my delegation is concerned, I must explicitly reserve the position of my country with regard to this resolution.

36. The PRESIDENT: I would ask Members to turn their attention to the decision in principle taken by the First Committee which is to be found in paragraph 12 of its report [A/7834]. As stated therein, the decision was communicated by the Chairman of the First Committee to the Chairman of the Fifth Committee. I understand that the recommendation of the Fifth Committee on this matter will be included in its report to the General Assembly on agenda item 76 (Pattern of Conferences).

AGENDA ITEM 22

Fourth International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy: report of the Secretary-General

37. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United States who wishes to introduce the draft resolution on this item [A/L.585].

38. Mr. WHALLEY (United States of America): My Government wishes to express its appreciation to the Secretary-General for his report to this Assembly concerning preparations undertaken for the Fourth International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy [A/7823/Rev.2]. We recognize that the cost estimates presented are only preliminary and will be adjusted in April 1970 to take into account the recommendations of the Scientific Advisory Committee on the agenda of the Conference. However, we are pleased with and support the assumption used in the report on the size and organization of the Conference programme as a basis for estimating costs. In particular we are satisfied with the efforts made to keep expenditure to a minimum without sacrifice to the objectives of the Conference.

39. With respect to the reference in the report on exhibitions [*ibid.*, para. 8], my delegation reconfirms its previous belief that exhibitions should be organized for the public to accentuate the impact of the Conference, recognizing that all expenditure involved would be borne by the

exhibiting Member States, as was the case for the 1964 Conference.

40. My Government strongly reaffirms its support for the Fourth International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy and continues to believe that this Conference should contribute significantly towards the achievement of the objectives of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons as they relate to the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

41. Today nuclear energy is already being employed as a source of electric energy, as a technique to diagnose and cure the sick, to fight pestilence, to improve agriculture and to improve and simplify processes. Moreover, in the future we face the very exciting prospect of being able to employ nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes and to use the atom as an energy source to desalt water and possibly, in time, to run vast agro-industrial complexes that could literally transform the basic economies of the developing countries of the world. In view of these benefits that can now or soon will be realized through the peaceful applications of nuclear energy, we believe more than ever that it is necessary to ensure that all Member States participate in the fullest possible exchange of technological and scientific information in this field. In the furtherance of this goal, my Government looks forward to participating in the Fourth International Conference.

42. It is with pleasure that the United States delegation introduces draft resolution A/L.585 and urges its unanimous adoption.

43. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

44. Mr. ARAUJO CASTRO (Brazil): The delegation of Brazil supports all measures designed to bring about an orderly preparation for the Fourth International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy. We voted for resolution 2406 (XXIII) adopted at the twenty-third session of the General Assembly, on the understanding that financial considerations should not be allowed in any way to restrict the scope and the importance of the projected meeting. Our position today remains unchanged. We believe that every effort should be made to prevent the economy drive—laudable in itself—from imposing any undue restrictions on the Conference.

45. In reiterating its support for the resolution concerning the Fourth International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, the delegation of Brazil wishes to emphasize three points which we think are particularly relevant to the orderly preparation and fruitful realization of this Conference: first, all working documents should be distributed well in advance in order to facilitate the preparatory work of all delegations concerned; secondly, the agenda should be carefully drawn up in order to serve as a realistic programme of work which, without by-passing any important matters, will permit the accomplishment of the aims of the Conference within the time allotted for the session; thirdly, we should never lose sight of the fact that the Conference is not purely scientific in nature, but has as its main goal the exchange of information and experiments and the establishment of greater co-operation between

administrators, economists and planners in the area of nuclear energy.

46. These are the observations we felt bound to make at this stage. I will only add that we wish to stress the great significance and importance Brazil attributes to the convening of the Fourth Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy. It is self-evident that the Conference has great relevance for all nations, and particularly for the developing ones. We hope that this Conference will contribute a great deal towards broader co-operation between nuclear and non-nuclear countries on the basis of mutual understanding for the construction of a better and peaceful world. It is with this understanding that the delegation of Brazil will vote in favour of draft resolution A/L.585.

