

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**
THIRTY-SEVENTH SESSION
*Official Records**



SECOND COMMITTEE
48th meeting
held on
Monday, 13 December 1982
at 6 p.m.
New York

COPY:
DO NOT REMOVE
FROM ROOM
L-201 (W.W.R.R.)

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 48th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. FAFOWORA (Nigeria)

CONTENTS

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

- AGENDA ITEM 74: SPECIAL ECONOMIC AND DISASTER RELIEF ASSISTANCE (continued)
AGENDA ITEM 71: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued)
AGENDA ITEM 72: OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR DEVELOPMENT (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.48
20 December 1982

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 7.30 p.m.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the two Vice-Chairmen of the Committee to report on the informal consultations on the remaining draft resolutions before the Committee.
2. Mr. FAREED (Pakistan), Vice-Chairman, said that despite goodwill and hard work, it had not been possible to reach agreement on draft resolutions A/C.2/37/L.5 and L.74 concerning, respectively, food problems and new and renewable sources of energy. It had therefore been decided to ask for a further extension, to Thursday morning, 16 December, bearing in mind the need for delegations to seek instructions from their Governments.
3. Mr. PAPADATOS (Greece), Vice-Chairman, supported the request for an extension, since at least two days would be needed to consider a new draft resolution on science and technology for development which had just been distributed.
4. Mr. CHOWDHURY (Bangladesh) proposed, supported by Mr. IVERSEN (Denmark), on behalf of the Group of 77, that action on draft resolutions A/C.2/37/L.5, L.74, and L.101 and on the draft resolution on science and technology for development should be deferred until Thursday afternoon, in order to allow further time for informal consultations.
5. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that a further extension would cause difficulties for the President of the General Assembly and the plenary itself. However, in view of the importance of informal consultations with a view to reaching agreement, he invited the Committee to agree to extend the deadline for a decision on draft resolutions A/C.2/37/L.5, L.74, L.101 and the draft resolution on science and technology for development until the evening of Thursday, 16 December.
6. It was so agreed.

AGENDA ITEM 74: SPECIAL ECONOMIC AND DISASTER RELIEF ASSISTANCE (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.82/Rev.1

7. Mr. SZEREMETA (Poland) said, with reference to draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.82/Rev.1, which had been adopted, as orally revised, at the 47th meeting, that his delegation's position on the Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator (UNDRO) had not changed since 1981, when it had been explained in a statement on behalf of a number of socialist States after the adoption of General Assembly resolution 36/225. However, in his delegation's opinion, the resolution dealt, in a rather confusing manner, with two topics: an assessment of what UNDRO was doing and an attempt to reformulate the principles governing its operation. While not agreeing with the content of the draft resolution on the latter topics, his delegation recognized the valuable aid activities being carried out by UNDRO and had therefore abstained in the vote on the draft resolution.

8. Mr. DIECKMANN (Federal Republic of Germany) said that he had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.82/Rev.1. His delegation had taken an active part in consultations aimed at broad understanding and support for UNDRO, and it recognized the need for timely action in disasters and consequently for quick decisions on employment of temporary staff and procurement of supplies. It agreed to the increased expenditure provided for in paragraph 8 and to the mobilization of additional voluntary funds through the Co-ordinator, but had strong reservations on paragraph 13.

9. During the protracted negotiations on General Assembly resolution 36/225 in 1981 it had become clear that there were shortcomings in UNDRO's effectiveness and efficiency, and it was in that context that the Secretary-General had been requested to submit a comprehensive report to the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session. Although UNDRO had made some progress in 1982, his delegation considered that major decisions on staff increases and financial and organizational matters should be taken in the light of that report and the debate on it in the Committee. Paragraph 5 of the statement of administrative and financial implications (A/C.2/37/L.107) did not adequately explain the immediate need for new posts.

10. Miss COURSON (France) said that her delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.82/Rev.1 because it attached great importance to the co-ordination of humanitarian assistance in disaster situations; she regretted that there had not been a consensus. However, it would be premature to decide at the current session to strengthen the Office of the Co-ordinator; the report to be submitted by the Secretary-General at the thirty-eighth session should be awaited. If a separate vote had been taken on paragraph 13, her delegation would have abstained.

