

United Nations

**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-FOURTH SESSION

*Official Records* \*



SECOND COMMITTEE

57th meeting

held on

Tuesday, 11 December 1979

at 6.30 p.m.

New York

---

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 57th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. MURGESCU (Romania)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 55: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 60: UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME (continued)

---

\* 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.57  
14 December 1979

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 7.15 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 55: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued)

1. Mr. LOQUET (Belgium), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had abstained from voting on operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.114, as amended. His country was in favour of decentralization to the regional commissions, but considered that the strengthening of personnel should be done primarily through internal redeployment and not through the establishment of new posts. In abstaining, his delegation wished to reserve its position pending discussion of the question in the Fifth Committee.

2. Mr. EHRMAN (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had been pleased to join in the consensus of the draft resolution but had abstained on paragraph 3, as amended, because it believed that decentralization should be brought about through the redeployment of posts from Headquarters. His delegation reserved the right to comment further on the practical application of the decentralization measures in the Fifth Committee.

3. Mr. KOLEV (Bulgaria), 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 those delegations supported the decisions of the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly designed to bring about the decentralization of the economic and social activities of the United Nations and the strengthening of the regional commissions. They fully agreed with the statement in paragraph 19 of section IV of the annex to General Assembly resolution 32/197 that the regional commissions should be enabled fully to play their role under the authority of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council as the main general economic and social development centres within the United Nations system for their respective regions. They welcomed the endorsement of the proposals made by the Secretary-General in parts I and II of his report (A/34/649) for the transfer of certain resources to the regional commissions from the Department of International Economic and Social Affairs and the Department of Technical Co-operation for Development.

4. However, the delegations for which he spoke had been obliged to vote against the Indian amendment to paragraph 3 of the draft resolution and had therefore abstained on the text as a whole. The amendment recommended that the Secretary-General should be guided in his future work in the elaboration and implementation of decentralization measures by the report in document A/34/649. Part IV of that report contained requests for additional posts for some of the regional commissions which had not yet been discussed or endorsed by a single intergovernmental body. That being so, it was premature to recommend that those requests should be considered.

5. Mr. PONCET (France) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution but had abstained on paragraph 3, as amended, because it felt that the strengthening of the regional commissions should be achieved through the transfer of existing posts and resources.

/...

6. Mr. ALLEN (United States of America) said that his delegation had supported the consensus on the draft resolution, but had been obliged to abstain on the amendment to paragraph 3. It supported decentralization but believed that it should be carried out primarily through the redeployment of existing resources.

Draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.85

7. Mr. HAIDAR (India), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, said that one change had been made in the wording of draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.85 on the sixth replenishment of the International Development Association and recapitalization of the World Bank so that it could be adopted by consensus. In operative paragraph 1, the words "a substantial" should be replaced by the words "an adequate".

8. Draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.85, as orally revised, was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution A/34/L.18

9. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on draft resolution A/34/L.18 on the United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries.

10. Draft resolution A/34/L.18 was adopted by 94 votes to none, with 17 abstentions.

11. Mr. SHAPALOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the USSR appreciated the special needs of land-locked developing countries and had been one of the first States to ratify and implement the Convention on Transit Trade of Land-locked States which provided assistance towards the solution of the special transport problems of those countries. The USSR also had a number of special agreements on transit questions with neighbouring countries and for a number of years had been providing them with assistance in the development of transport infrastructures. It was taking practical measures to bring about the further development of trade and of economic, scientific and technical co-operation with those countries on just and equitable terms and was prepared to continue to broaden its co-operation with them in the future on a bilateral and multilateral basis. For those reasons, it had voted in favour of the draft resolution.

12. Mr. DAVENPORT (Ireland), speaking on behalf of the States members of the European Economic Community, said that those countries had abstained from voting on the draft resolution, as they had consistently done in the past with regard to similar resolutions. While recognizing the right of any country to contribute to the Special Fund, the Community intended to adhere to its policy of providing assistance to land-locked developing countries through other existing bilateral and multilateral channels.

