

GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records\*



SECOND COMMITTEE  
51st meeting  
held on  
Monday, 20 December 1982  
at 6 p.m.  
New York

COPY:  
DO NOT REMOVE  
FROM ROOM  
L-201 (WVRR)

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 51st MEETING

Chairman: Mr. FAREED (Pakistan)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 71: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued)

(f) FOOD PROBLEMS

(e) SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT: REPORT OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL  
COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT

COMPLETION OF THE COMMITTEE'S 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.2/37/SR.51  
29 December 1982

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 6.25 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 71: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.101/Rev.1

1. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the words "new international economic order" in the first and third preambular paragraphs should not be capitalized.
2. Mr. CHOWDHURY (Bangladesh), introducing the revised draft resolution, said that the problems currently facing the developing countries could be solved on a long-term basis through the restructuring of international economic relations within the framework of the establishment of a new international economic order. The Group of 77 attached great importance to the draft resolution before the Committee and had had extensive consultations with other delegations so as to take account of their concerns regarding certain parts of the draft resolution, and it believed that the text before the Committee could be adopted by consensus.
3. Mr. AL-HADDAD (Democratic Yemen) informed the Secretariat of the Arabic word that should be used to translate the word "grave" in the second preambular paragraph.
4. At the request of the representatives of the United States of America and Denmark, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.101/Rev.1.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, 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, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, 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, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

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

5. Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.101/Rev.1 was adopted by 94 votes to none, with 22 abstentions.

6. Mr. ZOLLER (Australia) said that he regretted the failure to achieve consensus on the draft resolution because he regarded the principle behind the resolution with considerable sympathy. World economic problems were undoubtedly having a particularly serious impact on the poorer developing countries. His delegation appreciated the efforts made by a number of colleagues in the Group of 77 to take account of Australia's problems during the informal consultations. Regrettably, those consultations had failed owing to disagreement not so much over the need for urgent measures as over other issues. His delegation's need to abstain should not be taken to indicate any lack of support for the concept of immediate measures.

7. Mr. IVERSEN (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the 10 members of the European Economic Community, said that they were sorry that consensus had not been achieved. The draft resolution contained some elements which were not acceptable to the EEC member States for reasons that were well known: that was unfortunate, because those States were very much in favour of immediate measures, on the basis of agreed priorities, in favour of the developing countries as a vital step towards solving world economic problems, although they did not consider such measures an alternative to global negotiations. They were very interested in pursuing those ideas in the appropriate forums.

8. Mrs. WALDER-BRUNDIN (Sweden), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries, said that they supported the concept of immediate measures. They had, however, been unable to support the draft resolution and had had to abstain in the voting. The Nordic countries regretted that the serious endeavours made by all to achieve a mutually acceptable text had been unsuccessful. Their main objection had been that the resolution failed to distinguish between immediate measures and the call to restructure international economic relations. Furthermore, they would have liked to see a reference to the primary responsibility of the developing countries for their own development.

9. Mr. LEE (Canada) said that it was unfortunate that the draft resolution had had to be put to the vote. His delegation had abstained because the resolution placed undue weight on issues other than those contemplated in the title. Naturally, his Government remained committed to the North/South dialogue and all its component parts.

10. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) said that his delegation had many problems with the resolution. In particular, it regretted that a resolution of such a nature should have been submitted so late in the session that adequate discussion was impossible. The fact that his delegation had abstained in the vote

(Mr. Goodman, United States)

did not mean that it did not object strongly to much of the language used in the resolution. He hoped that the sponsors would draw the appropriate conclusions from the unity among those delegations which had abstained.

11. Mr. SCHWEISGUT (Austria) said that his delegation fully supported the concept of immediate measures as it recognized that the economic problems of many developing countries were such as to require concerted action on the part of the international community. The suggestions made by the Secretary-General in his address to the second regular session of the Economic and Social Council had particular relevance in that context. He hoped that the Committee for Development Planning and the Council itself would continue to give urgent consideration to the issue. Unfortunately, his delegation had been unable to support the resolution despite the sincere efforts which had been made to achieve an acceptable text. The analysis of the developing countries' problems given in the resolution, particularly in the fourth preambular paragraph, was still not balanced enough to constitute a basis for mutually agreed measures. His delegation's main doubt, however, concerned the failure to distinguish between immediate measures and the call for restructuring of international economic relations. His delegation would also have liked to see those measures spelled out more clearly.

