

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records*



SECOND COMMITTEE

47th meeting

held on

Wednesday, 8 December 1982

at 6.30 p.m.

New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 47th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. FAFOWORA (Nigeria)

CONTENTS

- AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 71: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 72: OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 73: TRAINING AND RESEARCH (continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 74: SPECIAL ECONOMIC AND DISASTER RELIEF ASSISTANCE (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.2/37/SR.47
19 December 1982
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

The meeting was called to order at 7.20 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)
(A/C.2/37/L.19, L.20, L.21, L.31, L.65/Rev.1 and L.99)

Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.19 entitled "Financing of the Multinational Programming and Operational Centres of the Economic Commission for Africa on an established basis"

1. Mr. CHOWDHURY (Bangladesh), speaking on behalf of the Member States of the Group of 77, said that, despite the spirit of compromise and understanding manifested by those States, it had not been possible to reach a consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.19. The Group of 77 deeply regretted that state of affairs and believed that a consensus should also have been achieved on draft resolutions A/C.2/37/L.41, L.26 and L.77.
2. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) said that, at the time of their establishment, it had been understood that the multinational programming and operational centres (MULPOCs) of the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) would be financed solely by voluntary contributions. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.19 now wanted some of the resources needed for the financing of those centres to be provided from the regular budget of the United Nations under the pretext that some voluntary contributions, such as those of UNDP, were declining. His delegation could not agree that funds from the regular budget should be used to finance bodies which were originally to have been financed from extrabudgetary resources. If that course were continued, the United Nations budget would soon rise to such proportions that certain countries might reconsider their support to the United Nations and thus endanger its viability.
3. His delegation also noted that draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.19 reproduced word for word a draft resolution which had already been submitted in the previous month despite the reservations it had aroused at the time and the numerous compromise formulae that had been proposed; thus there was some doubt as to whether the sponsors really wished to negotiate in good faith on a compromise text. His delegation could only deplore that state of affairs.
4. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.19.
5. At the request of the representative of the United States, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.19.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia,

/...

Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Japan, Luxembourg, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Australia, Austria, Canada, Denmark, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden.

6. Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.19 was adopted by 98 votes to 14, with 16 abstentions.

7. Mr. RINGNALDA (Netherlands) said that his delegation had intended to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.19 but although it had pressed the yellow button, its vote had not been recorded. He also noted that if there had been a separate vote on paragraph 6 of the draft resolution, his delegation would have voted against it.

8. Mr. TANIGUCHI (Japan) said that it was regrettable that it had been necessary to take a vote on draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.19. His delegation believed that draft resolutions of that nature, with substantial financial and programme implications, should always be adopted by consensus.

9. Miss FORD (Canada) said that she also regretted that it had not been possible to adopt draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.19 by consensus. Her delegation was prepared to agree that modest resources should be provided from the regular budget for the MULPOCs but only during a trial period not exceeding one year; it believed that voluntary contributions should be sought as far as possible.

10. Mr. DUVERNEY (France) said that his delegation had unfortunately had to vote against draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.19, not because it questioned the value of the MULPOCs, which played a very important role by extending the activities of ECA at the subregional level, but because it could not agree that additional resources from the regular budget should be allocated to the MULPOCs over and above the resources provided to ECA. Since the MULPOCs were concerned with technical projects they should be financed through voluntary contributions. At all events, his delegation could only accept that procedure after detailed consideration and after the submission of the programme implications which it had requested, along with other delegations, during informal consultations.

Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.20 entitled "Special measures for the social and economic development of Africa in the 1980s"

11. The CHAIRMAN announced that, on the basis of informal consultations, it had been agreed to make a number of changes in the draft resolution: in the sixth preambular paragraph, the word "Reaffirming" should be replaced by the words "Fully aware"; in operative paragraph 3, the word "concrete" should be deleted; in operative paragraph 4, the word "rising" should be replaced by the word "sustained". If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.20, as orally amended.

12. Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.20, as orally amended, was adopted.

13. Mr. IVERSEN (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the 10 member States of the European Economic Community, said that those countries had joined the consensus on the basis of the favourable attitude they had always taken towards all measures aimed at promoting the economic development of Africa, but it should not be concluded that they were prepared to make contributions to the Trust Fund mentioned in paragraph 4 of the resolution. The member countries of the European Economic Community opposed the proliferation of funds and believed that assistance should be provided through existing institutions.

Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.21 entitled "Transport and Communications Decade in Africa"

14. The CHAIRMAN said that, following informal consultations, the sponsors of the draft resolution had agreed to revise operative paragraph 11 by inserting, after the words "other resources" in the third line, the words "using, inter alia, extrabudgetary funds and existing resources to the maximum extent possible". With regard to the statement on the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution, circulated in document A/C.2/37/L.31, he drew attention to the following amendment to the last sentence of paragraph 3, which remained valid even though the draft resolution had been revised:

"A special report (A/C.5/37/13) requesting an appropriation in the amount of \$542,400 for that purpose was submitted to the Fifth Committee. On the basis of that report and of the related report of ACABQ (A/37/7/Add.7), the Fifth Committee at its 30th meeting on 10 November 1982, recommended that an additional appropriation of \$483,100 under section 13 (ECA) of the programme budget for 1982-1983."

15. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) said that his delegation wished to propose an amendment to operative paragraph 11 of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.21. He proposed that the words "inter alia" and the expression "to the maximum extent possible" should be deleted.

16. Mr. CHOWDHURY (Bangladesh) said that the members of the Group of 77 had made great efforts to produce the text which was currently before the Committee. Although they were quite prepared to accept the amendment proposed by the Chairman, they were not prepared to agree to that proposed by the representative of the United States.

17. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the amendment proposed by the representative of the United States.

18. The amendment proposed by the representative of the United States was rejected by 110 votes to 8, with 11 abstentions.

19. Mr. EBARE (Gabon) said that he had mistakenly voted in favour of the amendment; in fact, he had meant to vote against it.

20. At the request of the representative of the United States, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.21 as a whole, as orally amended.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

21. Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.21 as orally amended, was adopted by 130 votes to 1.

22. Mr. KITIKITI (Zimbabwe) said that his delegation was deeply concerned at the uncompromising spirit demonstrated by certain delegations during the negotiations on draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.21. The Decade had been launched on the basis of a universal consensus, demonstrating that the international community was prepared to join with Africa to help it in its development efforts. His delegation was therefore greatly disturbed at the attitude of certain delegations which seemed to

/...

