

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-FOURTH SESSION

*Official Records \**



SECOND COMMITTEE  
48th meeting  
held on  
Friday, 23 November 1979  
at 3 p.m.  
New York

---

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 48th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. MURGESCU (Romania)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 64: OFFICE OF THE UNITED NATIONS DISASTER RELIEF CO-ORDINATOR  
(continued)

AGENDA ITEM 59: OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 65: HUMAN SETTLEMENTS (continued)

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

---

\* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.2/34/SR.48  
28 November 1979

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)

Assistance to Sao Tome and Principe (continued) (A/C.2/34/L.39/Rev.1)

1. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee of its decision to limit statements on the substance of draft resolutions and explanations of vote to 10 minutes.
2. Mr. ABDALLAH (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that, after consultations with the delegation of Sao Tome and Principe, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.39 could accept the three amendments reflected in document A/C.2/34/L.39/Rev.1. They hoped that the revised draft resolution could be adopted by consensus.
3. Draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.39/Rev.1 was adopted without a vote.
4. Mr. BARROS (Sao Tome and Principe) expressed gratitude to the sponsors of the draft resolution and appreciation to the Committee for adopting it by consensus.

Assistance to the Palestinian people (continued) (A/C.2/34/L.52)

5. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Congo, Guinea, Indonesia and Senegal had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.52, as orally revised at the 42nd meeting.
6. Mr. ORON (Israel) reiterated his delegation's objections to General Assembly resolution 33/147 and Economic and Social Council resolutions 2026 (LXI) and 2100 (LXIII), which were referred to in the preambular and operative parts of the draft resolution. At the thirty-third session of the General Assembly, his delegation had drawn attention to the insistence of some delegations on pressing demands regardless of their implications. Some had argued that there was no need for concern, since the wealthy Arab countries would provide the necessary funds. That seemed unlikely. The major Arab oil-exporting countries had contributed less than 1 per cent of total voluntary contributions to UNDP, and there appeared to be a lack of real commitment to change that pattern. His delegation would vote against the draft resolution, since it would obviously only jeopardize the objectives of United Nations development activities.
7. At the request of the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.52, as orally revised.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan,

/...

Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Canada, Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Burma, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

8. Draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.52, as orally revised, was adopted, by 96 votes to 3, with 20 abstentions.

9. Mr. ROSEN (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation supported the programme of assistance to the Palestinian people approved by the Governing Council of UNDP. It had voted against the draft resolution because of the references to Economic and Social Council resolutions which it had consistently opposed.

10. Mr. FESENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the position of principle of the USSR on the question of assistance to the Palestinian people was well known. The General Assembly had often reaffirmed the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to sovereignty and self-determination and to return to their homeland. The Palestine Liberation Organization had been granted observer status by the General Assembly and had been recognized by many States and organizations as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. His Government realized that the needs of the Palestinian people far exceeded the assistance provided and therefore welcomed the measures adopted by the Governing Council of UNDP to improve their living conditions.

11. Miss BARRINGTON (Ireland), speaking on behalf of the States members of the European Economic Community, said that those States had abstained because of the references in the draft resolution to two Economic and Social Council resolutions on which they had also abstained. However, their abstention did not alter their position of support for assistance to the Palestinian people.

12. Mr. LÓPEZ PAZ (Cuba) said that, if his delegation had been present during the voting, it would have voted in favour of the draft resolution.

13. Ms. CRONENBERG-MOSSBERG (Sweden) said that her delegation welcomed the assistance which UNDP would provide to the Palestinian people, but regretted the

/...

(Ms. Cronenberg-Mossberg, Sweden)

reference in the draft resolution to resolutions which it had been unable to support. It had therefore abstained in the vote.

World Tourism Organization (continued) (A/C.2/34/L.54)

14. The CHAIRMAN announced that Brazil, Burundi, the Ivory Coast, Lebanon, Rwanda, Senegal and Uganda had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.54, which had been orally revised by the representative of the Philippines at the 44th meeting.

15. Draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.54, as orally revised, was adopted without a vote.

Assistance for the reconstruction and development of Lebanon (continued)  
(A/C.2/34/L.55)

16. The CHAIRMAN said that Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Ethiopia, France, Iran, Iraq, Italy, the Ivory Coast, Japan, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Mauritania, Oman, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Qatar, Senegal, Somalia, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, the United Arab Emirates, the United States of America, Uruguay and Yemen had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.55.

17. Draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.55 was adopted without a vote.

18. Mr. KHARMA (Lebanon) thanked the Committee for adopting the draft resolution by consensus. His Government was continuing its efforts to reconstruct the vital sectors of the economy and was grateful to all States which had helped it directly or indirectly in that difficult task, which required finance and expertise beyond its means. It commended the Secretary-General for his appointment of a co-ordinator to assist it in the assessment, formulation and phasing of aid. The reconstruction and development of Lebanon would undoubtedly contribute to peace and stability in the region. Believing as it did in international co-operation and interdependence, his Government earnestly hoped that States would continue to support its efforts.

19. Mr. FESENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) reiterated his delegation's view that the draft resolution on assistance for the reconstruction and development of Lebanon should be implemented with funds already appropriated for that purpose.

Assistance to Tonga (continued) (A/C.2/34/L.60)

20. The CHAIRMAN announced that the delegations of Equatorial Guinea, the Ivory Coast and Mali had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.60.

21. Draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.60 was adopted without a vote.

22. Mr. LIPTAU (Federal Republic of Germany) said that, despite some objections, his delegation had joined in the consensus on the draft resolution because it

/...

(Mr. Liptau, Federal Republic  
of Germany)

agreed with its basic objective. His Government would not, however, be able to extend special assistance and benefits to countries not on the list of the least developed countries.

23. Miss LØJ (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the delegations of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden, said that those delegations had joined in the consensus because they acknowledged the need for international assistance to Tonga. The established procedures and criteria should be observed with respect to the category of least developed countries. It was for the Committee for Development Planning to determine which countries should be included in the list.

24. Miss COURSON (France) said that, although her delegation had joined in the consensus, it did not agree that countries not on the list of the least developed countries should be accorded special assistance and benefits. It was for the Committee for Development Planning to determine the composition of the list of least developed countries on the basis of well-defined criteria.

Permanent sovereignty over national resources in the occupied Arab territories  
(A/C.2/34/L.51)

25. Replying to a question from Mr. NABULSI (Jordan), Mr. MULLER (Secretary of the Committee) said the Office of Financial Services had requested that the introduction of draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.51 should be deferred because of its possible financial implications. Efforts were being made to ascertain the nature of any such implications.

AGENDA ITEM 64: OFFICE OF THE UNITED NATIONS DISASTER RELIEF CO-ORDINATOR  
(continued) (A/C.2/34/L.37, A/C.2/34/L.47 and Corr.1)

26. The CHAIRMAN announced that El Salvador, the Gambia, Honduras, Mozambique, the Philippines and the Upper Volta had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.37.

27. Mr. EHRMAN (United Kingdom) said that the United Kingdom had been a major contributor to the Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator and supported its co-ordinating role. However, UNDRO was not a direct provider of disaster relief and his delegation had hoped that any increase in its funding would come from extrabudgetary sources. It therefore had reservations about operative paragraph 8 of the draft resolution and has asked for informal consultations in the hope that it could be redrafted, thus permitting a consensus to be reached. Other delegations also had difficulties with that paragraph and, if it were not amended, he would request a separate vote on it. If such a vote were taken, his delegation would vote against paragraph 8. While his delegation could support the rest of the draft resolution, it regretted that the sponsors had chosen to submit it to the Second Committee rather than the Fifth Committee, and it would therefore abstain in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

/...

28. Miss COURSON (France) said that the General Assembly had previously decided that the activities of the Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator should be funded from extrabudgetary sources. Her delegation therefore regretted that, after informal consultations, no consensus had been reached. It could not agree that funds for UNDRO should come from the regular budget of the United Nations and would therefore vote against paragraph 8 and abstain on the draft resolution as a whole.

29. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines) asked whether the figure of \$6,545 referred to in document A/C.2/34/L.47, paragraph 4, was correct.

30. Mr. VERKOL (United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator) replied that the total contributions received since 1976 had indeed amounted only to \$6,545.

31. Mr. LIPTAU (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation would vote against paragraph 8 because it believed that the question of additional funds from the regular budget should have been taken up by the Fifth Committee rather than the Second Committee. His delegation shared the views expressed by the representatives of France and the United Kingdom and would abstain on the draft resolution as a whole because the task of UNDRO, as set forth in General Assembly resolution 2816 (XXVI), should be focused on disaster preparedness and relief. With regard to other activities, UNDRO should be involved in exceptional cases only. The Federal Republic of Germany was not in a position to provide additional voluntary funds to UNDRO.

32. Operative paragraph 8 was adopted by 114 votes to 14, with 8 abstentions.

33. Draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.37 as a whole was adopted by 119 votes to none, with 17 abstentions.