47. Mr. MENDELEVICH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The Soviet Union, as is well known, attaches great importance to international co-operation in the field of the peaceful uses of atomic energy, especially in connexion with the conclusion and the forthcoming entry into force of the Treaty of the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII)*].

48. The Soviet Union takes an active part in the work of the International Atomic Energy Agency and it also co-operates in this field with many States on a bilateral basis and with international scientific institutions. We value highly the contribution made to international relations in this field by international conferences on the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The Soviet Union has taken an active part in the first three conferences held on this subject.

49. In connexion with the Fourth International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy to be held in 1971, for which preparations are now being made, we should like to express our gratitude to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and to the Scientific Advisory Committee for the work they have already done. The Soviet delegation takes note of the report of the Secretary-General [*A/7823/Rev.2*], which states, among other things, that the agenda of the Conference will be drawn up at the April 1970 session of the United Nations Scientific Advisory Committee.

50. The Soviet delegation would like at the same time to state that, as can be seen from the Secretary-General's report, in determining the preliminary costs of this Conference, insufficient attention has been given to the proposal made to the Secretary-General of the General Assembly in resolution 2309 (XXII) to the effect that the cost to the United Nations for the Fourth Conference should be less than that for the Third Conference in 1964.

51. We hope that, at the April 1970 session of the Advisory Committee, when more specific estimates of the expenditure for the Conference will be drawn up, this decision of the General Assembly will be taken more fully into account and that the cost to the United Nations of holding the Conference will be reduced below the original figures.

52. Account should also be taken of the advice of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary

Questions, which clearly stated in its thirty-seventh report [*A/7855*] that the cost of the Conference to the United Nations could be limited to approximately \$750,000, i.e., almost \$200,000 less than the figure submitted by the Secretariat.

53. The Soviet delegation is glad to see that, in preparations for the Fourth International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, the United Nations is co-operating closely with the International Atomic Energy Agency, which is the most competent international organization in the matters to be debated at the Conference. In view of all those considerations, the delegation of the Soviet Union will support the draft resolution submitted by Canada, France, India, the United Kingdom and the United States of America in document A/L.585.

54. The Soviet delegation is deeply convinced that the widest possible participation by all States in the world will help to ensure the success of such an important enterprise as the Fourth International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy. It would therefore be absolutely unjustified to restrict the number of participants in the forthcoming international Conference to States members of the United Nations, the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency. It is perfectly clear that, in those conditions, many States which have remarkable achievements to their credit in this field of the peaceful uses of atomic energy would be unable to share those achievements with the other participants at the Conference. Such an approach would constitute political discrimination, which is contrary to the United Nations Charter and intolerable in international relations.

55. In this connexion the Soviet delegation would like to refer in particular to the question of the participation in the Conference of the German Democratic Republic, a sovereign independent State, which was one of the first countries to ratify the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, a State which has great achievements to its credit in the field of the peaceful uses of atomic energy. We are convinced that the contribution of that State to the work of the forthcoming Conference would be extremely fruitful. An invitation to the German Democratic Republic to take part in the Fourth International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy would be a sign of a sound and a sensible attitude towards the realities of the present-day world.

56. Mr. SEN (India): In response to resolution 2406 (XXIII), the Secretary-General has presented his report on the Fourth International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy [*S/7823/Rev.2*], prepared with the assistance of the United Nations Scientific Advisory Committee. We are grateful to the Secretary-General and to the United Nations Scientific Advisory Committee for providing us with this valuable report so that we can estimate the progress made so far in preparing for the Conference, and can consider what further steps should be taken to complete the task of organizing that Conference, which is of great significance for my country as well as for other developing countries.

57. The Director-General of the International Atomic Energy Agency submitted a list of proposed agenda items

to the Advisory Committee. The Committee discussed Mr. Eklund's suggestions in detail. The Indian representative on the Committee has already indicated that the wishes of the General Assembly to keep the cost low should be taken into account and that therefore the Committee should refashion the list with the assistance of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

58. It has been stated by the Secretary-General that the United Nations Scientific Advisory Committee considered that:

“further examination of possible items would be necessary before a final agenda”—for the Conference—“could be decided upon” [A/7823/Rev.2, para. 2].