12. Mr. AKAO (Japan) said that his delegation recognized the economic difficulties that were facing many developing countries and the need for urgent measures. It had none the less abstained from voting because it could not support some of the ideas contained in the resolution.

13. Mr. NGAIZA (United Republic of Tanzania) said that had his delegation been present during the voting it would have voted in favour of the resolution.

14. Mr. GARCIA MORENO (Colombia) said that his delegation had not been present during the voting for reasons beyond his control. Had it been present it would have voted in favour of the resolution.

(f) FOOD PROBLEMS

Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.127

15. The CHAIRMAN said that the words "inter alia" should be added after the word "facilitating" in paragraph 27. In paragraph 4 the word "recommendations" should be followed by the word "as". In paragraph 26 the phrase "production in exports" should read "production and exports".

16. Mr. ZOLLER (Australia) requested a separate vote on paragraphs 23 and 24, which, in its view, constituted a request to the Assembly to endorse the outcome of the GATT ministerial meeting. His delegation was not prepared to do that, because it was profoundly dissatisfied with the results of that meeting. The final document of the meeting had side-stepped all the major issues, and Australia alone had had the courage to dissociate itself from such a meaningless communiqué.

(Mr. Zoller, Australia)

17. Although the major trading groups had accepted the idea of having a committee on trade in agriculture, they had done so on the understanding that its establishment involved no commitment to any negotiation or obligation. One group had even felt compelled to issue an interpretative statement which had further diluted the marginal measure of progress which might have been perceived to lie buried in the final document. While no group of countries had emerged blameless from the GATT meeting, the European Economic Community had done more than its share to make the outcome so toothless by blocking the "cease-fire" on new protectionist measures, insisting on its right to apply import safeguards selectively and refusing to accept any commitment to move agriculture towards the multilateral trading system.

18. While Australia shared the values and judgements of its Community colleagues in most areas of activity it did not do so in regard to trade. Indeed, the Community's Common Agricultural Policy - which ensured that no matter how efficient a country was or how low its production costs, it could not compete with the Community - was extremely damaging to Australia. For example, whereas Australia had exported 500,000 tonnes of wheat to the Community in 1973, it currently exported none at all. Whereas it had once exported 400,000 tonnes of sugar to the Community, it currently exported none. Its butter exports had likewise dropped from 30,000 tonnes to zero and its beef and veal exports from 150,000 to 12,000 tonnes. No country had suffered quite as much from the impact of the Common Agricultural Policy as had Australia.

19. That was to say nothing of the losses suffered by his country and others, as a result of the Community's policy of dumping surplus production through heavily subsidized exports. Indeed, it had had to stand by and watch the Community become a leading exporter of dairy products, sugar, beef and sheep as a result of massive subsidization. Although article XVI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade allowed subsidization, it did so provided that the subsidy should not be such as to allow the subsidizer to acquire an inequitable share of the world market. As a result of its subsidies, however, the Community had risen from being a net importer of sugar as recently as 1976 to becoming a major exporter: in 1981 it had exported 5.3 million tonnes. That remarkable performance had been achieved by a régime under which the Community support price, and eventually its restitution payments, had exceeded world sugar prices by a margin of 10 per cent in 1975, rising to a peak of 176 per cent in 1979. In the five years since the last International Sugar Agreement, the Community - which was not a member - had increased its exports by 500 per cent whereas exports by countries parties to that Agreement had increased by only 3 per cent. It would be noted that sugar was probably the product which affected the situation of developing countries more than any other.

20. It was one of the great myths perpetrated by Australia's adversaries on the matter that agricultural protectionism was not an issue between them and the third world but between them and Australia alone. Studies on the impact of agricultural protectionism showed, however, that while Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the United States had lost severely from agricultural protectionism, many developing

/...

(Mr. Zoller, Australia)

countries had done so too. Indeed, they had borne about half the losses. Third-world countries were prevented from growing and selling such crops as sugar, rice and manioc by policies in the developed world which paid no attention to the principle of comparative advantage and further entrenched the misallocation of resources.

21. It was for those reasons that his country could not endorse paragraphs 23 and 24. If anything, the outcome of the ministerial meeting of GATT reflected a widening of the disparity of opportunity facing exporters of manufactures and those of agricultural products.