11. Mr. FULZ (Czechoslovakia) said that he shared the concern which had been expressed concerning draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.82/Rev.1. His delegation had voted against it because its provisions would violate the United Nations Charter, and departed from the customary practice of the Organization's statutory bodies and because it could not support the provisions requiring increased expenditure.

12. Miss GARICA DONOSO (Ecuador) said that she had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.82/Rev.1 as an indication of her Government's appreciation and support for UNDRO's activities in favour of disaster-prone countries. However, in the light of the extension of UNDRO's mandate pursuant to General Assembly resolution 36/225, she wished to emphasize her delegation's firm support for UNDRO's essential function of assisting countries suffering natural disasters, which had been the main reason for establishing the agency.

13. Mr. PRODROMOU (Cyprus) said that had he been present at the time of the vote, he would have voted in favour of the draft resolution.

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

Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.94/Rev.1

14. Mr. CHOWDHURY (Bangladesh), introducing draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.94/Rev.1 on behalf of the Group of 77, said that it took account of the concerns of many

/...

(Mr. Chowdhury, Bangladesh)

delegations which had participated in the informal consultations and which trusted that it would achieve a consensus. A minor revision was to be made in the last line of the third preambular paragraph: the words "prospects of the" should be added after "development".

15. Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.94/Rev.1, as revised, was adopted.

16. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) said that there was much in the draft resolution with which he agreed, but there was much that was misleading. He had not wished to block a consensus. His delegation's position was, first, that it did not deny that countries were experiencing difficult economic times. Pressures on the international economic system were growing and could create serious economic dislocation and structural disequilibrium. However, he did not view the situation in terms quite as grave as those used in the draft resolution and wished to dissociate his delegation from the description of the international economic situation contained in the final preambular paragraph. Prevailing economic trends should be fully analysed with a view to making improvements where necessary, but to call such an analysis one of negative economic trends was to prejudge the results. Secondly, no attempt should be made to answer questions in advance - as seemed to be the case in the draft resolution. Thirdly, regarding the manner in which trends were to be selected for analysis, he wondered whether trends in all countries would be looked at or whether the focus would be only on policies in the developed countries, and whether information would be given on the effects of economic decisions by socialist countries on the health of the world economy. He trusted that all important questions would be dealt with equally.

17. Mr. BAKALOV (Bulgaria) speaking on behalf of the delegations of the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Ukrainian SSR and his own country, said that the debate in the Committee had shown that the overwhelming majority of delegations assessed the world economic situation as unfavourable. The general conclusion of the socialist countries was that the continuing crisis of world capitalism had seriously aggravated the financial, trade and economic problems of the developing countries, and that attempts had been made in certain circles to hinder the development of normal international economic co-operation, create new obstacles to the just restructuring of international economic relations and disregard progressive United Nations decisions on the establishment of a new international economic order. The world economy was also affected by the determination of the imperialist forces to continue the arms race and to dominate economic relations by undermining economic relations between countries, using methods that were incompatible with the principles of international law, such as blackmail, sanctions, economic boycott and blockade.

18. His delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.94/Rev.1 because the analysis proposed in it could produce sound guidelines for eliminating negative trends in the world economy. The adoption of the resolution was an indication of the growing concern about the future of the world's economic development and the desire of the majority of countries to expand mutually beneficial international economic co-operation and seek just ways of solving global problems in the interests of all countries, including the developing countries.

Draft resolution in document A/C.2/37/L.4

19. Mr. CHOWDHURY (Bangladesh) said that the issues raised in the draft resolution in document A/C.2/37/L.4 were of great concern to the Group of 77, which considered it important for the General Assembly to adopt a resolution on the subject as soon as possible. There was ample evidence of the tendency of many countries, especially developed countries, to protect their industries by restrictive trade, especially in times of unemployment. The developed countries should resist such trends. Uncompetitive industries should not be propped up by tariff and non-tariff barriers but should be progressively phased out and the resources released directed into other growth sectors. Workers in the developing countries suffered particularly from the effects of protectionism since they lacked the generous social welfare systems of the developed countries.