It has also been stated by the Secretary-General that the Committee expressed the hope that:

“by the time it reconvenes in April 1970, it would be able to come to an agreement regarding the proposed agenda and a recommendation on cost estimates of the Conference” [ibid.].

59. My delegation suggested at the 1743rd meeting of the General Assembly, on 16 December 1968—that is about a year ago—a list of topics for the general session as well as for the technical session of the Conference. Without wishing to repeat itself, my delegation would suggest the following topics for group discussions.

60. First, the role of Governments in promoting the possible uses of atomic energy. Secondly, priorities and constraints applicable to national atomic energy programmes. Thirdly—and this can be divided into two sections—international initiatives to promote the benefit of: (a) low-cost nuclear-power; and (b) isotopes and radiation. The Secretary-General stated in his report:

“However, the Committee noted that to maintain the expenditure at the same level in real terms as for the Third International Conference in 1964 would require, for a similar Conference in 1971, an appropriation of some 40 per cent in excess of the costs of the Third Conference. It was felt therefore that if the range of actual expenditure were to be kept at the same level as in 1964, this would in fact constitute a considerable reduction in costs.” [Ibid., para. 3.]

We would naturally welcome all possible economy, but not to the extent of curtailing discussion on subjects that are considered important by the Advisory Committee and the International Atomic Energy Agency.

61. The report has also indicated the financial requirements of the Conference for the years 1970, 1971, and 1972. It is estimated that in 1970 the cost would be \$116,600; in 1971, \$561,200; and in 1972, \$255,000. The Secretary-General has stated that those estimates were established on the assumption that the same number of agenda items would be retained as for the previous Conferences and that the contribution of the International Atomic Energy Agency for the Fourth Conference would be provided in the same proportion as for the Third Conference in 1964. The Secretary-General has also indi-

cated the assumptions on which the preliminary estimates were established. My delegation is prepared to support the financial estimates suggested by the Secretary-General.

62. The Secretary-General in paragraph 8 of his report has asked the Assembly to reconsider the question of organizing an exhibition for the public at the Fourth International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy in view of the additional expenses which would have to be borne by the participating Member States. This question was not fully discussed at the meetings of the United Nations Scientific Advisory Committee. In our view we should leave it to the Advisory Committee to make recommendations on this issue, keeping in mind the possible impact on public opinion on the one hand and the additional cost on the other. The Advisory Committee will undoubtedly consider how much of the cost can be covered by commercial arrangements with the participants and by gate-money.

63. My delegation has co-sponsored the draft resolution contained in document A/L.585. We hope it will be adopted unanimously. Briefly, it recommends preparations for a Conference at Geneva in 1971 lasting just over a week.

64. The PRESIDENT: I now invite representatives to take a decision on draft resolution A/L.585. The Fifth Committee has submitted a report on the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution, which is contained in document A/7868.

65. I take it that the Assembly would wish to adopt this draft resolution without objection.

The draft resolution was adopted [resolution 2575 (XXIV)].

AGENDA ITEM 35

Comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all their aspects: report of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE (A/7878)

Mr. Akongo (Uganda), Rapporteur of the Special Political Committee, presented the report of that Committee.

Pursuant to rule 68 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the report of the Special Political Committee.

66. The PRESIDENT: I call on those representatives who have indicated a desire to explain their votes.

67. Mr. NGUZA (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (*translated from French*): My delegation wishes once again to make its consideration to the deliberations on this important question of peace-keeping operations. We have always done so since we believe that the maintenance of international peace and security is the primary aim of the United Nations. I shall always remember the words of one of the most outstanding Presidents of the United States of

America, John F. Kennedy, who once said, from the rostrum of the General Assembly:

"Mankind must put an end to war, or war will put an end to mankind" [1013th meeting, para. 40].

This is particularly true in the present international context where some countries possess weapons capable of tremendous destruction. This is a dreadful sword of Damocles hanging over all of us. Those of us who are from small countries have no choice but to defend the aims, effectiveness and prestige of the United Nations, which is our natural protector.