22. Mr. CHOWDHURY (Bangladesh) said that a draft resolution identical with that before the Committee had been submitted at the second regular session of the Economic and Social Council but no action had been taken on it because of lack of consensus. The Group of 77 felt that draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.127 should be adopted by consensus, given its nature, and that concerned parties should work for consensus. The Group of 77 had not been pleased with the outcome of the GATT meeting and had great sympathy for the comments made by the representative of Australia; at the same time it did not want those difficulties to stand in the way of the consensus which had been achieved after very difficult negotiations. In an effort to preserve the consensus, he invoked rule 129 of the rules of procedure and requested that a separate vote should not be taken on paragraphs 23 and 24.

23. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote, in pursuance of rule 129 of the rules of procedure, on the motion not to take a separate vote on paragraphs 23 and 24.

24. At the request of the representative of Australia a recorded vote was taken on the motion of Bangladesh not to have a separate vote taken on paragraphs 23 and 24 of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.127.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, 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, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, 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.

Against: Australia, Canada, New Zealand, United States of America.

Abstaining: Morocco.

25. The motion not to have a separate vote taken on paragraphs 23 and 24 of the draft resolution was carried by 113 votes to 4, with 1 abstention.

26. Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.127 was adopted.

27. Mr. LEE (Canada), said that his delegation regretted that consensus had not been possible on a subject of such importance as food problems. However, it had voted against the motion not to hold a separate vote because it believed that once consensus had proved to be impossible, it was only right that a request for a separate vote should be acceded to.

28. Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.127 had been one of the most important proposals before the Committee. His Government remained firmly committed to helping to solve problems of world food security and it would continue both to participate actively in the policy and programme discussions in the many forums where food problems were considered and to make large and growing contributions to the agricultural and rural development sector of developing countries. Multilaterally, Canada was one of the largest donors, in absolute and relative terms, to organizations devoted to solving food problems: it was the second largest donor to the World Food Programme, the seventh largest donor to the Food and Agricultural Organization, the eighth largest donor to the International Fund for Agricultural Development and the fifth largest donor to the International Development Association. In 1982 Canada had contributed to developing countries in Africa and Asia some \$500 million, the single largest portion of which had gone to projects in the food and agricultural sector. The percentage of his country's official development assistance devoted to the food and agricultural sector was increasing and was expected to reach 40 per cent of the development budget within a few years.

29. Precisely because of the priority it attached to the transformation of the food and agricultural sector in the development process, Canada attached importance to ensuring that collective efforts were effective and well co-ordinated. That dual focus on the mobilization of resources and effectiveness was especially important in the current period of world recession, when new resources for any activity were scarce. His delegation had accordingly welcomed the content of paragraph 30 of the draft resolution; that paragraph reflected concerns that had been discussed in general terms at the Cancún summit and in the governing bodies of FAO and UNDP, in the World Food Council and elsewhere. Canada had therefore been disappointed to find that delegations were not prepared to take the next logical step of inviting an intergovernmental body such as the Economic and Social Council

(Mr. Lee, Canada)

to look at ways and means of reviewing the general effectiveness of the United Nations system in dealing with global food problems. His delegation strongly believed that questions of effectiveness and co-ordination should be raised in individual forums; each of the governing bodies of the major organizations in the food area, together with the regional development banks, could thus assess its progress in increasing food and agricultural production in the light of the priorities it had established. However, such individual assessments did not provide an overview of how the organizations interacted or reveal whether there were any gaps in their priorities, whether the objectives of the 1974 World Food Conference were being effectively met, whether there were any areas of duplication and overlapping, and whether resources could be more effectively employed. Those questions should be considered by Governments, and it was precisely that kind of co-ordination that the draft resolution rightly described as desirable.

30. His delegation firmly believed that questions of co-ordination and effectiveness of organizations and agencies involved in food problems should be considered further in appropriate forums. It looked forward to the special review assessment which was to be prepared for the tenth session of WFC on progress made and the tasks ahead in striving to achieve the objectives of the World Food Conference. Governments needed to be substantively prepared when those discussions took place. His Government planned to hold further talks on the subject in capitals and in the appropriate bodies.

31. Mr. JOSEPH (Australia) said that his delegation strongly believed that draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.127 was one of the most important resolutions before the General Assembly; regrettably, however, it was unable fully to endorse its content, largely because the significant differences which had been revealed during negotiations could not simply be ignored. Unfortunately, some members of the Committee had shown no genuine flexibility and had exacerbated the difficulties.

32. His delegation recognized the importance of tackling problems in the food area but felt that it was unrealistic to attempt to isolate those problems from the issues of international agricultural trade that were so closely interwoven with them. That interrelationship had been acknowledged in several of the earlier draft proposals before the Committee, which would have provided a good basis for a consensus text. The demands of certain countries with regard to the provisions on trade matters could not be reconciled with the current realities of those problems. His delegation could not endorse texts which had been forced upon the Committee at the last moment and which did not address either the issues or ways to solve them. The draft resolution contained vague, and sometimes distorted, language which not only concealed the seriousness of the problems but might stand in the way of genuine efforts by the international community to work towards removing them.

