



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 58th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. MURGESCU (Romania)

CONTENTS

- AGENDA ITEM 60: UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME (continued)
AGENDA ITEM 55: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued)
AGENDA ITEM 56: UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT (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.58
19 December 1979

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 9.40 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 60: UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME (continued)

1. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Assistant Secretary-General for Secretariat Services for Economic and Social Matters) said that the participants in the high-level meeting within the framework of the Economic Commission for Europe on the protection of the environment, held in Geneva in November 1979, had formally requested that the General Assembly should be informed of the conclusions of the meeting. The meeting had adopted by acclamation the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution, the resolution on long-range transboundary air pollution and the Declaration of Low- and Non-Waste Technology and Re-utilization and Recycling of Wastes. There had been a general debate on the environmental situation in the ECE region, in particular on long-range transboundary air pollution, low- and non-waste technology and water pollution, including transboundary water pollution. The meeting had requested the Executive Secretary of ECE to inform the forthcoming Madrid meeting of the participating States of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe of the results of the high-level meeting, including its report and the texts of the documents adopted.

2. After its adoption, the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution had been signed by 33 States. The meeting had been attended by representatives of 33 members of ECE, of whom 21 had been of ministerial rank. Representatives of the Holy See, Liechtenstein and San Marino had participated under article 8 of the ECE terms of reference, and a representative of Argentina under article 11. The relevant documents and the report of the meeting had been processed by the secretariat of the Economic Commission for Europe.

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

3. Miss GARCIA-DONOSO (Ecuador), explaining her delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.24/Rev.2, as amended, at the preceding meeting, said that her delegation wished to reiterate the reservations it had expressed on various occasions on the subject of natural resources shared by two or more States, and in particular on three of the draft principles for the guidance of States in the conservation and harmonious utilization of shared natural resources.

4. The Government of Ecuador considered that States should establish rules to ensure that the activities of one country did not cause damage to the environment of other countries. Those rules of co-operation should be formulated in such a way that they did not affect the principle of the sovereign right of States freely to dispose of their natural resources in accordance with their domestic legislation and policies. Her Government therefore had reservations about principle 6, because a general obligation to give advance notification could lead to harmful delays in projects for the development and utilization of the resources of a State, and might even affect that State's sovereign right freely to dispose of its natural resources.

/...

(Miss García Donoso, Ecuador)

5. Similarly, her Government could not accept principle 7 because of its general character. That principle not only covered exchange of information, notification and consultations but also, by introducing the notion of avoiding unreasonable delays, implied the opposite notion of reasonable delays, which could lead to differences of opinion regarding the delaying effect on essential development processes.
6. In the light of those reservations, principle 11 also gave rise to difficulties because of its legal character, particularly since there was as yet no definition of "shared natural resources".
7. Her Government wished to reiterate its support for international co-operation for the preservation of the environment as a common responsibility to bequeath to future generations the best possible legacy in terms both of the environment and of natural resources, as essential elements for their survival.
8. Mr. BLANCO (Venezuela) said that his delegation had considered it premature to adopt at the current session the draft principles on shared resources, even though it approved of several of them, especially where water resources were concerned. There must first be a full definition of shared resources, and additional information must be obtained about the views of the international community before such principles could be adopted. His delegation had voted accordingly.
9. Mr. FREYRE (Peru) said that his delegation had supported the draft resolution because of the Brazilian amendment to paragraph 2. It had reservations about one of the principles recommended by the Intergovernmental Working Group of Experts, but considered that the principles could be adopted as guidelines. They could not be binding on Governments, which had the sovereign right to exploit their own natural resources in accordance with domestic laws and policies. In addition, the views of more Governments must be obtained, and there must be an agreed definition of shared resources. Thus, the adoption of the draft resolution by the Second Committee was to be understood only as a recommendation of the principles as guidelines not involving any kind of obligation for States.
10. Mr. NISALF (Iraq) said it was important to adopt principles on shared resources, because the utilization of such resources must be organized on the basis of justice for all concerned. His delegation had abstained from voting on the draft resolution as a whole because it believed that there was no point in adopting such a resolution unless it fully endorsed the principles, and it hoped that that would be possible at the thirty-fifth session.
11. Mr. GADEL HAK (Egypt) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution as amended. It would be premature for the General Assembly to adopt the principles at the current session, firstly, because more views from Member States were needed, the Secretary-General having received comments from only 34 Governments, and, secondly, because of the need to ensure that the principles would not violate any existing agreements between States or restrict their freedom to seek bilateral or collective solutions in the future.