13. Mr. HAIDAR (India), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, said the Group regretted that the draft resolution had not been adopted by consensus. The special needs of land-locked developing countries were generally recognized, and it was time for the General Assembly to assist those countries through specific action. The Group of 77 hoped that the Special Fund would receive the necessary financial support to be able to assist land-locked developing countries in their development plans.

14. Mr. ALLEN (United States of America) said that his delegation had abstained on the draft resolution because of its Government's policy of channelling aid to land-locked developing countries through other multilateral and bilateral programmes. The United States did, of course, recognize the special problems of land-locked countries and took them into account in formulating its assistance policies. It also supported the right of any Government to contribute to the Special Fund.

AGENDA ITEM 60: UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME (continued)

Draft decision A/C.2/34/L.121

15. Mr. JÖDAHL (Sweden), introducing draft decision A/C.2/34/L.121 on the statement issued by participants in the United Nations symposium on interrelations among resources, environment, population and development, said that it was simply a way of drawing the attention of the United Nations bodies concerned with the question of interrelations among resources, environment, population and development to the statement issued by the participants in the United Nations symposium (A/C.2/34/5, annex). Since the draft decision had no financial or other implications, he hoped that it would be adopted by the Committee.

16. Draft decision A/C.2/34/L.121 was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.24/Rev.2

17. Mr. KHAN (Pakistan), introducing on behalf of the sponsors draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.24/Rev.2 on co-operation in the field of the environment concerning natural resources shared by two or more States, said that the latest revised text represented the highest measure of agreement that could be reached in the Committee. The first preambular paragraph recalled the principle, stated in the Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, of full permanent sovereignty of every State over its natural resources. In the fourth preambular paragraph the sponsors had included a mention of the explanatory note contained in the report of the Intergovernmental Working Group of Experts, which clarified the non-binding nature of the draft principles. The last preambular paragraph was added to clearly indicate the objective with which the principles had been drawn up.

18. In operative paragraph 1, the inclusion of the words "as adopted" had been accepted to accommodate and reflect some reservations that had been made when the Governing Council of UNEP had adopted the report of the Intergovernmental Group of Experts. In paragraph 2, which was the most important paragraph of the proposal, the words "guidelines and recommendations" had been included as further proof of the willingness of the sponsors to reflect as faithfully as possible the general sense of the informal consultations. Paragraph 3 indicated more clearly than the old paragraphs 3 and 4 that the principles were intended to help States in the formulation of unilateral and multilateral conventions on the basis of the principle of good faith and in the spirit of good neighbourliness and in such a

/...

(Mr. Khan, Pakistan)

way as to enhance and not to affect adversely development and the interests of all countries and in particular of the developing countries. In paragraph 4, which replaced the previous paragraphs 5 and 6, the question of the definition of shared natural resources had been deleted. It was true that, in international law, definitions of such concepts emerged only from State practice, usage and customs, and the adoption of the principles and their subsequent usage in bilateral or multilateral agreements would in fact facilitate the evolution of such a definition.

19. Although the sponsors had made extensive changes in the text in a spirit of accommodation, the submission of a consensus text in the name of the Vice-Chairman (Mr. Zifra) had proved impossible solely because a few delegations continued to oppose the fundamental principle of previous consultations on the conservation and harmonious utilization of natural resources shared by two or more States. Those delegations had been opposed to operative paragraph 2 in its present form and had pressed for the replacement of the word "Adopts" by the words "Takes note of". The sponsors could not accept that suggestion because they considered it important for the General Assembly to adopt the draft principles as recommended for two consecutive years by the Governing Council of UNEP. A consensus on the basis of such a change would not have been an honest consensus because it would have covered diametrically opposed views and changed the original purpose of the resolution, which was the adoption of the principles.