33. The text of paragraph 22 indicated that the considerable efforts put into negotiations since July had been of little avail. Protectionist measures, and their distorting and disrupting effects on agricultural trade and on the overall ability of the world to ensure universal and adequate food security, had continued to grow and calls for urgent action had gone unheeded. Nevertheless, it had been



(Mr. Joseph, Australia)

proposed that the Committee should simply revert to so-called "agreed" language, a suggestion that admirably suited the purposes of those who had proposed it, since they had already demonstrated by their actions that they had no intention of being bound by that language. The presence of that language in the draft resolution effectively nullified the work done in the Committee and in the Economic and Social Council in recent months. The Group of 77 and his delegation had attempted to meet the concerns of other delegations, but the wording of paragraph 22 was meaningless and even hypocritical. Nevertheless, his delegation believed that the importance of the resolution as a whole justified its adoption by consensus and it had reluctantly refrained from calling for a separate vote on paragraph 22.

34. His delegation could not accept the one-sided and false picture in paragraphs 24 and 25 of the outcome of the recent ministerial meeting of GATT. It was impossible to ignore the central importance of the efforts made at that meeting to bring agricultural trade, and in particular export subsidies, under the disciplines of GATT; the fact that those efforts had failed was not, of course, universally considered regrettable. His delegation could not allow to go unchallenged paragraphs which suggested a sense of achievement at the GATT meeting which was totally false. The paragraphs so obscured the real position that they constituted a plea for inaction. The reference to the committee on trade in agriculture, in paragraph 24, gave a totally unfounded emphasis to its potential to assist in overcoming the problems that were besetting agricultural trade. The two-year time frame given to that committee for its work programme was hardly compatible with the "urgent need" for action reflected in the final document of the GATT ministerial meeting. Even so, the EEC had found it necessary in its interpretative statement, unilaterally to interpret the part of that document relating to the GATT work programme as not being a commitment to any new negotiation or obligation with respect to agricultural products.

35. In conclusion, he said that his delegation's reservations on the draft resolution were in the context of the three paragraphs he had mentioned; it believed that much had been achieved in other parts of the text and it could strongly endorse the consensus on those other matters.

36. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) said that the draft resolution on food problems (A/C.2/37/L.127) probably affected more people more vitally than any other considered by the Committee. Although his delegation had voted in favour of having a separate vote taken on paragraphs 23 and 24, it had joined in the consensus on the draft resolution as a whole.

37. No one could dispute the need to take adequate measures to overcome the problems of world hunger, but his delegation seriously questioned the estimates for future external assistance in the food sector cited in paragraph 9. The figure of \$8.3 billion was correctly identified as an estimate and not a target; the figure of \$12.5 billion had been suggested by the provisional FAO study entitled "Agriculture towards 2000". At the 1979 General Conference of FAO several countries had disputed the validity of the forecasting models used in the study of recommended changes. The FAO Secretariat had published a version of the study but

/...

(Mr. Goodman, United States)

had never submitted it for approval by member Governments. The estimates contained in the study were therefore only those of FAO and were not officially recognized by the international community. His delegation consequently reserved its position on that point.

38. Mr. HARDY (Observer for the European Economic Community) said that it was the EEC's understanding that the main aim of the draft resolution was to deal with food problems in the light of the specific needs and aspirations of the developing countries. The EEC had always sought to show by concrete measures its determination to contribute to the effective solution of the food problems of developing countries. Under its plan to combat hunger in the world, it had decided to give support to the food strategies drawn up by countries which wished to place their efforts and those of aid donors within the framework of a comprehensive approach. At the same time, while recognizing food aid as a transitory measure which might sometimes be necessary while policies to achieve self-sufficiency were being established, it had maintained a substantial aid programme, concentrated on the poorest countries and those affected by the largest cereals deficit. As to the Generalized System of Preferences, the EEC would endeavour to concentrate its future efforts in the agricultural sector on improving preferential margins while increasing the list of products covered and extending the special measures in favour of the least developed countries.