20. The draft resolution before the Committee had been deferred at two previous sessions owing to lack of time. At the the previous session a host of amendments had been submitted which the Group of 77 had found helpful in some cases but unacceptable in most, as they had tended to undermine the intent to produce a balanced draft resolution. The Group of 77 had refrained from raising the issue earlier in the session in view of the GATT Ministerial Meeting at the end of November, but they understood that little that was positive and helpful to the developing world had come out of the meeting. Their commitment to the draft resolution was therefore even more resolute. Since, however, there would not be enough time to give the draft resolution the consideration it deserved, the Group of 77 was proposing that the matter should be referred to the sixth session of UNCTAD, to be held in June 1983, and that future action should be decided on at the following session of the General Assembly in the light of developments at the UNCTAD session.

21. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, in view of the statement by the representative of Bangladesh, no action should be taken on the draft resolution and that the General Assembly should revert to the question at its thirty-eighth session.

22. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.24

23. Mr. CHOWDHURY (Bangladesh) introduced draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.24 on behalf of the Group of 77. Despite exchanges of views in recent weeks, there were still, unfortunately, differences over the text. The issues raised in the draft resolution were extremely important to the Group of 77, which considered that the General Assembly should adopt policy guidelines on the reverse transfer of technology, in accordance with the International Development Strategy for the Third Development Decade and with UNCTAD resolution 102 (V). Work on policy measures had been in abeyance for some time, and the Group of 77 considered that the time had come to make a new start with a view to mitigating the adverse effects of the reverse transfer of technology on the developing countries.

24. Some provisions of the text had been revised. The words "included in the report of the Trade and Development Board on its twenty-fifth session" were to be

(Mr. Chowdhury, Bangladesh)

added at the end of the final preambular paragraph; in paragraph 4 the words "the World Health Organization, the United Nations Institute for Training and Research" were to be added before "the Statistical Office", and the words "their actions" were to be replaced by the "measures"; and in paragraph 5 (b) the words "through the Committee on Transfer of Technology at its fifth session" were to be replaced by "at its twenty-fifth session".

25. 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.24.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, 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, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Greece.

26. Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.24, as revised, was adopted by 106 votes to 21, with 1 abstention.

27. Mr. PAPADATOS (Greece) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution even though it supported its intent. With regard to paragraph 5, he said that more information was needed before policy recommendations were made and concrete measures taken. The problem of the measurement of human resource flows was likewise not adequately defined.

28. Mr. BAKALOV (Bulgaria), speaking on behalf of the Socialist States, said that they had consistently supported the just demands of the developing countries regarding the outflow of trained national personnel and had accordingly voted in favour of the draft resolution. The main cause of the brain drain lay in the economic inequality between the developed capitalist countries and developing countries, and that could be remedied only by the establishment of a new international economic order. Another cause was the activities of transnational corporations, which were linked to the neo-colonialist policies of the capitalist countries. The Socialist countries believed that the entire United Nations system should play an active role in seeking solutions to that problem within the framework of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States. The developing countries themselves needed to institute progressive socialist reforms in keeping with their national development plans.

29. Mr. ZHONG Shukong (China) said that his delegation had supported the draft resolution because it referred mainly to the outflow of technology. China wholeheartedly sympathized with the developing countries' position on that problem. His delegation agreed that the solution to the problem lay in the establishment of a new international economic order and that the developed countries that received those trained immigrants should work with developing countries towards an acceptable solution.

Draft resolution A/C.2/27/L.122

30. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the statement of the financial implications of the draft resolution (A/C.2/37/L.105). Members would note that draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.100, to which the statement referred, had been withdrawn and replaced by the proposal before the Committee.

31. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) said that his delegation still did not believe that there was a need for a United Nations Conference on the Conditions for Registration of Ships. However, because it did not wish to block consensus within the Committee, it would not call for a vote on the draft resolution but would not participate in its adoption. That position was being taken without prejudice to possible United States participation in the meetings of the Preparatory Committee for the Conference.

32. Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.122 was adopted without a vote.

33. Mr. BAKALOV (Bulgaria), speaking on behalf of the Socialist States, said that they had supported draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.122 and reaffirmed their position regarding financing, namely that, as they had stated in the Trade and Development Board, the Conference should be financed from available resources.