(Mr. Kitikiti, Zimbabwe)

be trying to question the very bases of that very important political and economic alliance which was the cornerstone of multilateral economic co-operation. It was the first time that a draft resolution concerning the Decade had been put to the vote notwithstanding the fact that international consensus had been reached in that area and notwithstanding the fact that all parties involved seemed to want to show the necessary political goodwill. In fact, the disagreement which had emerged that day related more to procedural issues than to the substance of the resolution. His delegation supported the ideals of multilateral economic co-operation and felt that members of the Committee must do everything within their powers to promote those ideals particularly at a time of world economic crisis. He was, however, encouraged to see that certain developed countries still believed in those ideals.

23. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) deplored the fact that the Second Committee had seen fit to approve a draft resolution which provided for financing the second phase of the Decade for Transport and Communications in Africa from the regular budget. His delegation wholeheartedly supported the aims of the Decade for there was absolutely no doubt that inadequate means of transport constituted one of the most serious problems in Africa. Moreover, his Government, through the bilateral assistance it was giving to a number of African States and through its voluntary contributions to multilateral institutions, was seeking to help Africa to overcome that handicap. However, there was another very important problem for the United Nations: the fact that it must not live beyond its means. The programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983 had already been approved and the United Nations must stick to it. Accordingly, the recommendation of the Fifth Committee for an additional appropriation of \$483,100 under the section of the budget relating to ECA for the biennium 1982-1983 was unacceptable to his delegation. That appropriation should have been planned and included in the programme budget at the appropriate time. Accordingly, his delegation had voted against the recommendation in the Fifth Committee and, although it fully agreed with the aims of the Decade, it had just voted against draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.21. He recalled that the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 1982/55, had recommended to the Secretary-General to finance ECA as far as possible from voluntary contributions. Judging from document A/C.2/37/L.31 and all the other statements concerning administrative and financial implications submitted to the Committee, it was clear that the Secretary-General did not seem to have done as much as he might have to find funds from extrabudgetary sources before taking the easy way out and getting them from the regular budget.

24. Mr. KABA (Guinea) pointed out that, had he been present at the time of the voting on draft resolutions A/C.2/37/L.19, L.20 and L.21, he would have voted in favour of them. He asked that his statement be reflected in the summary record.

Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.65/Rev.1 entitled "Protection against products harmful to health and the environment"

25. Mr. ter HORST (Venezuela), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the 23 sponsors, said that the revised text took into account all the comments made by other delegations during the informal consultations. He also pointed out that the sponsors had agreed to include in the last preambular paragraph the list of organizations of the United Nations system which dealt with the question of harmful

(Mr. ter Horst, Venezuela)

products. In addition, a new operative paragraph (paragraph 6) had been added according to which the General Assembly decided to keep under review the format of the consolidated list referred to in paragraph 4.

26. All delegations but one had been able to agree to the text during informal consultations thus demonstrating that the international community was conscious of the problem and that it was worth taking steps to solve the problem. The preparation and updating of the consolidated list referred to in operative paragraph 4 required modest resources and it was unfortunate that it had not been possible to reach agreement on that point owing to the rigid attitude displayed by one delegation. He hoped, nevertheless, that all the members of the Committee present, with the exception of that delegation, could approve the draft resolution contained in document A/C.2/37/L.65/Rev.1.

27. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the statement of the administrative and financial implications of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.65, issued under the symbol A/C.2/37/L.99, applied also to draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.65/Rev.1.

28. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) proposed an amendment to delete the words "to the maximum extent possible" from paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.65/Rev.1.

29. Mr. ter HORST (Venezuela) noted that the question raised by the representative of the United States had been the subject of lengthy discussions in the informal consultations, at which time the sponsors had indicated that they could not accept that deletion. It was impossible to accept the amendment proposed by the representative of the United States; if it was put to a vote, the sponsors would vote against it.

30. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the United States amendment to paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.65/Rev.1.

31. The amendment was rejected by 111 votes to 8, with 10 abstentions.

32. Mr. DIOP (Senegal), comparing the English and French texts of paragraph 4, observed that the phrase "to the maximum extent possible", which the representative of the United States proposed to delete from the English version, had not been translated in the French text, which contained only the words "dans les limites des ressources existantes".

33. The CHAIRMAN asked the representative of Senegal whether that omission would influence his delegation's vote.

34. Mr. DIOP (Senegal) replied that his country would vote in favour of the draft resolution, but in its English version.

35. Mr. FAURE (France) confirmed the statement made by the representative of Senegal. It was suprising that the United States amendment had, in a manner of speaking, been accepted and incorporated into the draft resolution beforehand.

/...

36. The CHAIRMAN suggested that draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.65/Rev.1 should be put to the vote, reminding the Committee that the United States had asked for a recorded vote.

37. At the request of the representative of the United States, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.65/Rev.1.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

38. Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.65/Rev.1 as a whole was adopted by 132 votes to 1.

39. Mr. BAKALOV (Bulgaria), speaking on behalf of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, said that those countries had supported draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.65/Rev.1. They had on many occasions stated their position with regard to the question of products that were harmful to health and the environment. The problem of distributing those products had not arisen spontaneously. It was the result of the selfishness of transnational corporations and the weakness of national monitoring bodies. It was very important that harmful products should be condemned; by doing so, the draft resolution might make a useful contribution to the efforts to establish a code of conduct for transnational corporations. The United Nations had acquired some experience in that area, and it ought to be possible to implement the provisions of the draft resolution from the regular budget of the Organization.

40. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) said he regretted that, despite all the efforts made in the course of the negotiations on the draft resolution, it had not been possible to reach a consensus. His delegation was perfectly aware of the seriousness of the problem and of the need for international co-operation to solve it. There could be no doubt that the United States wished to help to protect health and the environment, particularly in developing countries.

41. The draft resolution just adopted was a considerable improvement over the preceding ones. His delegation fully endorsed its underlying principles and approach, as also the opinion expressed in the seventh preambular paragraph that the primary responsibility for consumer protection rested with each State. It was for each country ultimately to decide which products it intended to import or ban. However, there were many countries in which the procedures for correctly identifying potentially hazardous products should be improved and appropriate measures with regard to their consumption or sale in home markets should be taken. His delegation therefore wholeheartedly supported the efforts to enable developing countries to take a more precise stand on the question.