/...

12. Mr. HERNÁNDEZ (Colombia) said that his delegation had been able to support the draft resolution, once paragraph 2 had been amended. Colombia had always maintained the principle of the sovereignty of a State over the resources in its territory. As long as the expression "shared natural resources" remained undefined, Colombia understood it to mean resources sovereignty over which was shared between two or more States, and the use of that expression therefore excluded any encroachment on the sovereignty of the States concerned or over resources in their territories. That sovereignty covered all uses of resources, without prejudice to any agreements that might be concluded, on the basis of good-neighbourly policies or the rules of international law, between neighbouring States in the light of their particular circumstances.
13. Colombia was aware that some of the draft principles already had legal acceptance, but it regarded others, particularly principles 6 and 7, as unacceptable, since they limited the sovereignty of States and constituted interference in their internal affairs.
14. Mr. LASARTE (Uruguay) said that his delegation's abstention from voting on the draft resolution should not be taken to imply that it did not support the draft principles. Uruguay would support all efforts of the United Nations Environment Programme to protect the environment. Unfortunately there were still difficulties in promoting co-operation in that field, because of the divergent political and economic interests of States and because the framework of traditional law seemed to provide the best basis for dealing with the most urgent ecological problems in the short term. The formulation of principles concerning the environment in general and shared natural resources in particular might lead to the drafting of declarations lacking the force of law, or recommendations of limited value, unless there was strong support for them in a spirit of real solidarity and based on a broad consensus. Principles of conduct were only acceptable when the responsibility was shared as much as the resources themselves; otherwise, good intentions would drown in a sea of individual interests. That accounted for his delegation's abstention despite its support for the idea of guiding principles.
15. Mr. KHAN (Pakistan) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on paragraph 2 as amended and on the draft resolution as a whole because it believed that paragraph 2 had been made too weak. The Committee should have taken more positive action and adopted the draft principles. The principles themselves were acceptable and the draft resolution contained many positive elements, particularly the request to all States to use the principles as guidelines in bilateral and multilateral conventions. Accordingly, his delegation supported all other aspects of the draft resolution and would continue to work for the protection of the environment with UNEP and all other bodies concerned.
16. Mr. NELLI (Italy) said that he wished to restate two fundamental assumptions which had made it possible for his delegation to vote for the draft resolution, as amended. First, he emphasized the importance Italy attached to the voluntary nature of the principles for co-operation in the field of the environment with respect to shared natural resources, which were to be used by Governments as mere recommendations or guidelines. Secondly, the problem of defining shared natural resources remained unsolved, and work on a definition must proceed.

17. Mr. ZIMMERMANN (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation maintained its reservations regarding the first preambular paragraph of the draft resolution.

18. Mr. TEIXEIRA DA MOTTA (Portugal) said that his delegation's position on the draft resolution was based on two premises. The first was that the solution of the problems relating to shared natural resources should be found through bilateral agreements between the States concerned in a spirit of good faith and good-neighbourliness. Secondly, the establishment of a more just and safe world order required the progressive standardization and systematization of the practices and behaviour of States in the international sphere, to ensure the progress of the rule of law, justice, equity, and respect for the rights of all States. In the modern world, peaceful coexistence, economic co-operation and sharing were becoming inevitable.

19. Portugal's position followed from those two assumptions. It had been able to support the draft resolution as amended, because it embodied principles that were mere recommendations to States for use in concluding bilateral agreements dealing with the problem of shared resources, and it welcomed the reference to such agreements in the seventh preambular paragraph. Nevertheless, in the context of the codification of State practice, or international customary law, which might eventually lead to binding international conventions, the work done by the Intergovernmental Working Group of Experts was a valid contribution to the achievement of the aims desired by all.

20. Portugal had hoped that the General Assembly would be able to adopt the principles, and had supported wording to that effect, not because that would involve any binding obligations but because all resolutions of the General Assembly were only recommendations, and the draft resolution itself clearly stated that the principles were of the nature of recommendations. The wording of paragraph 2 as amended might be interpreted as a less positive appreciation of the value of the principles. As Portugal had not been a sponsor of the draft resolution, it would have no difficulty in accepting the Yugoslav proposal that the General Assembly should recommend the principles rather than adopting them. His delegation was satisfied with the resolution as it now stood and felt that paragraph 3, requesting all States to use the principles as guidelines, had achieved in practical terms the effect that Portugal had desired.