20. Mr. PARANHOS-VELLOSO (Brazil) said that his delegation wished to convey its sincere appreciation to the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.24/Rev.2 for the understanding shown during the informal consultations. Their commendable co-operation had led to a series of modifications which had considerably improved the original draft, to such an extent that the present text reflected a basically realistic approach. Although some difficulties still remained both in the preamble and in the operative part, his delegation had also been willing to show a spirit of co-operation to the extent possible, without prejudice to its basic tenets.

21. However, all efforts to achieve a compromise encountered a solid barrier resulting from a question of principle. In paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly was requested to adopt the draft principles conceived by UNEP. Those principles dealt with a highly controversial subject, namely, co-operation among States in a field in which both research and actual experience were still extremely limited. The so-called principles had been devised with a view to guiding the action of States in the utilization of resources shared by two or more States, a concept which remained totally obscure and undefined at the international level. The issue was all the more serious as some of the principles constituted an encroachment upon sovereignty itself. His delegation could not accept principles, guidelines or recommendations that imposed limitations on the fundamental principle of the full and permanent exercise of sovereignty by States over natural resources in their respective territories. No restriction whatsoever, other than that of not causing damage to another State or States could be accepted. Any formulation - and the draft principles were clearly a case in point - which deviated from those fundamental rules violated the principle of sovereignty. Before it committed itself to the observance of such rules, a State must be in a position to properly identify exactly what they applied to.

/...

(Mr. Paranhos-Velloso, Brazil)

22. In the name of international co-operation, there was the danger that the General Assembly might embark on an exercise of extremely questionable validity, that of adopting a set of norms the application of which could not be ensured for the simple reason that their object had yet to be clearly identified. It had become evident, during the very constructive consultations, that there was hardly any prospect of bridging such a difference, since it involved a delicate question of principle. As expected, therefore, negotiations had failed to produce a compromise solution.

23. Nevertheless, since only one major difficulty still persisted in the text, and since the international community as a whole was not ready to adopt such principles at the General Assembly level, his delegation, envisaging the possibility of a consensus based on an agreement which must necessarily be less ambitious by avoiding premature commitments, wished formally to introduce an amendment to paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.24/Rev.2. At the beginning of the paragraph, the word "Adopts" would be replaced by "Takes note of". By taking note of the draft principles, the General Assembly would have taken adequate action; States would be free and even encouraged to observe the set of principles as long as they, individually, were in a position to do so. On the other hand, they would not be entering into a commitment which, apart from threatening the exercise of sovereignty, did not take into account the fact that the nature of problems linked to the conservation and utilization of natural resources differed from region to region. By taking note of the draft principles, the General Assembly would have acted positively and prudently. With a view to implementing General Assembly resolution 33/87, the Secretary-General had called upon all Member States to comment on the draft principles. Only 34 States - 17 of which were developing countries - had complied with the request, and several Governments had expressed their opposition or reservations regarding the draft principles.

24. Mr. KHAN (Pakistan), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.24/Rev.2, said that the Brazilian proposal had the effect of negating the very purpose of the draft resolution, which was to adopt the draft principles. That proposal would result in the General Assembly's merely noting the draft principles, which would represent no real commitment to them. The Assembly had already taken note of the draft principles in its resolution 33/87. The Brazilian proposal was devoid of substance and would be a step backwards. It altered the fundamental character of the draft resolution and was therefore unacceptable to the sponsors.

25. His delegation was of the view that the Brazilian motion constituted not an amendment, but a new proposal. The Committee should first decide on that procedural question.

26. Mr. PARANHOS-VELLOSO (Brazil) said that, in paragraph 2 of resolution 33/87, the General Assembly had taken note of the report of the Group of Experts, its approval, as adopted, by the Governing Council of UNEP and its transmission to the General Assembly with an invitation to adopt the draft principles. The General Assembly had therefore limited itself to noting an invitation to adopt the draft principles. In paragraph 3, the Assembly had invited the Secretary-General

/...