34. Mr. TANIGUCHI (Japan) said that his delegation had joined in the consensus in a spirit of co-operation and compromise. However, his Government found it difficult to subscribe to the 20 per cent target for the share of developing countries in the dead-weight tonnage of the world merchant fleet by 1990. That position had been set forth during the preparation of the International Development

(Mr. Taniguchi, Japan)

Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade. His delegation believed that the draft agreement referred to in paragraph 4 should be kept open so that the work of the Preparatory Committee did not prejudice the decisions of the Conference.

35. Mr. IVERSEN (Denmark) said that the members of the European Economic Community had been happy to join in the consensus. However, as they had stated earlier, they had reservations regarding the 20 per cent target referred to in the second preambular paragraph and they maintained that position.

36. Mr. KUMLIN (Sweden), speaking on behalf of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and his own delegation, said that the Nordic countries had joined in the consensus. However, they maintained their position regarding the 20 per cent target referred to in the second preambular paragraph.

Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.115

37. The CHAIRMAN said that the draft resolution had no financial implications and invited the Committee to adopt it without a vote.

38. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.125

39. Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.125 was adopted without a vote.

Draft decision A/C.2/37/L.95

40. Mr. SOBHAN (Bangladesh) said that the sponsors had revised the title of draft decision A/C.2/37/L.95 by deleting the words "and technical". The Group of 77 had always attached great importance to economic co-operation among developing countries as an essential requirement for the establishment of the new international economic order. The Group of 77 felt that the United Nations system had a definite role to play in that sphere. The Group also believed that ample scope existed within the United Nations system to promote economic co-operation among developing countries and accordingly wished the Trade and Development Board and UNCTAD itself to pursue their efforts to improve the basis for it. It was on the understanding that that would be done that the Group of 77 had decided to withdraw draft decision A/C.2/37/L.95, and it hoped that that gesture would be duly rewarded - in particular, by the successful outcome of the sixth session of UNCTAD.

Draft decision A/C.2/37/L.120

41. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to adopt draft decision A/C.2/37/L.120 without a vote; draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.72 on the same subject had been withdrawn by the sponsors.

42. It was so decided.

43. Mr. BAKALOV (Bulgaria), speaking on behalf of the Socialist countries, said that they had repeatedly set forth their position on the restructuring process and

(Mr. Bakalov, Bulgaria)

that that position was unchanged. They supported Economic and Social Council resolution 1982/50 because it drew attention to the unremitting attempts that were being made to steer the work of the Council towards revising the Charter of the United Nations. The Socialist countries had always objected to those attempts in the belief that Article 59 of the Charter was sufficiently broad to ensure international economic and social co-operation and that maximum use should be made of it. The Socialist countries had not objected to the adoption of draft decision A/C.2/37/L.120 because its purpose was to have the international community study the earlier resolutions on the restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system and see to what extent restructuring had eliminated duplication and whether the process was conducive to the establishment of a new international economic order and consistent with the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States.

44. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) said that his delegation interpreted paragraph (j) to mean that a Secretary-General's Bulletin (SGB) and a section of the United Nations organizational manual would be issued immediately detailing the duties and authority of the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation on the lines suggested in paragraph 26 of the JIU report (A/36/419).

45. The CHAIRMAN said that there were no proposals before the Committee under item 71 (k), and he therefore proposed that the Committee should take note of the report of the Secretary-General on the progress made in the preparation of a world survey on the role of women in development (A/37/381).

46. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.121

47. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to adopt draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.121 without a vote; draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.78 on the same subject had been withdrawn.

48. It was so decided.

49. Mr. TANIGUCHI (Japan) said that, while his delegation had joined in the consensus on the draft resolution, its position on the Substantial New Programme of Action referred to in paragraph 3 remained unchanged.

50. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) said that the United States had long recognized the special problems faced by the least developed countries and had accordingly supported the adoption of the Substantial New Programme of Action and assisted in its implementation. His delegation had been pleased to join in the consensus on the draft resolution, which recognized that the domestic policies pursued by the individual least developed countries were of critical importance to their development and that international support measures played a vital contributory role in the development process.