68. My own country, more than any other, has a duty to defend the effectiveness and prestige of the United Nations in the sphere of peace-keeping operations. The sacrifices of lives and money made by the United Nations in the course of the peace-keeping operations in the Congo bring to mind the human victims, including the late Secretary-General, Dag Hammarskjöld, and the budgetary deficit which followed. We therefore appeal again to the great Powers to review their position and to make a substantial voluntary contribution to help the United Nations out of the financial stalemate in which it has been caught since the peace-keeping operations in my country. We thus regret the decision of the Committee of Thirty-three to abandon its efforts to get the Powers to agree on this important problem of eliminating the \$36.5 million deficit.

69. My delegation still holds that the Committee of Thirty-three was established by General Assembly resolution 2006 (XIX) of 18 February 1965 because of the crisis which occurred during the nineteenth session, a crisis which resulted from the fact that certain Powers felt that they need not contribute to the Congo operation, whereas others felt that they should be made to contribute because of the collective responsibility of Member States. In fact, it is precisely there that the true conflict lies. It is a two-fold conflict: it is both constitutional and financial. The financial aspect is bound up with the effectiveness of a duly authorized operation; the constitutional aspect is bound with the interpretation of the spirit and letter of the Charter. We must, moreover, acknowledge that the two points are closely related.

70. The problem should not be complicated unduly. The first point is to determine which organ is competent to take a decision on peace-keeping operations and then, once the decision has been duly taken, how to implement it in an effective manner consistent with the intentions of that organ. Assuming that we agree on this approach to the problem, I should like to state the views of my delegation.

71. The first conflict involves the constitutional aspect. This is, in fact, the conflict of competence between the Security Council and the General Assembly. I must stress this point because, as you will certainly have noticed, the Committee of Thirty-three burked the issue by speaking only of military observers duly authorized by the Security Council, whereas we all know that there are military observers who were appointed by the General Assembly. The basis for the Committee's action was a resolution introduced by the members of the Committee itself and adopted last year by the General Assembly resoluti

[2451 (XXIII)] on which my delegation expressed reservations and abstained in the vote.

72. We know that this constitutional conflict is based on a particular conception of power held by certain permanent members of the Security Council. We know that because of the international political situation which prevailed at the time when the United Nations was established it had to be acknowledged that a stable peace and international security could be based only on the absolute unanimity of the United States, the Soviet Union, France, the United Kingdom and China. It was on the basis of that realistic philosophy that the United Nations was established a philosophy which took account of the balance of power at that time, but which today could quite justifiably be called in question, since we must ask ourselves very seriously whether unanimity can still be achieved among the present permanent members of the Security Council. Furthermore, are the Powers of yester-year still Powers today? The example of 1956, when two permanent members of the Security Council were involved in a conflict in the Middle East and two others gave them notice to cease fire, is a striking one.

73. It is quite clear that the power criterion which was the basis for the designation of the permanent members of the Security Council is now obsolete, and that power is no longer necessarily the sole prerogative of the present members.

74. We know that the great Powers of 1945 are anxious about this situation and are struggling to maintain their hold over the United Nations at all costs, particularly within the Security Council. They reject any idea of amendment of the Charter on this point and repudiate any decision relating to peace-keeping operations taken outside the Security Council a decision which would escape their arsenal of vetoes. But they are the first to come running to the General Assembly if they have no hope of escaping the veto of the other permanent members of the Security Council.

75. That, unfortunately, is the reality. The constitutional conflict is in fact only a red herring. The theory vigorously defended by some today will not be defended tomorrow if the interests of the defenders run counter to it. In its twenty-four years of existence, the United Nations has already accumulated a substantial body of case-law: Korea in 1950, the Middle East in 1956 and 1967, and the Congo in 1960.

76. What is most striking about these cases is that they raise the question whether the Charter is binding on all or whether it is accepted only when it does not clash with certain political positions.

77. Let us consider the first case: Korea.

78. On the Korean question, the General Assembly, in resolution 195 (III) of 12 December 1948, declared that there was a lawful régime in South Korea, and that the United Nations Commission was present in that territory and was collaborating with the Government, although the latter was not a Member of the United Nations. On 25 June 1950, the armed forces of North Korea crossed the frontier

of South Korea. The Security Council, which was convened in emergency session on the same day, noted the aggression in resolution 82 (1950), which also invited

“the authorities in North Korea to withdraw forthwith armed forces to the 38th parallel”.