39. In connection with the paragraphs of the draft resolution concerned with GATT, he said that the matters referred to by the representative of Australia had been discussed at great length at the GATT ministerial meeting, when Australia had had ample opportunity to put forward its views. The representative of Australia had chosen to reiterate those views; the EEC reserved the right to reply in detail to his remarks in the plenary. The results achieved at the GATT ministerial meeting had been reflected in the Declaration it had adopted and the EEC, for its part, had accepted that Declaration. The EEC had always attached high importance to the principles and fundamental objectives of GATT. It accepted and fully supported the major work programme on agriculture, which would examine all measures on the same basis; its acceptance, however, was not to be understood as a commitment to any new negotiation or obligation in relation to agricultural products.

40. Mr. AKAO (Japan) said, in relation to paragraph 22, that Japan recognized the need to bring about a gradual reduction and elimination of barriers to trade in agricultural products, but hoped that exporting countries would give significant consideration to the difficulties associated with the domestic economic situations of importing countries. His delegation felt that paragraph 26 did not fully reflect the reality of the situation. As to paragraph 27, his delegation believed that the economic and social conditions affecting the agricultural sector of individual countries should be duly taken into account in implementing agricultural adjustment policies.

41. Mr. BAKALOV (Bulgaria), speaking on behalf of the delegations of the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian SSR and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and of his own delegation, said that they supported the draft resolution, which set forth a number of important principles for solving the food problems of developing countries. Their position on the quantitative targets referred to in the draft resolution had been stated repeatedly in the Committee and in the Economic and Social Council.

42. Mr. BOYD (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had been pleased to join in the consensus on the draft resolution. It understood that the terms of paragraph 12 applied to developing countries.

The meeting was suspended at 7.35 p.m. and resumed at 7.55 p.m.

(e) SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT: REPORT OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT

Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.128

43. Mr. PAPADATOS (Greece), Vice-Chairman, introducing draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.128, drew attention to paragraph 13 of the text quoted in paragraph 1 of the draft resolution; members would note that the number of directors was to be 21. The draft resolution had been formulated as a result of intensive informal consultations and agreement had been reached only after all the major parties involved had bent over backwards in order to achieve consensus.

44. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Committee), referring to the administrative and financial implications of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.128, said that its provisions required a special session of the Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development to be convened in February or March 1983. The session would last for one week, and on a full-cost basis, would cost \$121,600. He had been assured by the Secretariat that the costs could be absorbed within existing budgetary resources.

45. The CHAIRMAN said that the representative of the Soviet Union had requested that the draft resolution should be put to a vote. Since the Vice-Chairman had suggested that it should be adopted by consensus, he appealed to the representative of the Soviet Union not to press his request.

46. Mr. ASTAFIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation still wanted its request to be acceded to.

47. Mr. PAPADATOS (Greece), Vice-Chairman, said that, in view of the USSR delegation's position, he was withdrawing the draft resolution.

48. Mr. SCHWEISGUT (Austria) said that he regretted that the Vice-Chairman had withdrawn the draft resolution. His delegation felt that it was a fair and workable compromise which had required great effort and flexibility on all sides.

49. Difficult negotiations still lay ahead, but it would be unfortunate if the efforts made so far were not reflected in a text adopted by the General Assembly. Accordingly, on behalf of the delegations of Egypt, Sweden and Tunisia and his own delegation, he reintroduced draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.128.

50. Mr. DON NANJIRA (Kenya), supported by Mr. BEN MOUSSA (Morocco), endorsed the statement made by the representative of Austria. It would have been most regrettable if the Committee had had to vote upon the Vice-Chairman's text; that would have created an unfortunate precedent, inasmuch as texts produced by the Vice-Chairmen were traditionally adopted by consensus.

51. Mr. KABA (Guinea), Mr. AL-KHATIB (Jordan) and Mr. SALLU (Sierra Leone) said that they wished to become sponsors of the draft resolution.

52. Mr. ZHANG (China) said that the draft resolution had been worked out in lengthy negotiations; it was highly regrettable that, because of the objection of one delegation, the Vice-Chairman should have been forced to withdraw his text. His delegation supported the draft resolution and regretted the action of the delegation of the Soviet Union.

53. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) said that his delegation was not prepared to join in a consensus on the draft resolution.

54. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that his delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.128, as an expression of its conviction that a viable financing system for science and technology for development was needed. However, his Government was not convinced that the text of the draft resolution would ensure the viability of the system envisaged, since that demanded that developing and developed countries should share both the managerial responsibilities and the burden of financing the new system in accordance with appropriate arrangements.