(Mr. Paranhos-Velloso, Brazil)

to take certain action with a view to enabling it to take a decision at its thirty-fourth session. In no way, however, had the resolution prejudged the nature of the decision to be taken. The fact that only 34 States had responded to the request to comment on the draft principles suggested that there was no widespread disposition to go so far as to adopt them.

27. According to rule 130 of the rules of procedure, a motion was considered an amendment to a proposal if it merely added to, deleted from or revised part of the proposal. By that definition, the Brazilian motion was an amendment. It was a valid alternative to the existing text, and was not in direct opposition to it. By taking note of the draft principles, the General Assembly would be taking a decision consistent with the terms of paragraph 3 of resolution 33/87. That was the only reasonable course of action at the current session.

28. Mr. RODRÍGUEZ (Venezuela) supported the representative of Brazil's comments and said he agreed that the Brazilian motion was an amendment.

29. Mr. TABIBI (Afghanistan) said that under rule 130 of the rules of procedure Brazil had made an amendment, not a new proposal. Paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.24/Rev.2, as it stood, would be prejudicial to the work being done at the international level on the codification of legal principles in respect of shared natural resources. Adoption by the General Assembly of the draft principles before shared natural resources had been defined would be harmful. In the absence of such a definition, the draft principles lacked any solid foundation. It was doubtful whether the Governing Council of UNEP, or the General Assembly for that matter, was in a position to adopt legal principles of that nature. It was inappropriate to elaborate principles on the basis of the views of only a few Member States. For all those reasons, his delegation supported the Brazilian amendment.

30. Mr. TEIXEIRA DA MOTTA (Portugal) said he agreed with the representative of Pakistan that the Brazilian motion was a new proposal, not an amendment. His delegation preferred the word "Adopts" because "Takes note of" might have negative connotations with regard to the draft principles. The Secretary-General had suggested in document A/34/557 that the General Assembly should adopt the draft principles, because that would be in the best interest of the international community. The Pakistan motion that the wording proposed by the representative of Brazil should be treated as a new proposal, and not an amendment, should be put to the vote.

31. Mr. ADEKUOYE (Nigeria) said that he supported the wording proposed by the representative of Brazil, which was an amendment and not a new proposal. The General Assembly should merely take note of the draft principles, thus allowing more time for the views of an appreciable number of States to be made known.

32. Mr. HAIDAR (India) said that his delegation strongly supported the Brazilian amendment. The draft principles should be no more than recommendations, if the sovereignty of States over their natural resources was not to be impaired. The Intergovernmental Working Group of Experts had not defined shared natural resources. In the absence of an accepted definition, it would be premature for the General

/...

\

(Mr. Haidar, India)

Assembly to adopt the draft principles. His delegation could not accept the argument that by adopting the draft principles the General Assembly would be facilitating such a definition. The Brazilian amendment would make the wording of paragraphs 1 and 2 of the draft resolution more uniform. It would not negate the purpose of the draft resolution, and India would vote against the motion to treat it as a new proposal.

33. Mr. KANTE (Guinea) said that his delegation fully supported the representative of Brazil.

34. Mr. LAZAREVIĆ (Yugoslavia) said that, although his delegation preferred the present wording of the draft resolution, the sponsors and the representative of Brazil might consider using the word "Endorses" or "Recommends" instead of "Adopts" or "Takes note of".

35. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the representative of Pakistan's motion that the wording proposed by the representative of Brazil should be considered to constitute a new proposal, and not an amendment.

36. Mr. WORKU (Ethiopia) suggested that all votes concerning draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.24/Rev.2 should be recorded.

37. A recorded vote was taken on the Pakistan motion.

In favour: Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Botswana, Canada, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iraq, Israel, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Mauritania, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Portugal, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Swaziland, Sweden, Tunisia, United States of America, Upper Volta, Yugoslavia.