42. It also thought that countries which had drawn up stricter regulations must inform the countries concerned of the regulatory measures they had adopted with regard to products judged by them to be potentially hazardous to health and the environment. That was what the United States was doing to a greater extent than any other Member State. In short, more than any other country, the United States had already taken measures in keeping with the goals of the draft resolution. Nevertheless, the wording of certain passages in the draft resolution continued to pose problems. The categorical and unfounded judgements pronounced in the first and third preambular paragraphs did not take into account specific situations or needs or the offsetting, in certain circumstances, of dangers by advantages. Some problems of definition and intent, as well as some ambiguities, remained despite the attempts to clarify the meaning of the terms "severely restricted" and "non-approved". It was to be hoped that at the implementation stage those terms would be interpreted reasonably and precisely; otherwise, the consolidated list which the Secretary-General was requested to prepare in paragraphs 4 and 5 would be so lengthy that countries would be unable to assimilate its data usefully. His delegation regretted that the text of paragraph 2, did not clearly specify, as the sponsors had affirmed that it would, that Governments would not be required to provide information about certain proprietary products. It also thought it rather unlikely that Governments would be able to meet one of the apparent requirements of the draft resolution, namely, the provision of information on non-approved products.

43. In any event, the financial implications of the draft resolution, which had been calculated by the Secretariat at \$138,600, constituted a particularly serious problem for his delegation, which had repeated throughout the session that it could not accept continued increases in the regular budget of the United Nations. That was why it had proposed its amendment to paragraph 4 and that was why, when its amendment had been rejected, it had been obliged to cast a negative vote.

44. Mr. ter HORST (Venezuela) said that, with regard to definitions and proposed measures, draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.65/Rev.1 was clear. Moreover, 132 countries took that view and he therefore hoped that the United States might soon join them.

45. The CHAIRMAN suggested that before concluding its consideration of agenda item 12, the Committee should consider the following draft decision with regard to Secretary-General's note on the World Communications Year:

"The General Assembly decides to take note of the note in which the Secretary-General transmitted to it the report of the Secretary-General of the International Telecommunication Union, prepared in accordance with General Assembly resolution 36/40 of 19 November 1981 (A/37/232) "

46. If he heard no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the proposed draft decision.

47. It was so decided.

48. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee had concluded its consideration of item 12.

AGENDA ITEM 71: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued)
(A/C.2/37/L.6, L.26/Rev.1, L.41, L.91, L.110, L.111, L.113, L.114, and L.117)

Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.91 entitled "Review and appraisal of the implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade"

49. The CHAIRMAN said that he took it that, following informal consultations, the sponsors of the draft had agreed to make the following changes: in the eighth preambular paragraph, the words "in particular" should be inserted after the words "international economic crisis"; and, in paragraph 8, the words "process of" should be deleted in the second line.

50. Mr. UY (Budget Division) said that the decisions taken during informal consultations on draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.91 entailed a change in the statement of financial implications (A/C.2/37/L.109), in particular in paragraph 3. As indicated by certain delegations during the consultations, the volume of pre-session and post-session documentation should be limited to 15 pages each. In that case, estimated conference-servicing costs for the organizational session would be \$37,000, taking into account documentation costs (\$1,700), interpretation services (\$6,400) and Office of General Services expenses (\$1,900) and could be charged to the resources allocated for the two meetings of the Second Committee which would be cancelled in favour of the organizational session.

51. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take a decision on the draft resolution, as orally amended.

52. Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.91, as orally amended, was adopted.

53. Mr. CHOWDHURY (Bangladesh) said that the Group of 77 considered that the action requested in paragraph 6 of the organs, organizations and bodies of the United Nations system was consistent with paragraph 175 of the International Development Strategy, in that the reports that they would present would cover not only the results achieved by applying the ideas presented in the Strategy for

(Mr. Chowdhury, Bangladesh)

formulating and implement their own programme of work and medium-term plans but also the experience they acquired in their respective sectors. He also hoped that they would indicate the problems which they encountered and the action that could be taken to overcome them.

54. Mr. BAKALOV (Bulgaria) reserved the right to express, at a later date, the position of a number of socialist countries on the draft resolution and several others.

55. Mr. IVERSEN (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the ten States members of the European Economic Community, welcomed the fact that the spokesman of the Group of 77 shared their view with regard to the connection between paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.91 and paragraph 175 of the Strategy.

Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.26/Rev.1 entitled "Charter of economic Rights and Duties of States"

56. Mr. CHOWDHURY (Bangladesh), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the members of the Group of 77, indicated that only the fourth preambular paragraph had been amended to take account of the concerns of a number of delegations. For that reason, the Group of 77 hoped that the draft could be adopted by consensus.

57. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) said that he did not think that that would be possible and requested a recorded vote.

58. At the request of the representative of the United States, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.26/Rev.1.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, 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, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Japan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

59. Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.26/Rev.1 was adopted by 127 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

60. Miss FORD (Canada) explained that her delegation supported the draft resolution because of its procedural nature. Canada's position on the substance remained unchanged.

61. Mr. ZIMMERMAN (United States of America) said that, while the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States contained a number of positive elements, it also contained aspects which the United States had always considered unacceptable. As his country had noted in 1974, the Charter was not balanced: rather than promoting an inflow of capital which was critical for development, it discouraged it. For that reason, the United States had voted against draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.26/Rev.1.

62. He also drew attention to the fact that, since few Governments so far had taken the trouble to provide information on the efforts they had made to implement the Charter, there was little reason for them to do so at present. He feared that the resolution just adopted would simply further weaken the moral authority of the United Nations.

63. Mr. IVERSEN (Denmark) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution, although it had, in 1974, voted against the Charter. The Charter did not take into account the fact that in order to further economic growth in the developing countries, it was necessary to avoid adopting measures which would, in the final analysis, infringe upon the development and stability of the industrialized countries and thereby the world economy as a whole. Progress in international relations could be achieved only through sustained and coherent efforts and a spirit of co-operation which took into account the interests of all concerned. The Charter contained a number of unacceptable articles and Denmark had, on other occasions, expressed reservations in that connection. His delegation had hoped that, after adoption of the Charter, it would be possible to reach agreement on a new and more balanced text. Its vote in favour of the draft resolution did not mean that its position had changed. He expressed the hope that, on the tenth anniversary of the adoption of the Charter, all groups would come together to negotiate a more comprehensive and satisfactory text for the benefit of all which would take into account not only the problems of the developing countries but also the seriousness of the world economic situation.