21. Mr. PONCET (France) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution. However, in connexion with the first preambular paragraph, he wished to reaffirm France's view that the authority of States over their natural resources could not be "full". France had entered reservations on that point when General Assembly resolutions 3201 (S-VI) and 3202 (S-VI) had been adopted, and they remained valid. As to the reference in the same paragraph to the Stockholm Declaration, France understood that as a reference to principles 21 and 22 in their agreed wording.

22. With respect to operative paragraph 2, it was the understanding of his delegation that the draft principles of which the General Assembly was taking note

(Mr. Poncet, France)

included the explanatory note contained in the report of the Intergovernmental Working Group, as indicated in the fourth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution.

23. Mr. GORITZA (Romania) said that his delegation wished to reaffirm its Government's position of principle as stated in the Governing Council of UNEP, in its comments submitted to the Secretary-General pursuant to General Assembly resolution 33/87 and at the thirty-third session of the Assembly. Romania considered that the principles put forward by the Intergovernmental Working Group of Experts were only recommendations which could not establish any legal obligations. Such obligations could derive only from bilateral or multilateral agreements. The debate had shown that problems of international co-operation in respect of shared natural resources could not be resolved except on the basis of friendly and good-neighbourly relations between the States concerned.

24. Mr. KANTE (Guinea) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution as amended, in which the General Assembly took note of principles that were to serve as guidelines. However, he wished to point out that no definition had been produced of shared resources as opposed to resources that were not shared. His delegation had some difficulty in accepting all of the principles, and it was not entirely clear to it what was meant by the term "harmonious utilization of natural resources shared by two or more States".

Draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.17

25. Mr. HAIDAR (India), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, said that one revision had been made in draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.17 on the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification. Paragraph 7 would now read: "Requests the Secretary-General, in consultation with the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme, to submit ...".

26. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation would like formally to submit an amendment that had already been agreed to by the sponsors of the draft resolution and by a number of other delegations. The amendment referred back to decision 7/13 of the Governing Council of UNEP, which noted that the special account to finance the implementation of the Plan of Action was of a voluntary nature. His delegation therefore proposed that the words "and bearing in mind the voluntary nature of this account" should be added at the end of paragraph 1 of the draft resolution.

27. The amendment was adopted.

28. Draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.17, as orally revised and amended, was adopted, by 100 votes to none, with 21 abstentions.

29. Mr. KOLEV (Bulgaria), speaking on behalf of the delegations of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, said that those delegations generally

/...

(Mr. Kolev, Bulgaria)

supported the Plan of Action and had voted for the draft resolution. However, they would like to stress the voluntary nature of the proposed funding. The group of high-level specialists in international financing referred to in paragraph 7 should be invited to concentrate on finding funds from additional voluntary or extrabudgetary sources.

30. Mr. BASSIN (Finland), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries, said that those countries had abstained from voting on the draft resolution because of its references to the special account for the financing of the Plan of Action. That was in keeping with the position of principle they had maintained, ever since the United Nations Conference on Desertification, in opposition to the proliferation of special-purpose funds in the United Nations system. With regard to operative paragraph 7, the Nordic countries did not consider that making "a complete inventory of relevant ideas and proposals" fell within the sphere of competence of UNEP and were not convinced of the utility of a study of the feasibility of the creation of a public international corporation to attract investments.

31. Mr. DAVENPORT (Ireland), speaking on behalf of the States members of the European Economic Community, said that, despite their positive attitude to the task of combating desertification, the EEC countries had been forced to abstain from voting because of the numerous references in the draft resolution to the special account. The position of the Nine on the subject was well known; they had always had serious doubts on the principle of the special account because, in their view, it was not the best way of attracting funds to combat desertification. Such funds should be obtained through existing bilateral and multilateral channels.

32. Ms. VARRATI (United States of America) said that, although the United States fully supported the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification, its opposition to the special account had been placed on record at the Conference on Desertification and in the General Assembly. Her delegation had abstained from voting on the draft resolution because it considered that a special account would duplicate existing facilities, increase the task of co-ordination within the United Nations system and result in increased expenditure for administrative purposes at the expense of field activities. The United States would therefore continue to channel its contributions in support of the Plan of Action through existing international and bilateral arrangements.