It should be pointed out that one permanent member was absent. On 27 June 1950, in resolution 83 (1950), the Council noted that North Korea had not withdrawn its forces. It called on all Member States to give South Korea assistance in repelling the attackers. On 7 July 1950, still in the absence of one permanent member, the Council, in resolution 84 (1950), recommended the Member States which were supplying military forces to place them under a unified command. The absent permanent member subsequently returned and categorically opposed the implementation of that resolution. It might be useful to learn the views of the permanent members of the Security Council on the value of a decision taken by the Council in the absence in one permanent member.

79. In any event, what happened in 1950 when, with the return of the absent permanent member, the Council found itself likely to be caught in an impasse? Another Power brought the question before the General Assembly, on 3 November 1950. Since the competence of the General Assembly in this matter was challenged, the General Assembly then adopted the famous resolution 377 (V) which was given the title “Uniting for peace”.

80. It is interesting to note paragraph 1 of part A of this well-known resolution. It reads as follows:

“1. *Resolves* that if the Security Council, because of lack of unanimity of the permanent members, fails to exercise its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security in any case where there appears to be a threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression, the General Assembly shall consider the matter immediately with a view to making appropriate recommendations to Members for collective measures, including in the case of a breach of the peace or act of aggression the use of armed force when necessary, to maintain or restore international peace and security. If not in session at the time, the General Assembly may meet in emergency special session within twenty-four hours of the request therefor. Such emergency special session shall be called if requested by the Security Council on the vote of any seven members, or by a majority of the Members of the United Nations”.

81. It is important to note that it was on the basis of that resolution that the General Assembly found, in resolution 498 (V) of 1 February 1951, that there had been an act of aggression against Korea by the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, and that, in resolution 500 (V), it called for a continuing blockade in recommending that every State:

“Apply an embargo on the shipment to areas under the control of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China and of the North Korean authorities of arms, ammunition and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, transportation mate-

rials of strategic value, and items useful in the production of arms, ammunition and implements of war”.

82. That is what is usually termed action under peace-keeping operations. Those are decisions taken under Chapter VII of the Charter and, in that particular case, the decision was taken pursuant to Article 41 of the Charter. Some Members maintain that such matters are within the exclusive competence of the Security Council. We note, however, that the General Assembly has taken decisions on the matter. The Assembly has, in fact, never concluded its consideration of the question.

83. I now come to the second case: the Middle East. There are two notable dates: 1956 and 1967.

84. In 1956, two Powers which are permanent members of the Security Council were directly involved. The 749th and 750th meetings of the Security Council demonstrated its importance because of what is known as lack of unanimity among the permanent members, which, in that case, simply reflected the opposition by the two permanent members directly involved in the conflict-members which, of course, had the right of veto. Thus, at its 751st meeting on 31 October 1956, the Security Council adopted a resolution [119 (1956)] which is part of the record on this subject. In that resolution, the Council, after noting the lack of unanimity among its permanent members, decided:

“to call an emergency special session of the General Assembly, as provided in General Assembly resolution 377 A (V) of 3 November 1950, in order to make appropriate recommendations”.

85. That is very important. The Security Council, with the agreement of the two major Powers which were opposed on the Korean question, relieved itself of responsibility for the question because it was unable to reach a solution, thus giving effect to General Assembly resolution 377 A (V), which does in fact enable the Assembly to take decisions in a sphere which some now claim is within the exclusive competence of the Council.

86. The General Assembly, which met on that basis, did not fail to perform its duty and made recommendations directly to Member States, with the agreement of certain Members which today maintain that only the Security Council has competence in such matters. The Assembly called for a cease-fire, the withdrawal of troops, and the reopening of the Suez Canal, and even went so far as to establish a United Nations emergency force in order to put an end to the hostilities and to separate the combatants.

87. In 1967, at the request of a Power which maintains that the Security Council alone is competent to take decisions on action, the General Assembly met in emergency special session and even made recommendations to the Council while the latter was still considering the same question.