64. He hoped that it would be possible to initiate negotiations on a new text. It would therefore be unnecessarily costly to prepare a report on the implementation of the Charter in its present state, as requested in paragraph 2 of the draft resolution just adopted.

(Mr. Iversen, Denmark)

65. He recalled that Denmark had always maintained a positive position towards dealing with the problems of the developing countries, especially the least-developed among them, and in the context of the North-South dialogue. It went without saying that that position remained unchanged.

66. Mr. TANIGUCHI (Japan) announced that his country had abstained. Since he had already expressed its position at the time of the adoption of the Charter, there was no need for him to do so again.

67. Mr. FAURE (France) said that, although his country had not adopted the Charter in 1974, he had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.26/Rev.1 because he was prepared to participate in the review planned on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the Charter. France's position on the substance had not changed.

68. Mr. RINGNALDA (Netherlands) thanked the Group of 77 for the amendments it had made in the fourth preambular paragraph, thus making it possible for his country to vote in favour of the draft resolution which was important from the procedural point of view. The position of the Netherlands remained unchanged with regard to the substance of the Charter.

69. Mrs. DANIELSEN (Norway) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, but that the reservations expressed by her country at the time of the adoption of the Charter remained valid.

70. Mr. MIGNOT (Belgium) said that the vote of his delegation should in no way be interpreted as denoting a change of the position that it had taken at the time of the adoption of the Charter.

71. Mr. HILLEL (Israel) said that his delegation had abstained for the reasons it had set forth at the time of the adoption of the Charter.

72. Mr. BRUNI (Italy) said that his delegation had welcomed the spirit of compromise shown by the Group of 77. Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.26/Rev.1 was of procedural importance, and for that reason, Italy had supported it. That did not imply that its position had changed. In 1974, it had abstained in the vote.

73. Mr. SCHWEISGUT (Austria) said that his country had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.26/Rev.1 because of its procedural nature; however, Austria's substantive position had not changed.

74. Mr. BOYD (United Kingdom) said that his delegation's vote implied no change in the position it had taken regarding the content of the Charter.

75. Mr. GOTTELMANN (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote, even though on 12 December 1974 it had voted against resolution 3281 (XXIX). The Federal Republic of Germany could not support the basic tenor of the Charter nor some of its articles, in particular article 34. Nevertheless, it had abstained because it wished to demonstrate that it was prepared to participate in a realistic debate, both in the Economic and Social Council and at the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly. It was fully

/...

(Mr. Gottelmann, Federal
Republic of Germany)

prepared to enter into a constructive dialogue on the norms that should govern international economic relations, a dialogue that would make it possible to improve co-operation at the global level and study the progress made since 1974, especially with respect to developing countries.

Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.41 entitled "Specific action related to the particular needs and problems of land-locked developing countries"

76. The CHAIRMAN said it was his understanding that following informal consultations, it had been agreed to postpone until the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly the consideration of the draft resolution entitled "Specific action related to the particular needs and problems of land-locked developing countries" (A/C.2/37/L.41). He therefore submitted the following draft decision to the Committee: "The General Assembly decides to postpone until its thirty-eighth session the consideration of the text of the draft resolution entitled: 'Specific action related to the particular needs and problems of land-locked developing countries' (A/C.2/37/L.41), annexed hereto."

77. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.111 entitled "Action programme in favour of island developing countries"

78. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee now had before it draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.111, which had been submitted by its Vice-Chairman, Mr. Fareed (Pakistan) on the basis of informal consultations concerning draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.93. It was his understanding that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.111.

79. Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.111 was adopted.

80. Mr. ZIMMERMAN (United States of America) said that his delegation had not opposed the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.111 but believed that the category of island developing countries did not make much sense. The United States was not in favour of creation of new categories; the category of least-developed countries would amply suffice.

81. The CHAIRMAN said he took it that draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.93 had been withdrawn by the sponsors.

82. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.6 entitled "Food and agriculture"

83. The CHAIRMAN said it was his understanding that following informal consultations, it had been decided to refer consideration of the text of the draft resolution entitled "Food and agriculture", contained in the note by the Secretariat issued as document A/C.2/37/L.6 to the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session.

84. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.117 entitled "Situation of food and agriculture in Africa"

85. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take up draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.117, submitted by the Vice-Chairman of the Committee, Mr. Fareed, on the basis of informal consultations concerning draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.18, and drew attention to the financial implications of the draft, stated in document A/C.2/37/L.79. If there was no objection, he would take it that members of the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.117.

86. Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.117 was adopted.

87. The CHAIRMAN said that if there was no objection, he would take it that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.18 were withdrawing it.

88. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.113 entitled "International year for the mobilization of financial and technological resources for food and agriculture in Africa"

89. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.113 submitted by Mr. Fareed, Vice-Chairman of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations concerning draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.81.

90. Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.113 was adopted.

91. The CHAIRMAN said that if there was no objection, he would take it, in view of the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.113, that draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.81 had been withdrawn by its sponsors.

92. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.114 entitled "Economic Commission for Africa: regional programming, operations, restructuring and decentralization issues"

93. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.114 submitted by the Vice-Chairman of the Committee, Mr. Fareed, on the basis of informal consultations concerning draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.84, and drew attention to the financial implications, stated in document A/C.2/37/L.108. However, in the light of the text published in document A/C.2/37/L.114, paragraphs 1 (a) and 2 should be deleted. If there was no objection, he would take it that members of the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.114.

94. Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.114 was adopted.

95. The CHAIRMAN said that if there was no objection, he would take it, in view of the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.114, that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.84 were withdrawing it.

96. It was so decided.

97. Mr. BAKALOV (Bulgaria) speaking also on behalf of 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, in connection with draft resolutions A/C.2/37/L.117, A/C.2/37/L.19, A/C.2/37/L.20, A/C.2/37/L.21, A/C.2/37/L.113 and A/C.2/37/L.114, that the socialist countries were constantly strengthening their co-operation with African States in the commercial, economic, scientific and technological fields, were providing them with many forms of assistance in many sectors and were participating in the practical activities of ECA, which could help to solve the problems of African countries. The socialist countries therefore supported the provisions of the resolutions adopted at the meeting which served that end.