33. The study requested in paragraph 7 appeared to be an extension of the study on additional methods and means to finance the combating of desertification, which had been circulated to Governments for comment earlier in the year. The United States considered still another study on international financing before a proper evaluation of the findings and recommendations of the previous one to be imprudent.

34. Mr. XIFRA (Spain) said that his delegation had abstained because of Spain's traditional opposition to the proliferation of special funds.

/...

35. Mr. HANKEY (Canada) said that Canada had abstained on the draft resolution because it felt that a special account was not the most effective tool for the purpose. The Plan of Action came under the heading of a regional development need and should be funded on a regional basis, for example through UNDP. Canada was deeply sympathetic to the problems resulting from desertification and supported activities to combat it through bilateral and multilateral channels. In 1979, his Government had budgeted \$127 million to assist in combating desertification.

Draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.77

36. Mr. HAIDAR (India), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, read out a number of revisions to draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.77. A new sixth preambular paragraph had been added, worded as follows:

"Mindful of possible adverse effects on the marine environment as a result of off-shore mining and drilling".

The end of the final preambular paragraph would now read: "development objectives of all countries, in particular of the developing countries". Lastly, the words "as well as the balance between global and regional programmes as identified in the relevant decision of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme" had been added at the end of operative paragraph 5.

37. Mr. ALLEN (United States of America) said that, following further consultations, his delegation was withdrawing its amendments (A/C.2/34/L.95). It would, however, pursue its arguments at a later date and in an appropriate forum.

38. The CHAIRMAN said it had been suggested that another new preambular paragraph should be inserted, after the fourth paragraph of the existing text, reading as follows:

"Noting the results of the all-European High-Level Meeting on co-operation in the field of the protection of the environment held under Economic Commission for Europe auspices from 13 to 15 November 1979 in Geneva".

39. Mr. HAIDAR (India) accepted that amendment on behalf of the sponsors.

40. Draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.77, as orally revised and amended, was adopted without a vote.

41. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had not opposed the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.77, on the understanding that any increase in the funding of projects for developing countries would come from the voluntary fund of UNEP and would not entail any reduction in the role of UNEP in global, interregional or regional programmes in which all or most countries had an interest.

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

Draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.111

42. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.111, entitled "Proposals for the new international development strategy".

43. At the request of the representative of India, a recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Japan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden.

44. Draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.111 was adopted by 100 votes to 5, with 16 abstentions.

45. Mr. PONCET (France), speaking in explanation of vote, said that he regretted having had to vote against draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.111, but there had been no opportunity to engage in informal consultations. Moreover, the outcome of in-depth discussions in the Preparatory Committee for the New International Development Strategy should not be prejudged.

46. Mr. SCHWEISGUT (Austria) said his delegation had abstained from voting because it felt that the proposal contained in the draft resolution should have been dealt with in the over-all context of the transfer of resources and should

(Mr. Schweisgut, Austria)

have taken into account other proposals, such as those referred to in the report of the Secretary-General on increased transfer of resources (A/34/493) and those contained in General Assembly resolution 33/136 on the acceleration of the transfer of real resources to developing countries, which had invited the Secretary-General to undertake consultations with a view to appraising the concept of a substantially increased transfer of resources. As those consultations had not yet been concluded, his delegation believed that the proposal contained in draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.111 should be the subject of further study as part of the concept of a massive transfer of resources to developing countries.

47. 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, while those delegations had voted for the draft resolution, they wished to state that their position with regard to the transfer of real resources to developing countries remained unchanged.

48. Mr. ORON (Israel) said his delegation had been forced to abstain from voting on the draft resolution because of some controversial and unacceptable elements in the wording of the preamble, although it had no reservations of substance regarding the operative part.

49. Mr. AKTAN (Turkey) said his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.111 on the understanding that the Preparatory Committee for the New International Development Strategy, when considering the possibility of additional transfers of resources to developing countries during the coming decade, would treat the figure mentioned in paragraph 2 as a mere indication and not necessarily a target. Time was too short for the Preparatory Committee to work out mutually acceptable solutions to that complex problem, but his delegation agreed that substantially increased resources should be made available for development.

50. Mr. IVERSEN (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries, said that those countries had abstained on the draft resolution because of some hesitation over the contents of paragraph 2. They agreed with the idea of referring the matter for further discussion to the Preparatory Committee for the New International Development Strategy, but wished to state that acceptance of that procedure did not prejudice their views on the substance of the proposal.