55. As it was, the Group of 77 was not prepared to agree to have paragraph 6 of the text quoted in paragraph 1 of the draft resolution make a clear reference to appropriate burden-sharing and was insisting that two thirds of the seats on the Executive Board should be held by developing countries. In other words, the industrialized States would bear most of the financial burden but would have no real power on the Board and could not prevent the adoption of decisions that were contrary to their vital interests.

56. He expressed the hope that, for the sake of the international community as a whole, the provisions concerning the Executive Board would be reconsidered before the following session because, without a minimum of realism, the financing system would be doomed from the start.

57. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.128.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, 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, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, 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, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

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

58. Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.128 was adopted by 108 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.

59. Mr. BAKALOV (Bulgaria) speaking on behalf of the delegations of the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Poland, the Ukrainian SSR and the Soviet Union and of his own delegation, said that draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.128 had been submitted so late that the delegations of the socialist countries had not had sufficient time to study it properly and had therefore abstained in the vote. However, they would state their final position on the subject at the relevant plenary meeting. The socialist countries favoured the implementation of the Vienna Programme of Action on Science and Technology for Development, on the understanding that the development of science and technology depended primarily on the efforts of the developing countries themselves. At the same time, they recognized the importance of international co-operation in that field.

(Mr. Bakalov, Bulgaria)

60. Decisions concerning the implementation of the Vienna Programme of Action, including those relating to financing activities, must be consistent with the United Nations Charter and respect the intergovernmental nature of such activities. The delegations of the socialist countries therefore seriously objected to the financing of United Nations activities in that field by private capital; they also objected to the establishment of organizational arrangements for financing and voting regulations which did not correspond to the basic principle of the equality of States enshrined in the Charter. Similarly, while noting that the Financing System was to be organized on a voluntary basis, they could not agree to it because it divided finances into core and non-core components. At the same time, those delegations strongly rejected the concept of "burden-sharing" in connection with contributions to the resources of the Financing System. Responsibility for the grave economic situation prevailing in the developing countries lay entirely with the developed capitalist countries, and the socialist States would never assent to the concept of shared responsibility.

61. The delegations of the socialist States were not convinced, in any event, that the establishment of yet another United Nations fund would make new financial resources available. On the contrary, the existing institutional framework and financing possibilities of the United Nations system should be fully utilized. Halting the arms race generated by the most aggressive imperialist circles and adopting effective disarmament measures would release substantial resources that could be used for the scientific and technological development of the developing countries.

62. The socialist countries were prepared to participate in the implementation of the Vienna Programme of Action to the extent that their means allowed and to intensify their scientific and technological co-operation with the developing countries, in accordance with their social and economic structure and with the principles underlying their external economic relations.

63. Mr. CHOWDHURY (Bangladesh), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, pointed out that the Group had negotiated on draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.128 in a spirit of understanding and in the hope of achieving progress. As had been stressed repeatedly, science and technology were important factors in promoting the economic and social welfare of the developing countries. Even the obstacles to the establishment of the Financing System reflected the inherent importance and practical complexity of that subject. The positive outcome of the negotiations confirmed the vitality of the United Nations as a negotiating forum for economic questions of global importance.

64. Although a durable basis had been established within the United Nations for financing the application of science and technology to development and for strengthening national capabilities, a great deal remained to be done before several outstanding features of the Financing System could be finalized. In that connection, the Group of 77 attached considerable importance to the special session of the Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development to be held in February or March 1983.

(Mr. Chowdhury, Bangladesh)

65. Lastly, he expressed the hope that, once the General Assembly had established the Financing System in a permanent form, those governments that had not yet formally decided to do so would give serious consideration to full participation in the System. The Group of 77 was receptive to any genuine consultative effort that might be required to promote the Financing System on a truly universal basis and called upon all Member States to join in the common effort to attain that end.

66. Mr. AKAO (Japan) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.128 in a spirit of compromise and in view of the important role science and technology played in the development of the developing countries. However, his delegation was not entirely satisfied with the draft resolution; it was uncertain, for example, how the core component of the proposed Financing System would function. As his delegation had stated repeatedly, it had difficulty accepting the notion of negotiated commitments for contributions, and it was still his delegation's understanding that, even within the framework of paragraph 3 of the proposed arrangements, a participating country would not be forced to contribute a predetermined portion of any target figure.

67. Moreover, although his delegation was not opposed to the arrangement for the Executive Board and secretariat of the Financing System to be separate from UNDP, it attached great importance to ensuring effective co-operation and co-ordination between the two organizations, at both the Board and the secretariat levels. Since his delegation was not certain that such co-operation and co-ordination were fully ensured, it would welcome further details about the relationship between the two organizations in terms of the actual functioning of the Financing System in years to come.

68. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) said that his Government recognized the benefits the developing world could gain from science and technology and strongly supported the notion of increasing the developing countries' ability to apply science and technology to their development. However, his Government also believed that such progress could be achieved by improving the co-ordination and co-operation among the numerous United Nations technical agencies in order to ensure that available resources were used in the most efficient way possible. The United States was giving added emphasis to science and technology in its own bilateral programmes and would continue to co-operate with other countries in applying science and technology to development.

69. However, the Committee had spent a great deal of time on discussing the establishment and funding of a new system of financing, while little time had been spent on other aspects of the Vienna Programme of Action, such as improving the co-ordination of bilateral and multilateral programmes and making greater use of the expertise and mechanisms provided by UNDP. Given current economic conditions, his delegation could not support yet another United Nations fund and would not be able to contribute to such a fund in the foreseeable future. However, he stressed that his Government did not wish to dissuade those who might contribute to the fund or to hinder its operation in any way.

/...

70. Mr. DIECKMANN (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.128. His Government was apparently not the only one which was still unable to finalize its position on the outcome of the consultations held on the subject.

71. Mr. BOYD (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, although that action should not shed doubt on his Government's consistent attitude towards the Financing System. In its opinion, science and technology were essential components of the development process, and that belief was reflected in the technical assistance which his Government provided. However, his Government had never been certain that that cause was best served by creating a new "sector" or new sectoral funds which generated no additional resources for development. On the contrary, the new sector might well divert money from existing central funds, which were of proven worth and which were themselves in dire straits.

72. With regard to the negotiations just concluded, his delegation had thought it right to respect the evident wish of other delegations to establish a long-term financing system for science and technology for development. It had accordingly voted in favour of the draft resolution, but the United Kingdom itself would not be contributing to the Financing System.

#### COMPLETION OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK

73. The CHAIRMAN invited the Secretary to inform the Committee, in accordance with rule 154 of the rules of procedure, of the total amount of the financial implications of draft resolutions adopted by the Committee at the current session.

74. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Committee) said that, as indicated in the consolidated statement considered by the Fifth Committee some days earlier, the grand total of the financial implications of the draft resolutions adopted by the Committee was \$8,021,750, of which \$2,003,600 related to conference-servicing requirements.

75. The Committee had held 51 formal meetings, totalling 109 hours, 76 informal meetings, totalling 256 hours - not including the "informal informal" meetings - and had not utilized 29 hours of formal meeting time at the current session. It had adopted 76 draft resolutions and 8 draft decisions, compared with 71 draft resolutions and 17 draft decisions at the thirty-sixth session. At the current session, the Committee had adopted 17 draft resolutions by recorded vote. Moreover, 51 new reports had been requested, not including reports to be submitted to the General Assembly pursuant to existing legislative mandates.

76. The CHAIRMAN read out a statement prepared by the elected Chairman of the Committee, Mr. Fafowora (Nigeria), who had been called away to other duties.

77. In his statement Mr. Fafowora reminded the Committee that at the second meeting he had urged delegations to bear in mind the relevant resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly concerning the need to streamline agenda items and documentation and to implement the provisions of paragraph 7 of resolution 34/212, by which the Assembly had decided to consider at its thirty-fifth session



(The Chairman)

the possibility or desirability of examining some of the items of its agenda allocated to the Second Committee on a biennial basis, including the possibility of assigning some items to the Economic and Social Council for consideration and final decision. He had also referred to an important resolution of the Economic and Social Council, resolution 1982/50, which related to the same question.

78. He was sure that all members concurred with his belief that the Second Committee had reached a stage at which it needed to take bold decisions if it was to avoid being paralysed by the sheer volume not only of documentation but of items before it. There was a need to reassess the Committee's programme and organization of work in order to enable it to carry out its tasks effectively. At the current session there had been too many general debates, too many resolutions and too many meetings, both formal and informal. Although, officially, the Committee had no working groups, it had effectively established at least two, each presided over by a Vice-Chairman. The informal nature of those working groups had made it difficult to provide conference servicing facilities on an assured basis; provisions had had to be made on an "as available" basis.

79. Delegations should give serious consideration to the organization of the work of the Committee at future sessions. In that context, the General Assembly might benefit from the help of the Economic and Social Council which, in accordance with resolution 32/197, should assist in the preparation of the work of the Assembly in the economic, social and related fields.