98. Nevertheless, the community of socialist countries continued to consider it necessary to restrain the unjustified growth of the United Nations regular budget and had joined the consensus on draft resolutions A/C.2/37/L.20, A/C.2/37/L.113, A/C.2/37/L.114 and A/C.2/37/L.117, it being understood that the measures envisaged therein would be carried out within the limits of existing resources.

99. For the implementation of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.113, it was important to respect all the criteria applicable to the organization of international years in accordance with Economic and Social Council resolution 1980/67. The delegations of the socialist countries had not opposed draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.21, since it confirmed Economic and Social Council resolution 1982/54, which had been adopted by consensus.

100. The socialist countries had spared no effort to reach a consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.19. However, they continued to oppose the idea that all activities of the United Nations system hitherto financed by voluntary contributions should now be financed by funds allocated from the regular budget. Moreover, it was regrettable that the Secretariat had not provided delegations with additional information on the financial implications of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.19 as it was required to do in accordance with General Assembly resolution 36/228. That might have made it possible to reach agreement on the question and would have freed the socialist countries from the obligation of either voting against that draft resolution or abstaining.

Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.110 entitled "International co-operation in the field of the environment"

101. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.110 submitted by Mr. Papadatos, Vice-Chairman of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations concerning draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.46.

102. Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.110 was adopted.

103. Mr. DMITRIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had voted for draft resolutions A/C.2/37/L.103 and A/C.2/37/L.110 because it appreciated the activities undertaken by UNEP and felt that its efforts had made it possible to strengthen international co-operation in the field of the environment.

104. However, without disputing the usefulness of the regional activities of UNEP, the Soviet Union believed that it should centre its efforts on problems of concern to the majority of States, such as the monitoring of the oceans.

(Mr. Dmitriev, USSR)

105. Analysis of the projects in which UNEP had participated in recent years showed that it concentrated its resources and efforts too much on projects aimed at solving regional problems to the detriment of global ones.

106. UNEP should devote more attention to developing an approach which would make it possible to solve the problem of the relationship between the environment and development; in particular, it should elaborate planning and management methods for the protection of the environment. With regard to the draft resolution on the implementation of the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification (A/C.2/37/L.86), he said that his delegation had noted the appreciable results obtained by UNEP in that field and was prepared to help it in solving the problem, particularly in instituting specific programmes of research in accordance with General Assembly resolution 35/73 and decision IX of the Governing Council of UNEP.

107. With regard to the note of the Secretary-General on co-operation in the field of the environment concerning natural resources shared by two or more States, his delegation felt that the principles of conduct recommended in General Assembly resolution 34/186 should be implemented not by elaborating special agreements but by making use of bilateral and multilateral instruments adopted on the initiative of the interested countries themselves.

108. Mr. GOTTELMANN (Federal Republic of Germany), referring to paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.110, said it was his delegation's understanding that the activities which would be undertaken by UNEP to implement Governing Council decision 10/26 concerning the plan for an exchange centre would be in keeping with its catalytic, co-ordinating and stimulating role and that the executing agencies concerned would be responsible for the operations undertaken.

109. It was also his delegation's understanding that UNEP would make arrangements with bilateral and multilateral organs in order to respond to requests from developing countries with regard to the planning, execution and evaluation of priority programmes and projects in the environmental field.

110. The Federal Republic of Germany would take part in the plan for exchange centres, principally in the context of pools of experts recruited on a short-term basis. Experts from developing countries would be chosen, in so far as possible, in co-operation with relevant regional offices and the resident co-ordinators of the United Nations system. Making experts available under that plan would complement the regular contributions already provided to the United Nations Environment Fund.

111. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America), referring to draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.110, said that his country, which had joined in the consensus, was a firm supporter of international co-operation in the environmental field and was ready to associate itself with efforts made at the global level to protect and improve the common heritage. However, it had important reservations concerning paragraph 8 of the draft resolution, in which the General Assembly would take note of decision 10/7 of the Governing Council of UNEP on the impact of apartheid on the environment. His country had frequently made it clear that it condemned apartheid, but it had also always opposed the introduction of political questions into the

/...

(Mr. Goodman, United States)

work of technical organs of the United Nations, such as UNEP. For that reason, his delegation had voted against Governing Council decision 10/7. It was therefore regrettable that by taking particular note of that decision in draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.110, the General Assembly was reinforcing tendencies towards the politicization of UNEP.

112. Paragraph 5 of that same draft resolution mentioned another decision of the Governing Council of UNEP that the United States had not supported, namely, decision 10/21. Measures proposed under the Programme in a number of fields were premature, to say the least, and his delegation therefore maintained its reservations on that decision.

113. Nevertheless, in spite of those reservations, his delegation had joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.110, since it wanted the research efforts undertaken in that field to continue.

114. With regard to draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.8, he said that while his delegation did not accept all the arguments and all the conclusions presented in the report of the Secretary-General (A/37/211), it did wish to thank the Secretary-General for his efforts. However, given the lacunae of the first report, the General Assembly should take care at its fortieth session to weigh the pros and cons before authorizing the preparation of other reports to follow the one requested for 1985.

115. The CHAIRMAN said that, since draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.110 had been adopted, he would take it, if there was no objection, that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.46 were withdrawing their text.

116. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.116 entitled "Long-term trends in economic development"

117. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.116, submitted by Mr. Papadatos, Vice-Chairman of the Committee, on the basis of the draft resolution transmitted by the Economic and Social Council by its decision 1982/172 contained in document A/C.2/37/L.8. If there was no objection, he would take it that the members of the Committee agreed to adopt draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.116.

118. Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.116 was adopted.

119. Mr. BAKALOV (Bulgaria), speaking on behalf of 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 draft resolutions A/C.2/37/L.26, A/C.2/37/L.91 and A/C.2/37/L.116 were interrelated in that all three reflected the efforts made by the majority of delegations with a view to putting an end to negative trends in the world economy and accelerating the implementation of the progressive provisions of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, the International Development Strategy for the 1980s and other United Nations decisions in that field. Those

(Mr. Bakalov, Bulgaria)

resolutions were also aimed at putting an end to colonialism, imperialism and neo-colonialism and at removing obstacles to the economic independence of the developing countries. Unfortunately, their implementation was hindered by the Western Powers, which were trying to block all practical measures aimed at the establishment of a new international economic order.