51. Mr. ALLEN (United States of America) said that his delegation had been unable to accept the draft resolution, in the same way as it had been unable in the past to accept other commitments to such targets. The progress of the Preparatory Committee for the New International Development Strategy had not been smooth, and the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.111 virtually guaranteed that the future would be still less productive.

52. Mr. HAIDAR (India) said that the Group of 77 had been disappointed to find, in the course of the informal consultations, that prospects for consensus were very dim, owing to the evident reluctance of some delegations to enter into any meaningful exchange. The counterproposals which had been made had amounted to a

/...

(Mr. Haidar, India)

negation of the proposals advanced by the Group of 77. The Group regarded the draft resolution as procedural in nature, but as containing an extremely important idea, while not committing any delegation to anything more than considering the proposal along with other proposals for the new International Development Strategy. The sponsors had every intention, now that the draft resolution had been adopted, of making a positive effort to seek acceptance of the concept during the meetings of the Preparatory Committee.

53. Mr. GREET (Australia) said that his delegation's abstention had been on the understanding that the draft resolution was procedural in character. It implied no commitment and no prejudgement of the substance of the proposal, and had been intended to smooth discussion of the matter in the Preparatory Committee for the New International Development Strategy.

Draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.123

54. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.123 on special measures in favour of the least developed among the developing countries, submitted by the Vice-Chairman (Mr. Ahsan) to replace draft resolution A/34/L.16, which had been referred to the Committee by the plenary Assembly and which he understood the Group of 77 had agreed to withdraw in favour of the new text.

55. Draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.123 was adopted without a vote.

56. 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 the socialist States had repeatedly expressed their sympathy for and understanding of the problems of the least developed and most seriously affected countries. The grave difficulties faced by those countries were a result of exploitation by the imperialists and their monopolies. The socialist countries would continue to provide support, within their means, to the development of the national economies of the least developed and most seriously affected countries. It was for that reason that they had not objected to the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.123, even though they had some problems with it. They wished to reaffirm the position taken in the joint statements made on their behalf after UNCTAD resolution 122 (V) and Trade and Development Board resolution 165 (S-IX) had been adopted. The socialist countries could not agree that the same criteria should be applied to them as were applied to the developed capitalist countries and could not assume any financial commitments resulting from the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.123.

57. Miss EVANS (United Kingdom) said that, although her delegation had joined in the consensus on the draft resolution, the reservations it had expressed at the fifth session of UNCTAD on the adoption of resolution 122 (V) still stood.

58. Mr. ALLEN (United States of America) said that his delegation had been pleased to join in the consensus on the draft resolution. Its adoption and the decision concerning the United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries

/...

(Mr. Allen, United States)

were two of the most important achievements of the General Assembly at its current session. The United States, which was providing bilateral and multilateral assistance to the least developed countries, noted that several operative paragraphs of the draft resolution were similar to those of UNCTAD resolution 122 (V); accordingly, as it had stated at Manila, it could not commit itself to the specific recommendations for assistance in the draft resolution. With regard to operative paragraph 7, his delegation reaffirmed its concern for the debt servicing problems of many poor countries and believed that new action was needed for the implementation of that paragraph.

Draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.124

59. Mr. HAIDAR (India), introducing draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.124, on behalf of the Group of 77, urged all delegations to view the draft resolution sympathetically, because it posed no real problems. It completed the series of proposals on restructuring, and both the preamble and the operative part were self-explanatory. The Group of 77 believed that the draft resolution could be adopted with a minimum of informal consultations.

60. Mr. ALLEN (United States of America) pointed out that the deadline for submission of draft resolutions, particularly those with financial implications, had already expired.

61. Mr. MAKEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that restructuring was a complex issue, and hasty decisions were not the best way of dealing with the problems involved. His delegation was prepared to discuss the draft resolution in informal consultations, but was very concerned that it should have been submitted at the last minute.

62. Mr. DAVENPORT (Ireland), speaking on behalf of the States members of the European Economic Community, said that the draft resolution had been submitted rather late and the EEC countries would have difficulty in accepting it.

Draft decision A/C.2/34/L.125

63. Mr. SAUNDERS (Jamaica) said that, following consultations between the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.103 on restructuring and other delegations, it had been decided to submit draft decision A/C.2/34/L.125 and withdraw the draft resolution from consideration at the current session. The sponsors felt that the new text provided a basis for consensus but suggested that a decision should be postponed to give delegations more time to study it.