34. Mr. WORKU (Ethiopia) said that his delegation had voted in favour of paragraph 8 and the draft resolution as a whole as an expression of its support for UNDRO, which was the most effective organ for dealing with emergency situations. UNDRO had done more than had been expected from it and had worked closely with the Ethiopian authorities since 1973 to mobilize international assistance which had been of great help to the drought-stricken areas of the country. Nature still had a firm grip on Ethiopia, as could be seen from the report of the Secretary-General in document A/34/198. The situation in 1979 had been as bad as that of the earlier 1970s, and his delegation could not accept the comment that UNDRO's mandate did not give it the authority to act in such situations.

35. Mr. NELLI (Italy) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on paragraph 8 because of its well-known position regarding the use of the United Nations regular budget to finance such types of assistance. Such costs should, as a general rule, be met from extrabudgetary sources. His delegation had voted for the draft resolution as a whole because it supported UNDRO and recognized the need to improve international solidarity in times of disaster.

36. Mr. FESENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on behalf of the delegations of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR, said that, as stated at the thirty-second and thirty-third sessions of the General Assembly, those delegations believed that the financing of measures of assistance in cases of natural disaster should be from voluntary contributions. They reserved their position until such time as the matter was taken up in the Fifth Committee. UNDRO should play only a co-ordinating role in cases of natural disaster; it was not an independent body and should not take on functions of direct assistance.

37. Mr. ROSEN (United States of America) said that his delegation had voted against paragraph 8 and had abstained on the draft resolution as a whole because of its policy that there should be zero growth in the United Nations regular budget.

38. Miss LOECKX (Belgium) said that her delegation had abstained on paragraph 8, rather than voting against it, because making provision for additional funds did not necessarily mean that additional operational activities would be undertaken and because it wished to show its sympathy for people stricken by disaster.

39. Mr. BERKOL (United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator) said he wished to thank all delegations for the encouragement they had given to UNDRO. Despite some comments made in the Committee, everyone knew that more had to be done to assist disaster-prone countries. UNDRO was fully aware of its mandate, and all the suggestions made in the Committee would receive its detailed consideration.

40. The CHAIRMAN declared that the Committee had concluded its consideration of item 64.

AGENDA ITEM 59: OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR DEVELOPMENT .continued)  
(A/C.2/34/L.59)

41. The CHAIRMAN announced that Burundi, Canada, the Central African Republic, the Comoros, the Congo, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Indonesia, Italy, Lebanon, Malaysia, Morocco, Oman, Panama, the Philippines, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, the Sudan, Suriname, Uganda, the United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen and Zambia had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.59, on the United Nations Children's Fund.

42. Mr. KHAN (Pakistan) said that, while there was obviously widespread support for the draft resolution, some of the sponsors wished to modify it so as to strengthen it in order to attract more sponsors. He therefore requested that consideration of the draft resolution should be postponed until a subsequent meeting.

43. It was so decided.

/...

AGENDA ITEM 65: HUMAN SETTLEMENTS (continued) (A/34/8; A/C.2/34/L.53, A/C.2/34/L.56)

44. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.53, on the living conditions of the Palestinian people, and drew attention to the statement of administrative and financial implications in document A/C.2/34/L.56. He announced that Guinea, Indonesia, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Morocco, Senegal, Somalia and the Syrian Arab Republic had become sponsors of the draft resolution.

45. Mr. ORON (Israel) said that Israel was afraid neither of United Nations experts' studying the living conditions of the Palestinian people nor of the conclusions they might reach. What it objected to was one-sided resolutions such as General Assembly resolution 33/110. For years, the Committee had seen fit to discuss conditions in territories administered by Israel. Israel had offered to show evidence of the progress made in those territories, but the result of that offer was that the Israeli authorities were referred to as imperialists who sought to justify their actions by showing the benefits of occupation. Israel had been accused of exporting its economic ills, thus disrupting the economic Utopia that had previously existed in those territories. When such bias was shown in the Committee, there was little hope for any rational discussion.

46. The report before the Committee (A/34/536) asked Member States to take note of data provided only from Arab sources. As a demonstration of the one-sidedness of that data, he wished to draw the Committee's attention to two studies made by United Nations bodies on conditions in the territories. ILO and UNESCO had made studies which demonstrated that labour conditions and educational facilities were far better than the report of the Secretary-General would suggest.

47. Despite improvements made in those and other fields, his delegation could agree that the situation was far from ideal, just as Israel was far from solving all its problems. Israel was now negotiating a peace settlement after 30 years of conflict. The negotiations were difficult, but there was no viable alternative. Israel could not, therefore, be expected to co-operate on a draft resolution which sought to impose the will of one party on the other. A one-sided draft resolution could not improve living conditions or be conducive to peace, and his delegation would therefore vote against it.