120. The socialist countries had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.26 and had supported the adoption of draft resolutions A/C.2/37/L.116 and L.91, since they continued to believe in the need for the United Nations to adopt practical measures to overcome the obstacles to the restructuring of international economic relations, the settlement of the serious economic problems of the developing countries and the establishment of co-operation for the benefit of all.

121. The provision of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.116 concerning the need to strengthen confidence among nations in their economic co-operation was particularly important, as was the maintenance of the relationship between the objectives of the global negotiations and the implementation of the provisions of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, the International Development Strategy and the Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order. Negotiations on international economic problems, if they were to succeed, must be founded on the provisions of those United Nations instruments and take account of the need to reduce international tensions and achieve disarmament.

122. With regard to the statement of the financial implications of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.91 (A/C.2/37/L.109), the socialist countries considered that the evaluation of the implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade was an extension of similar activities undertaken by the United Nations and did not call for either the elaboration of a new programme or the creation of a new body. The evaluation should be financed from the existing resources of the regular budget and draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.91 should have no financial implications. The socialist countries therefore considered that there was no need for the Secretariat to seek additional funds for that activity.

123. Mr. CHOWDHURY (Bangladesh) announced that the Group of 77 had decided to support draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.72.

AGENDA ITEM 72: OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.70 entitled "United Nations Volunteers Programme"

124. The CHAIRMAN said that if there were no objections, he would take it that the members of the Committee agreed to adopt draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.70, entitled "United Nations Volunteer Programme".

125. Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.70 was adopted.

Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.77 entitled "United Nations Special Fund for Land-Locked Developing Countries"

126. At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.77.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, 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 Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

127. Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.77 was adopted by 112 votes to none, with 21 abstentions.

128. Mr. DMITRIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his country, which understood the needs of the land-locked developing countries and tried to help them to settle their particular problems, was also one of the few countries which was a party to the Convention relating to Transit Trade of the Land-locked Countries. It had therefore voted for draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.77 and confirmed the statements made by representatives of the Soviet Union at the time of the adoption of the United Nations instruments mentioned in it.

129. Mr. RUSO (Finland), speaking also on behalf of Denmark, Iceland, Norway and Sweden, said that those countries had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.77 as they had done in the past on similar draft resolutions, because they wished to avoid the proliferation of special funds for the provision of

(Mr. Ruso, Finland)

multilateral assistance. The Nordic countries would continue to contribute to the operational activities of the United Nations through other channels, such as UNDP.

130. The Nordic countries had reservations concerning the need to create a special category for the land-locked developing countries.

131. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) said that, while it had not opposed the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.77, his country considered that there was little point in creating a new category of countries. The United States of America was opposed to the establishment of a special category of developing countries other than that of the least advanced.

132. Mr. IVERSEN (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the member countries of the European Economic Community, said that, as in the past, those countries had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.77. The special measures on behalf of the land-locked developing countries should be linked to their particular level of development and designed to overcome their geographical handicaps. While recognizing the right of all countries to contribute to the United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries, the members of the European Economic Community would continue to provide their assistance through existing bilateral and multilateral institutions.

Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.112 entitled "United Nations Children's Fund"

133. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.112, submitted by Mr. Fareed, Vice-Chairman of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations on draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.87. If there were no objections, he would take it that the members of the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution.

134. Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.112 was adopted.

135. Mr. DMITRIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his country was aware of the value of the activities carried out by UNICEF during the past year and had joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.112. It must be emphasized, however, that the basic services approach for children as defined in the draft resolution should not interfere with efforts to promote the social development of the developing countries. His country's experience showed that the needs of children were best provided for in the States which adopted social measures of a general nature.

136. Mr. BHANDARI (Bhutan) asked the Secretariat to take note that his delegation had asked to be included in the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.87.

137. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objections, he would take it that the sponsors withdrew draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.87.

138. It was so decided.

/...

AGENDA ITEM 73: TRAINING AND RESEARCH (continued) (A/C.2/37/L.15/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.15/Rev.1 entitled "United Nations Institute for Training and Research"

139. Mr. FAREED (Pakistan) introduced draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.15/Rev.1 on behalf of the sponsors, who had made a genuine and imaginative effort to avoid the necessity of vote. Unfortunately, it had not been possible to reach consensus on the text of the draft resolution, in particular that of paragraph 7, in which the Secretary-General was requested to submit a report on the possibilities for funding UNITAR on a more assured basis. Although the sponsors had made various proposals and had indicated that the Committee's decision on the matter would in no way change the nature of UNITAR, some delegations had found the text of that paragraph acceptable. He trusted, nevertheless, that the draft resolution would be adopted by a very large majority.

140. Mr. KUMLIIV (Sweden) said that his delegation wished to join the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.15/Rev.1.

141. Mr. MIGNOT (Belgium) said that his delegation had taken part in the informal consultations on the draft resolution under consideration and it seemed that the text of paragraph 7 had been slightly altered. In the version submitted to the participants in the consultations, the words "keeping in mind article VIII of the statute of the Institute and the views expressed during the thirty-seventh session of the Assembly" had appeared not at the end of paragraph 7 but at the beginning, after the words "Requests the Secretary-General to examine". The change was not perhaps of great importance, but to avoid any misunderstanding about the interpretation of the paragraph, he would like the sponsors to confirm that the Secretary-General was in fact being requested to keep in mind article VIII of the statute of UNITAR and the views expressed during the thirty-seventh session of the Assembly when he examined all possibilities for funding.

142. Mr. FAREED (Pakistan) said that the wording referred to by the representative of Belgium was one of the many successive versions of paragraph 7. The text now before the Committee was the one circulated in writing during informal consultations. The representative of Belgium had been consulted in connection with the text and had stated that he found it acceptable. Pakistan believed that the English text of paragraph 7 was very clear and could not give rise to misinterpretation: the Secretary-General was requested to submit a report on funding for UNITAR, keeping in mind the two elements clearly indicated in that paragraph.

143. Mr. AL-AMRI (United Arab Emirates) said that his delegation wished to become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.15/Rev.1.

144. At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.15/Rev.1.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central

/...

African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America.

Abstaining: Poland.

145. Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.15/Rev.1 was adopted by 121 votes to 8, with 1 abstention.