88. The convening of the General Assembly would have been consistent with the Charter if it had been the Security Council itself which had taken the initiative, but that was not the case. How then could one justify the convening of the General Assembly at a time when the question was

before the Security Council and when those who proposed convening the General Assembly had called upon it, in an appropriate draft resolution, to make recommendations relating to action? The only explanation lies in resolution 377 (V)—“Uniting for peace”.

89. As far as the Middle East is concerned, it is clear that, in both cases, those who argue for the exclusive competence of the Security Council in decisions involving action have, either directly or indirectly, acknowledged that the General Assembly has the same competence.

90. The third example of United Nations peace-keeping operations was in my country, the Congo.

91. Need I recall the difficulties which my country encountered at the very start of its independence, the intervention of the armed forces of a foreign country, and the balkanization of the Congo? The Security Council, in a number of resolutions, adopted decisions establishing the United Nations force in the Congo (ONUC). On 20 September 1960, the General Assembly accepted the credentials submitted by the delegation of the Congolese Chief of State and, on 20 December 1960, it confirmed the resolutions adopted by the Security Council on the Congo. It should be recalled that my country was then at an important political turning-point. One Power began to call in question the activities of the United Nations in the Congo whilst another challenged the competence of the General Assembly to intervene in the question. Those two Powers refused to contribute to the financing of ONUC. They wanted the Security Council to reconsider the question, but they never convened it.

92. That is the record of international case-law in this matter; those are facts which no one in this Assembly can gainsay. In 1950 and 1956, my country was not a member of the United Nations, but we have found those facts here and have given you all the references.

93. The question thus arises: which United Nations organ has exclusive competence to take decisions on action relating to peace-keeping operations? I have heard some say that it is the Security Council and that Article 11, paragraph 2, of the Charter provides therefor. But what precisely does the last sentence of that paragraph state? I quote:

“Any such question on which action is necessary shall be referred to the Security Council by the General Assembly, either before or after discussion”.

94. Delegations which refer to Article 11 to support their contention that the Council has exclusive competence need only read paragraph 4 of the same Article, which says:

“The powers of the General Assembly set forth in this Article shall not limit the general scope of Article 10”.

Article 10 specifically confers on the General Assembly the right to discuss any question falling within the scope of the Charter and to make recommendations to the Security Council or to Member States. If we read Article 11 within its context, we see that the powers of the Security Council in the sphere of peace-keeping are far from exclusive.

95. Without claiming to give the only possible interpretation of the Charter—which, for some people, often changes with events—we note that: first, the Security Council has primary responsibility in this field [*Art. 24, para. 1*]; secondly, the Charter gives the Security Council and the General Assembly complementary responsibilities [*Art. 24 et seq., and Art. 10, 11, 12 and 14*]; thirdly, Articles 10, 11, 12 and 14 clearly confer on the General Assembly the right to discuss any questions relating to the maintenance of peace and authorize it to make recommendations to Member States or to the Security Council; fourthly, in the sphere of peace-keeping, the Charter limits the competence of the General Assembly in only three cases:

(a) According to Article 10, the General Assembly may only make recommendations to the Security Council or to Member States or to both;

(b) The last sentence of Article 11, paragraph 2, provides that any questions relating to the maintenance of peace on which action is necessary shall be referred to the Security Council. I have already explained how, in the context of Article 11 as a whole, that paragraph did not preclude the General Assembly from discussing and making recommendations on action;

(c) According to Article 12, the General Assembly may not intervene in connexion with a question already being dealt with by the Security Council unless the latter so requests.

96. During my account of these three past cases, I have tried to prove that the General Assembly took account of those restrictions only to the extent that the Security Council was itself able to fulfil its obligations. Let us also examine that Article of the Charter which grants those powers to the Security Council, namely, Article 24, paragraph 1 of which reads:

“In order to ensure prompt and effective action by the United Nations, its Members confer on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and agree that in carrying out its duties under this responsibility the Security Council acts on their behalf”.