48. Mr. POGREBENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had always supported the just demands of the Palestinian people and condemned the action of Israel in occupying the Arab territories. In his statement at the 7th plenary meeting of the General Assembly, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR had said that a just settlement and the establishment of lasting peace in the Middle East required that Israel should end its occupation of all Arab territories seized in 1967, that the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including the right to establish their own State, should be safeguarded, and that the right of all States in the Middle East, including Israel, to independent existence under conditions of peace should be effectively guaranteed. The Soviet delegation agreed with the statement in paragraph 1 of the draft resolution that the Secretary-General's report (A/34/536) had not been sufficiently analytical,

/...



(Mr. Pogrebenko, USSR)

and considered that the General Assembly should, within existing funds, continue work on the preparation of a comprehensive and analytical report on the social and economic impact of the Israeli occupation on the living conditions of the Palestinian people in the occupied Arab territories. In accordance with its position of principle, therefore, and in support of the just demands of the people of Palestine, whose sole legitimate representative was the Palestine Liberation Organization, his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution.

49. At the request of the representative of Democratic Yemen, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.53.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Leo People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

50. Draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.53 was adopted by 102 votes to 2, with 21 abstentions.

51. Miss BARRINGTON (Ireland), speaking on behalf of the States members of the European Economic Community, said that their abstention from voting on the draft resolution was in accordance with their well-known position of previous years.

/...

52. Mr. ALLEN (United States of America) said that his delegation fully supported the aims and the programme of Habitat. It had voted against the draft resolution because it injected extraneous political questions into a body that was concerned with economic and social matters.

53. Mr. FREYRE (Argentina) and Mr. HERNÁNDEZ (Colombia) said that, if they had been present during the voting, they would have voted in favour of the draft resolution.

54. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the draft resolutions proposed by the Commission on Human Settlements in its resolutions 2/3, 2/4 and 2/6, which appeared in annex I of the Commission's report (A/34/8) and which the Economic and Social Council, in its resolution 1979/46, had recommended for adoption by the General Assembly.

55. Mr. MÉNDEZ AROCHA (Venezuela) proposed two amendments to the draft resolution in Commission resolution 2/6. Firstly, in operative paragraph 1, the words "within the context of their national priorities" should be inserted after the word "devote". Secondly, the seventh preambular paragraph should be deleted. While it might be reasonable to refer to changes in living patterns in developed countries, that was a secondary matter in the case of developing countries, where the problem was the sheer lack of housing. Since it would not be in keeping with the spirit of the draft resolution to make a specific reference to developed countries, it would be better to delete the paragraph altogether.

56. The amendments were adopted.

57. The draft resolutions, as orally amended, were adopted without a vote.

58. Mr. MULLER (Secretary of the Committee) said that, in response to the question raised by a number of delegations regarding the inclusion of the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat) and the Habitat and Human Settlements Foundation in the list of programmes and funds participating in the annual pledging conference for development activities, he would like to make a clarification. Such a clarification was required, as it might affect other programmes and funds.

59. Pursuant to paragraph 31 of the annex to General Assembly resolution 32/197, on the restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system, a single United Nations pledging conference should be held for all United Nations operational activities for development, without prejudice to other arrangements for mobilizing additional funds for particular programmes through other measures, or from other sources, and also subject to provision being made for the earmarking of contributions for specific programmes. Further, in preparing for the pledging conference, the Secretariat should make available to Governments information concerning previous and current contributions for the various programmes from Governments and other sources. Accordingly, information on contributions made by Governments to the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements - Habitat and Human Settlements Foundation - would be included.

/...

60. He recalled in that connexion the understanding of the General Assembly, both at its thirty-third session and at the current session, that Governments might wish to utilize the single pledging conference to make pledges for all operational activities for development, whether or not such activities were performed under programmes for which pledging conferences had previously been provided, and without prejudice to other arrangements to which the programmes concerned might wish to have recourse for mobilizing funds.

61. In the circumstances, there was no need for specific decisions of the Assembly for the inclusion of individual programmes or funds in the consolidated conference. The comprehensive character of the conference would in future be more clearly reflected in the letters of convocation and other documentation for such conferences.

#### ORGANIZATION OF WORK

62. The CHAIRMAN said that he had received a request to extend to 26 November the deadline for the submission of draft resolutions under item 66. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to the extension of the deadline.

63. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.