146. Mr. VELLOSO (Brazil) said that the changes made to paragraph 7 of the draft resolution during informal consultations had permitted his delegation to cast an affirmative vote. He wished to reiterate, however, that Brazil remained opposed to the utilization of resources from the regular budget of the United Nations to finance, wholly or partly, activities or costs of bodies which had been established on the understanding that they would be financed from voluntary sources. That position of principle would be reflected at the next session of the General Assembly if the study which the Secretary-General had been requested to prepare aimed at transferring any part of the financing of UNITAR to the regular budget. UNITAR should tailor its activities and programmes to the resources at its disposal.

147. Mr. DMITRIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Soviet Union supported UNITAR's activities through annual voluntary contributions, through the participation of Soviet scholars and experts in UNITAR's research, and through the organization in the Soviet Union of scientific and training seminars for participants from developing countries. At the same time, the continuing attempts to change the way in which UNITAR was funded gave cause for concern. The current balance in the Institute's budget, to which the Executive Director had drawn the Committee's attention on 5 October, proved that UNITAR was able to plan its activities in accordance with the resources available. Paragraph 7 of draft

(Mr. Dmitriev, USSR)

resolution A/C.2/37/L.15/Rev.1 contained an ambiguous provision concerning an examination of possibilities for funding the Institute; that provision could be used by some in an attempt to change the current funding system, based on voluntary contributions, thereby radically altering the nature of the Institute.

148. The Soviet Union had always taken the view that there was no legal justification for charging to the regular budget the expenses of United Nations bodies that were financed from voluntary contributions. Since the second and fourth preambular paragraphs were also unacceptable to his delegation, it had voted against the draft resolution.

149. Mr. TANIGUCHI (Japan) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.15/Rev.1 on the understanding that the study which the Secretary-General was requested to prepare in paragraph 7 would be undertaken in accordance with the relevant provisions of article VIII of the statute of UNITAR. His Government believed that the Institute's financial resources should come exclusively from voluntary contributions.

150. Mr. de la TORRE (Argentina) thanked the sponsors of the draft resolution for taking into account the views of various delegations. That had enabled his delegation to vote in favour. Nevertheless, that affirmative vote in no way changed his Government's position that UNITAR's activities should be financed from voluntary contributions and should not be charged to the regular budget of the United Nations.

151. Mr. TUAN (Liberia) said that, in view of the importance and usefulness of UNITAR's work, his delegation wished to become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.15/Rev.1.

152. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) said that his country recognized the usefulness of UNITAR, which was performing training and research functions that could enhance the effectiveness of the United Nations in attaining its objectives, particularly in respect of economic and social development. The United States was among the countries which had helped to draft the statute of UNITAR. The decision that the Institute's budget should be financed from voluntary contributions had been taken with a view to guaranteeing objectivity in UNITAR research activities. Over the years, it had been possible, on that basis, to meet satisfactorily the needs of the Institute, whose activities had been generously supported by his Government.

153. The United States believed that it was pointless to adopt a solution which was contrary to one of the basic principles laid down when UNITAR had been established and which sought to make further inroads into the regular budget of the United Nations. It would be better to seek solutions based exclusively on the principle of funding from voluntary contributions, and to streamline UNITAR's activities and reorganize the services currently provided by the United Nations system which appeared redundant.

(Mr. Goodman, United States)

154. The sponsors of the draft resolution just adopted were calling for an examination of all possibilities for funding UNITAR, including charging its activities to the regular budget of the United Nations. The effect of that approach would be to delay until the next session of the General Assembly, or even longer, the adoption of measures necessary for the solution of the Institute's financial problems.

155. His delegation had found it necessary to vote against the draft resolution, since the purpose of the proposed study was unacceptable. That vote did not at all mean that the United States was insensitive to UNITAR's problems or that it was unwilling to participate in efforts to solve them.

156. Mr. OKLESTEK (Czechoslovakia) said that his delegation had voted against draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.15/Rev.1 for purely financial and budgetary reasons. The increase in the regular budget of the United Nations was imposing a very heavy financial burden on Member States, which were finding it increasingly difficult to meet their commitments to the Organization. The Committee had been informed that UNITAR had managed to balance its budget, which was a clear sign that the Institute had been able to plan its activities successfully under the current system of voluntary contributions.

157. The implicit aim of paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.15/Rev.1 was to charge UNITAR expenses to the regular budget of the United Nations or to finance the Institute's activities from other assessed contributions. That was unacceptable to his delegation, which would oppose any attempt to change the voluntary basis of contributions to UNITAR or other funds and agencies.

AGENDA ITEM 74: SPECIAL ECONOMIC AND DISASTER RELIEF ASSISTANCE (continued)
(A/C.2/37/L.82/Rev.1 and L.107)

Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.82/Rev.1 entitled "Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator"

158. Mr. DON NANJIRA (Kenya), introducing draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.82/Rev.1 on behalf of the sponsors, said that although there had been long and difficult negotiations concerning the text, it had not yet been possible to reach a consensus.

159. Since the draft resolution had been issued, certain changes had been made. The order of paragraphs 5 and 6 should be reversed. The words "preferably within the means at his disposal" should be inserted after the word "strengthening" in the penultimate line of paragraph 13. In the last line of the English text of that paragraph, the word "aid" should be deleted.

160. The draft resolution was the logical follow-up to General Assembly resolution 36/225, which made UNDRO the lead United Nations agency for the mobilization and co-ordination of disaster relief and other emergency relief. That resolution and the draft resolution broadened UNDRO's responsibilities, with special reference to

/...

(Mr. Don Nanjira, Kenya)

disasters of exceptional complexity and magnitude, early-warning systems and dissemination of detailed information. Because of the increased responsibilities entrusted to UNDR0, the Secretary-General would probably not have to take special measures to cope with complex disasters or unusually serious emergencies. That would make it possible to streamline the current system and provide a framework for the progressive redeployment of the resources currently devoted to such special measures.

161. The sponsors of the draft resolution had demonstrated a spirit of conciliation and compromise and had taken account of all the suggestions and amendments which had been proposed during the informal consultations, particularly with respect to paragraphs 5 and 6, by accepting the principle that additional resources for disaster relief assistance furnished by the Office of the Co-ordinator should come exclusively from voluntary sources.