64. Mr. MAKEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said it was true that the draft decision submitted by Argentina and Jamaica had been studied in detail in informal consultations; however, in view of the seriousness of the matter, his delegation agreed that a decision should be postponed so that the text could be studied further. As his delegation had stated during the informal consultations, it was not ready to consider the draft decision as it stood because it was convinced that there was a better way to solve the problem.

/...

AGENDA ITEM 56: UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.81

65. Mr. CHAIRMAN announced that Colombia had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.81.

66. Mr. KHAN (Pakistan) requested recorded votes on the fourth preambular paragraph, operative paragraph 1 and the draft resolution as a whole.

67. Mr. TABIBI (Afghanistan) said that the sponsors had made several changes in the draft resolution and a revised version would be issued the following day.

Draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.69

68. Mr. CHAIRMAN said he was informed that, on the basis of informal consultations, the Committee wished to refer draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.69 to the Fifth Committee for more detailed consideration.

69. Mr. JÖDAHL (Sweden) said it was his understanding that the Fifth Committee had already taken a decision on the UNCTAD budget.

70. Mr. ALLEN (United States of America) said that there was another matter which was related to UNCTAD, namely, the United Nations Conference on Restrictive Business Practices. That Conference, which had recently met in Geneva, had decided to hold a resumed session which would have financial implications, and his delegation believed that the General Assembly should take up the matter.

71. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Assistant Secretary-General for Secretariat Services for Economic and Social Matters) said that, while he was aware of the decision taken by the Conference, the Secretariat had not received any formal request for the Second Committee to take up the matter. As soon as such a request was received, it would be submitted to the Committee. In the meantime, he was not in a position to state whether there were any financial implications.

72. Mr. AYENI (Nigeria) said that, although the Chairman had not received the draft resolution for submission to the Committee, his understanding was that the Vice-Chairman had submitted the draft after holding informal consultations.

73. Mr. NABULSI (Jordan) expressed the view that the representative of UNCTAD could answer the question raised by the United States representative.

74. Mr. ADEBANJO (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development) said that the recent UNCTAD Conference on Restrictive Business Practices had been expected to report to the current session of the General Assembly. Various cables had been sent from the UNCTAD secretariat to the Secretariat at Headquarters with information on the outcome of the Conference and of a resolution which the Conference had adopted by consensus and in which the Secretary-General of UNCTAD was required to take the necessary measures for convening a resumed session of the Conference for a period of two weeks. Copies of those cables, of the

/...

(Mr. Adebajo, UNCTAD)

resolution of the Conference and of its financial implications had been promptly made available to OSSECS. A draft decision, he understood, had subsequently been considered during informal consultations of the Second Committee. He thought it strange that no one in OSSECS knew of this draft decision, which the delegations that had just spoken had seen and even approved. However, since the matter was not a controversial issue, he thought that the Committee would wish to take action in accordance with the decision of the Conference in Geneva, adopted with the consensus of all groups.

75. Mr. LAZAREVIC (Yugoslavia) suggested that the Chairman or one of the Vice-Chairmen could prepare the draft decision for submission to the Committee the following morning.

76. Mr. ALLEN (United States of America) said that he had raised the question because he had informed the Vice-Chairman in writing of his agreement with the draft resolution and had handed back his copy of that document.

77. Mr. FREYRE (Argentina) and Mr. NABULSI (Jordan) supported the suggestion made by the representative of Yugoslavia.

78. The CHAIRMAN said that he would ask the Secretariat, the representative of UNCTAD and the Vice-Chairman to prepare the text, which would be submitted the following morning.

79. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Assistant Secretary-General for Secretariat Services for Economic and Social Matters) emphasized that the text which had been considered during the informal consultations had been neither submitted to nor channelled through the secretariat of the Committee. With regard to the question raised by the representative of Sweden, he had been informed that the budget of UNCTAD had already been considered and concluded by the Fifth Committee one week previously.

80. The CHAIRMAN suggest that draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.69 should be transmitted to the Fifth Committee.

81. It was so decided.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

82. Mr. HAIDAR (India) said that the draft resolution on science and technology had been the subject of intensive consultations within the Group of 77 and a consensus was within reach. He therefore requested that more time should be allowed.

83. The CHAIRMAN said that he would ask the Secretary of the Committee to contact the President of the General Assembly and arrange for a meeting the following morning at which he (the Chairman) and the Chairman of the Group of 77 could discuss the situation with the President of the Assembly. He hoped that the Committee would be able to take a decision on science and technology the following evening.

The meeting rose at midnight