97. What do we find when we analyse this Article? First, that the Security Council has primary, and therefore not exclusive, responsibility; secondly, that it exercises this responsibility on behalf of those Members of the United Nations which are represented only in the General Assembly. Moreover, under Article 12, paragraph 2, of the Charter, the Security Council is required to notify the General Assembly at each session of its activities in the sphere of peace-keeping; thirdly, that this responsibility was conferred on the Security Council in order to ensure prompt and effective action by the United Nations. A condition is, therefore, attached to the exercise of this responsibility by the Council.

98. That, then, is the extent of the competence of the two organs.

99. We have noted that, in 1950 in the case of Korea, in 1956 and 1967 in the case of the Middle East, and in 1960

in the case of the Congo, the General Assembly, with the assent of different members of the Security Council, applied resolution 377 (V)—“Uniting for peace”.

100. We also noted that, in 1956 in the case of the Middle East, the Council, with the agreement of the two super-Powers, and feeling unable to solve the problem because of the direct involvement in the conflict of two of its permanent members, washed its hands of the problem and, on the basis of resolution 377 (V), convened a special emergency session of the General Assembly.

101. The General Assembly was called into action because the entire machinery of the Charter had seized up. The Council having failed to discharge the functions for which it has primary responsibility, the General Assembly, composed of all Members of the United Nations, took up the question and made recommendations relating to collective action to be taken by Member States as a whole.

102. We are not interpreting the Charter, an exercise which would in any case serve little purpose. We are merely noting what has taken place, with the agreement sometimes of some, sometimes of others.

103. That is the context of what we may term a duly authorized decision. It would not be honest to act in any other way. And now, if the decision to order an operation is duly taken, how is it to be carried out effectively? This raises the second aspect of the problem—financing.

104. My delegation believes that this is the collective responsibility of all Member States. I am still at a loss to understand why members, which created or joined the United Nations of their own free will, see fit to prevent it from achieving its primary goal by rendering impotent and ineffective if its decisions do not meet their political interests. Obviously, the establishment of military observers, an active general staff or even contingents of United Nations forces requires money. Where is that money to be found? That is the crux of the problem.

105. At the twenty-third session, and specifically in the Special Political Committee [638th meeting, *para.* 14], the Canadian delegation suggested a series of methods for financing peace-keeping operations. My delegation favours a pre-established system of financing which would apply to peace-keeping operations in all their aspects: military contingents, general staff, and so on. We are in favour of a pre-established system because it would remove the need for improvisation. We are in favour of a pre-established system because it would guarantee the effectiveness of the United Nations and safeguard its prestige. We are in favour of a pre-established system, lastly, because we are from a small country and, as such, we are in many cases at the mercy of the decisions taken by the larger countries; the effectiveness of the United Nations, therefore, is our sole guarantee.

106. In conclusion, I should like to say a word about the Committee of Thirty-three. We are very grateful to Mr. Cuevas Cancino, the Mexican Ambassador, for his unflagging efforts to ensure the success of the Committee's work. We also know that the members of the Committee are all imbued with goodwill, but my delegation no longer

believes that the Committee can accomplish the task facing it by itself. We think that at the present stage the General Assembly might entrust certain tasks to the Secretary-General, who also has responsibility in this sphere. It is only on the basis of an objective technical study by the Secretary-General that the General Assembly will be able to achieve real progress; this cannot be done within the exclusive framework of the Committee of Thirty-three.

107. Permit me to say, finally, that my delegation sincerely hopes that war will not put an end to mankind; the Democratic Republic of the Congo will do its utmost to ensure that mankind will put an end to war.

108. The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution recommended by the Special Political Committee in paragraph 6 of its report [A/7878].

The draft resolution was adopted by 109 votes to 1, with 1 abstention [resolution 2576 (XXIV)].

AGENDA ITEM 38

United Nations Industrial Development Organization: report of the Industrial Development Board (*continued*)*

REPORT OF THE SECOND COMMITTEE (part II)
(A/7774/Add.1)

AGENDA ITEM 47

General review of the programmes and activities in the economic, social, technical co-operation and related fields of the United Nations, the specialized agencies, the International Atomic Energy Agency, the United Nations Children's Fund and all other institutions and agencies related to the United Nations system

REPORT OF THE SECOND COMMITTEE (A/7881)

109. The PRESIDENT: I invite the Rapporteur of the Second Committee, Mr. Warsama of Somalia, to present the reports on agenda items 38 [A/7774/Add.1] and 47 [A/7881] in a single intervention.