162. They had not, however, been able to accept the request to include in paragraph 2 the phrase "in accordance with appropriate decisions of competent intergovernmental organs", as a dangerous precedent would be created if a provision which seemed to represent no more than ordinary common sense was included. In fact it would be out of the question to request the Secretary-General or the Co-ordinator to take steps incompatible with the decisions of the competent organs.

163. Equally, the sponsors of the draft resolution had not been able to agree to the elimination of paragraph 13, as certain delegations had requested, since they considered it essential to strengthen the Office of the Co-ordinator in order to enable him to meet his growing responsibilities and to make it possible for the Co-ordinator to submit to the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly a satisfactory report on the role of his Office in emergency situations such as those which currently existed in Chad and Lebanon.

164. In conclusion, he expressed the hope that the draft resolution, as orally revised, would be adopted by consensus.

165. Mr. ZIMMERMAN (United States of America) welcomed the efforts made by all delegations to reach consensus on the text of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.82/Rev.1. With a view to joining those efforts, he proposed that the following new paragraph 15 should be added at the end of the draft resolution: "Authorizes the Secretary-General to implement the activities approved under the present resolution only to the extent that they can be financed without exceeding the level of resources approved in the programme budget for the biennium 1982-1983 (General Assembly resolution 36/240 A)."

166. Mr. DON NANJIRA (Kenya) said that such an amendment could not be accepted because, in view of the scope of the activities entrusted to the Office of the Co-ordinator, particularly after the adoption of General Assembly resolution 36/225 and the escalating number of emergency situations, the Co-ordinator could not fulfil his mandate properly within the limits of available resources.

167. Mr. CHOWDHURY (Bangladesh) said that the Group of 77 supported draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.82/Rev.1.

168. At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on the amendment which he had proposed to draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.82/Rev.1.

In favour: Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Mongolia, New Zealand, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Burma, Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Barbados, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden.

169. The United States amendment was rejected by 96 votes to 19, with 12 abstentions.

170. At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.82/Rev.1 as orally revised.

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Australia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany,

Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America.

Abstaining: Mongolia, Poland.

171. Draft resolution A/C.2/37/82/Rev.1, as orally revised was adopted by 119 votes to 8, with 2 abstentions.

172. Mr. DMITRIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his country furnished substantial bilateral aid to countries which were victims of natural disasters and understood the desire of the developing countries to improve the effectiveness of the disaster relief furnished by United Nations agencies. Nevertheless his delegation had voted against draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.82/Rev.1 for the same reasons which had motivated its vote on resolution 36/225.

173. His delegation considered that the proposal to increase the financial aid and manpower resources of the Office of the Co-ordinator under the pretext of strengthening the capacity of the United Nations to relieve disasters was unacceptable. In that connection, it might be borne in mind that, when General Assembly resolution 36/225 had been adopted, the representative of the Secretariat as well as the sponsors of the resolution had assured the members of the Committee that its implementation would not lead to any increase in expenditure under the regular budget of the Organization; moreover, that point had been confirmed by the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination when, at its twenty-second session, it had examined the activities of the Office of the Co-ordinator for the period 1984-1989.

174. Mr. ZIMMERMAN (United States of American) expressed serious concern at the financial implications of paragraph 13 of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.82/Rev.1, contained in paragraph 5 of document A/C.2/37/L.107. No explanation had been given on the manner in which the proposed resources would make it possible to strengthen

(Mr. Zimmermann, United States)

and improve the effectiveness of the Office. In his opinion, it would be better to await the next session of the General Assembly before considering any increase in the financial aid and manpower resources of the Office of the Co-ordinator; moreover, it was in that spirit that paragraph 20 of General Assembly resolution 36/225 had been adopted.

175. Furthermore, his delegation could not accept the phrase "including the planning and implementation of relief programmes" in paragraph 5 of document A/C.2/37/L.107, as such activities went substantially beyond the mandate given to the Office of the Co-ordinator.

176. Finally, at a time when the principal operational organs of the United Nations were being asked to make reductions in their budgets, it was inopportune to request a budgetary increase for the Office of the Co-ordinator without providing a precise explanation of the manner in which such action would make it possible to enhance the effectiveness of the Office. For all those reasons, his delegation had voted against draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.82/Rev.1.

177. Miss FORD (Canada) said that her delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.82/Rev.1 with a view to demonstrating the importance which it attached to the work performed by the Office of the Co-ordinator. Nevertheless, if paragraph 13 had been voted on separately, her delegation would have abstained, since the effect of that paragraph would be to create three new posts in the Office of the Co-ordinator. It fully supported the co-ordination of the relief programmes undertaken by the Office of the Co-ordinator as well as the new responsibilities which had been entrusted to the Office, under General Assembly resolution 36/225, but it was not convinced that an increase in manpower resources was entirely justified at the present time. The Office could probably perform the main tasks entrusted to it by rationalizing and reorganizing its work programme.

178. If the Co-ordinator considered that it was absolutely essential that he should have additional resources, it would be preferable for the General Assembly to take a decision on the issue during its thirty-eighth session after the Secretary-General had submitted a full report on the implementation of resolution 36/225. The Co-ordinator would thus have time to make a more detailed evaluation of his manpower needs and to provide Governments with detailed explanations on the subject.

179. With the exception of those provisions, the draft resolution was satisfactory; her delegation nevertheless hoped that improvements would continue to be made in the functioning of the Office of the Co-ordinator in the ensuing year.

180. Mr. de la TORRE (Argentina) said that his delegation had been able to vote for the draft resolution which had just been adopted thanks to the spirit of co-operation which the sponsors had demonstrated. It considered that the Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator should give priority to natural disasters.

181. Mr. KORDS (German Democratic Republic) said that his delegation had voted against draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.82/Rev.1 because of a number of provisions which were unacceptable. Its vote had been motivated by the same considerations which had been expressed by the socialist countries at the time of the adoption of General Assembly resolution 36/225. The mandate of the Office of the Co-ordinator, as set out in General Assembly resolution 2816 (XXVI), constituted a sufficient basis for the delivery of relief to countries hit by natural disasters.

182. For its part the German Democratic Republic would continue, as in the past, to provide assistance, particularly on a bilateral basis, to countries which were victims of natural disasters.

183. Mr. RIERA DIAZ (Panama) said that if his delegation had been present, it would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.82/Rev.1.

The meeting rose at 10.30 p.m.