Against: Afghanistan, Algeria, Australia, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, France, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, Iceland, India, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nigeria, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zaire.

Abstaining: Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Burundi, Chile, China, Democratic Yemen, Gabon, Guyana, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Malawi, Mexico, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Thailand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Yemen.

/...



38. The Pakistan motion was rejected by 52 votes to 34, with 28 abstentions.

39. Mr. KHAN (Pakistan) said that, the Committee having decided the procedural issue, his delegation, in a spirit of compromise and in view of the suggestion made by the representative of Yugoslavia, proposed the following amendment to the Brazilian proposal: add after the words "Takes note" the words "with appreciation and endorses". He requested the Chairman to put his proposal to the vote in accordance with rule 130 of the rules of procedure.

40. Mr. PARANHOS-VELLOSO (Brazil) said that under rule 130 his proposal should be put to the vote first.

41. Mr. LAZAREVIĆ (Yugoslavia) reiterated his suggestion that the word "Recommends" should be used instead of "Adopt" or "Takes note of".

42. Mr. TEIXEIRA DA MOTTA (Portugal) said that his delegation could accept that suggestion. If the Committee decided that a proposal which changed the wording of a text was an amendment, logic required that a subamendment should be regarded in the same light. He proposed that interested delegations should hold consultations to see whether they could agree on the word "Recommends".

43. The CHAIRMAN said that, under the rules of procedure, the Brazilian proposal should be put to the vote first.

44. A recorded vote was taken on the Brazilian amendment to paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.24/Rev.2.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Australia, Austria, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, France, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nigeria, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zaire.

Against: Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Botswana, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Portugal, Sweden, United States of America, Upper Volta.

Abstaining: Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Chile, Cuba, Guyana, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Mauritania, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Thailand, Tunisia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay.

/...

45. The amendment was adopted by 59 votes to 25, with 27 abstentions.

46. Mr. KHAN (Pakistan) said that his delegation was unable to accept the Brazilian proposal. He therefore proposed that paragraph 2 should be deleted and that the draft resolution as a whole should be adopted by consensus.

47. Mr. PARANHOS-VELLOSO (Brazil) said that the Committee had already adopted his proposal, which related to only one word in paragraph 2; he therefore wondered whether the proposal by the representative of Pakistan was in order. If paragraph 2 was deleted, paragraph 3 would acquire a special status which was not intended by the sponsors.

48. Mr. KHAN (Pakistan) said it was clear that, under rule 130 of the rules of procedure, his proposal for the deletion of paragraph 2 should be put to the vote.

49. Mr. LAZAREVIĆ (Yugoslavia) said that an amendment to the paragraph had already been adopted and logic dictated that the paragraph, as amended, should be put to the vote.

50. A recorded vote was taken on paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.24/Rev.2, as amended.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Australia, Austria, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, France, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Japan, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nigeria, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Canada, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, Gabon, Greece, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Portugal, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Upper Volta.

Abstaining: Barbados, Belgium, Chile, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guyana, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Mauritania, Mexico, Philippines, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Thailand, Tunisia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay.

51. Paragraph 2, as amended, was adopted by 62 votes to 27, with 23 abstentions.

/...

52. Mr. KHAN (Pakistan) said that the draft resolution as amended was not acceptable to the sponsors, and they therefore wished to withdraw it.

53. The CHAIRMAN said that, under rule 122 of the rules of procedure, a motion might be withdrawn by its proposer at any time before voting on it had commenced, provided that the motion had not been amended. The draft resolution had been amended and must therefore be voted on.

54. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.24/Rev.2 as a whole, as amended.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Belgium, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Argentina, Bangladesh, Barbados, Burma, Canada, Chile, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, Gabon, Greece, Iraq, Netherlands, New Zealand, Pakistan, Philippines, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Sweden, Tunisia, Upper Volta, Uruguay.

55. Draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.24/Rev.2 as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 94 votes to none, with 23 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 9.05 p.m.