110. Mr. WARSAMA (Somalia), Rapporteur of the Second Committee: I have the honour to present part II of the report of the Second Committee on agenda item 38 [A/7774/Add.1]. Part I has already been presented to the General Assembly [1817th meeting]. In part II the Committee recommends two draft resolutions for adoption by the General Assembly which are reproduced in paragraph 18 of the report.

111. Draft resolution I invites the Industrial Development Board to consider the possibility of including in its annual reports a summary of the progress achieved in the implementation of the recommendations and resolutions of the Board and of the International Symposium, an up-dated

* Resumed from the 1817th session.

listing' of the titles of all projects and activities undertaken by UNIDO in each country and region and an outline of the future work programme.

112. Draft resolution II suggests the holding of an international conference of UNIDO at an appropriate time, provided it is not scheduled in the same year as that in which UNCTAD holds its third session. It requests the Board to consider first that suggestion and then the possibility of the Board acting as a preparatory committee of the conference.

113. I also have the honour to present the report on agenda item 47 [A/7881]. In paragraph 16 of its report the Committee recommends two draft resolutions for adoption by the General Assembly.

114. Draft resolution I, on the final report of the Enlarged Committee for Programme and Co-ordination, reaffirms the objectives set out in resolution 2188 (XXI) as the guiding objectives for the organizations in the United Nations system. It welcomes the Enlarged Committee's report and requests the Economic and Social Council, at its organizational session in January 1970, to reconstitute its Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and to examine and to keep under continuing review the machinery for co-ordination and programme review and to introduce improvements or modifications as necessary. It welcomes and encourages the practice of holding top echelon meetings of the staff concerned in economic and social affairs on the one hand, and the joint meetings between the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination on the other. It requests the Secretary-General to include as part of his report, pursuant to Council resolution 1454 (XLVII), an examination of the existing Secretariat machinery for providing scientific and technical advice within the United Nations system, and to prepare documentation for its reorganization.

115. Resolution II on marine activities, recognizing the need to avoid overlapping and duplication of programmes and areas of competence, requests the Economic and Social Council to consider instructing the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination to examine the need for a comprehensive review of existing activities of the United Nations system relating to the seas and oceans. The Secretary-General and the specialized agencies are asked to assist and to co-operate with the Committee in this respect.

116. The PRESIDENT: I now give the floor to the representative of India to introduce an amendment² to draft resolution II recommended by the Second Committee in paragraph 18 of its report on agenda item 38 [A/7774/Add.1].

117. Mr. DUBEY (India): Draft resolution II, contained in paragraph 18 of document A/7774/Add.1, was adopted in the Second Committee by 32 votes in favour to 9 against, with 47 abstentions. The sponsors had accepted a large number of amendments from the floor, and thereby took into account the points of view of a number of delegations which could not vote in favour of this draft resolution. If, in spite of this, the draft resolution did not secure as many votes in favour as it really should have done, this was because a clean copy of the final formulation was not available to delegations. Now that we have this draft resolution in the document I have referred to, it is sincerely hoped that many of the delegations which abstained in the voting on the draft resolution will not think it necessary to do so here.

118. Nevertheless, the sponsors have been consulting other delegations to find out if some further amendment could secure greater support in favour of the draft resolution. We feel that the amendment that I am going to propose should make it possible for the delegations that have not voted in favour of the draft resolution to do so here. The amendments relate to paragraph 2. In the second line of that paragraph, the words "the possibility for the Board to act as a preparatory committee of the special conference in order" should be deleted, and should be replaced by the words "if necessary". Then, with a few drafting changes resulting from the change I have just proposed, the paragraph would read:

"Requests the Industrial Development Board to consider the suggestion in paragraph 1 above and if necessary to propose the venue, date and duration of the special conference, and to formulate its provisional agenda and its basic objectives including the longer-range orientation of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, its organizational structure and the question of financing."

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

² Subsequently circulated as document A/L.586.