80. At the current session, most delegations had expressed dissatisfaction with the practice whereby all introductory statements on behalf of organs or organizations of the United Nations system were normally made during the first two weeks of the substantive work of the Committee. He was sure that members would agree that it would be preferable for the executive heads of the entities concerned to make their statements at the beginning of the consideration of the specific items concerned, and he invited the Committee to adopt his proposal to that effect.

81. It was so decided.

82. Mr. GIHANI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), speaking on behalf of the Group of African States, commended the Chairman and Vice-Chairmen and the other officers of the Committee, together with all areas of the Secretariat, on their efficient work during the session. Much had been achieved in terms of valuable resolutions providing for increased economic assistance to the least developed and disadvantaged nations of Africa, especially those facing natural disasters. He hoped that the constructive spirit which the Committee had displayed during the session would still prevail at the stage of implementation.

83. Mr. HOHWÜ-CHRISTENSEN (Sweden), speaking on behalf of the Group of Western European and other States, thanked the officers of the Committee and the Secretariat for their praiseworthy efforts during the session. While it was difficult to assess the long-term value of the Committee's work, it certainly represented a valuable contribution to international co-operation and dialogue.

/...

84. Mr. MARDOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), speaking on behalf of the Group of Eastern European States, said that he particularly welcomed the positive efforts which had been made towards re-structuring international economic relations on the basis of justice and equality. He expressed appreciation to the Secretariat for the measures which it had taken with regard to the preparation of documents; they had led to improvements in the Committee's work and should be continued.

85. Mr. PURUSHOTTAM (India), speaking on behalf of the Group of Asian States, said that they endorsed the expressions of appreciation which had already been addressed to the officers of the Committee and to the Secretariat.

86. Mr. de la TORRE (Argentina), speaking on behalf of the Group of Latin American States, said that the Secretariat's initiatives with regard to the preparation of documentation had been an advance over the system used the previous year and had been of great help to delegations.

87. Mr. SALLAM (Yemen Arab Republic), speaking on behalf of the Group of Arab States, expressed appreciation for the achievements of the session and for the assistance of the officers of the Committee and the Secretariat. The problems of development were of concern to the whole world and required the good will of all States in the search for practical ways of re-structuring international economic relations on the basis of equality and mutual interest. His Group had continued to work enthusiastically and responsibly to that end, in spite of the economic difficulties which the Arab world had suffered following repeated Israeli acts of aggression and Israel's continued refusal to recognize the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. The work of the United Nations continued to give impetus to the efforts to find a solution to the problem of the Middle East and the restoration of the Palestinian people to its rights of nationhood.

88. Mr. CHOWDHURY (Bangladesh), speaking on behalf of the countries members of the Group of 77, said that a great deal had been achieved at the current session, especially in the fields of new and renewable sources of energy and science and technology for development, even though the most important proposal, namely, the launching of global negotiations, remained unimplemented.

89. Mr. DON NANJIRA (Kenya) said that he felt unable to join in the general atmosphere of self-congratulation and celebration. As far as his delegation was concerned, the current session had been extremely frustrating and had been marked by a number of very unsatisfactory features. First, some items which were usually considered by the Committee had not been discussed; for example, no resolution had been put forward on the participation of women in development. Secondly, the negative attitudes of certain developed countries had been very damaging. To approach negotiations, which necessarily involved some "give and take", with preconceived and hostile ideas was a very destructive way of proceeding and revealed a lack of political resolve and commitment - something of which the Committee could hardly be proud. Thirdly, the Committee's rather low level of achievement had been partly due to a lack of discipline on the part of all groups.

(Mr. Don Nanjira, Kenya)

For example, it had been agreed at the beginning of the session that there would be no opening general debate. The only result of that decision had been general debates of even greater length on individual items. Lastly, the attitude of the United Nations staff at the operational level had at times been less than helpful. The role of the operational staff of the Secretariat was supposedly to inform delegations and to assist them in solving any problems which they encountered; that had not been the case in certain areas, where the tendency had been rather to mislead delegations, an attitude perhaps prompted by vested interests in certain items.

90. It was important that in future delegations should meet - preferably informally and without reference to any North-South or other divisions - to exchange views, to determine what sort of improvements should be made in working methods and to select the items which should be given priority.

91. In conclusion, he observed that the conference services provided by the Secretariat had been very valuable and efficient.

92. The CHAIRMAN declared that the Committee had completed its work for the thirty-seventh session.

The meeting rose at 9.50 p.m.