(Mr. Goodman, United States)

51. With regard to the final preambular paragraph and paragraph 3, the United States had made an interpretative statement at the time of the adoption of the Substantial New Programme of Action that contained objections to several elements in paragraphs 61-69 of that Programme. It continued to oppose a specific GNP-related target for overseas development assistance - a special drawing rights-AID link and the concept of international taxation. The United States did not acknowledge any commitment to implement those elements.

52. With regard to paragraph 14, his delegation noted that chapter III of the Substantial New Programme of Action assigned UNCTAD only a focal role in formulating detailed arrangements at the global level for implementing the Programme. The main component of that focal role was monitoring the implementation of the Programme at the global level. His delegation did not consider that requesting the Secretary-General of UNCTAD to prepare a report to the sixth session of UNCTAD on activities in implementation of the Programme was tantamount to amending or expanding the expressly limited mandate given to UNCTAD in the Substantial New Programme of Action with regard to its implementation.

53. Mr. BAKALOV (Bulgaria) said the position of the Socialist countries with regard to the complex issue of the Substantial New Programme of Action had been set forth at the Conference on the Least Developed Countries. The Socialist countries had contributed assistance to the least developed countries in keeping with their economic structures and their measures to strengthen détente and achieve real disarmament. The least developed countries themselves should speed up their industrialization and work to eliminate the negative effects of the activities of transnational corporations. UNCTAD could play an active role in that field. The main task of the United Nations was to make maximum use of its potential in implementing the Substantial New Programme of Action; any measures contemplated should be undertaken within existing resources.

Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.96/Rev.1

54. Mr. CHOWDHURY (Bangladesh), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, said that the thrust of the draft resolution was the development of the energy resources of developing countries and that its provisions were to be implemented only in that context. The comprehensive report which the Secretary-General had been asked to prepare should focus on the ways and means of developing energy resources in developing countries that were outlined in paragraph 1.

55. 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.96/Rev.1.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, 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, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, 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, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

56. Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.96/Rev.1 was adopted by 127 votes to 1.

57. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America), said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution because the terms of reference of the report called for in paragraph 1 did not give sufficient attention to the private sector or to the need to study energy supply and demand and energy prices. Furthermore, his delegation could not participate in an implicit call for an energy affiliate of the World Bank. At the urging of the sponsors of the draft resolution, his delegation had made specific suggestions with a view to improving the text, but the sponsors had rejected them without discussing their merits. Consequently, his delegation considered that it was the sponsors, not his delegation, which had made it impossible for the draft resolution to be adopted by consensus.

58. Mr. IVERSEN (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the States members of the Europe Economic Community, said that they had voted in favour of the draft resolution in the belief that the development of energy resources in energy deficient developing countries was extremely important, not only for them but for the world community as a whole. It was their hope that further discussions of energy problems within the United Nations would follow the approach outlined in paragraphs 126 and 127 of the International Development Strategy, which viewed co-operation in the energy sector in the overall context of international co-operation. Many studies of energy problems had been conducted by the World Bank and the International Energy Agency and his delegation urged the Secretary-General to take account of those studies in the preparation of the comprehensive report requested in paragraph 1. The countries members of the European Community attached importance to the expansion of lending, including lending from private and commercial sources, to facilitate the exploration and development of energy resources.

59. Mr. TANIGUCHI (Japan) said that his delegation had, reluctantly, voted in favour of the draft resolution. With some modifications, the draft resolution could have provided a firm basis for reviewing how developing countries were being assisted in dealing with their energy problems and developing their own national plans. His delegation would, however, do its utmost to help to implement the provisions of the resolution. The energy problems of one country or a group of countries could not be considered in isolation; they had to be viewed in a broader global context with a view to finding a comprehensive solution.

60. Mr. CHOWDHURY (Bangladesh), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, said, in response to the statement made by the United States delegation, that the spirit of compromise and understanding of the Group of 77 had been duly reflected in the vote on the draft resolution. The vote had clearly shown where responsibility for the failure to adopt the draft resolution by consensus lay.

The meeting was suspended at 9.10 p.m. and resumed at 10.35 p.m.

61. Mr. ZIDUEMBA (Upper Volta) said that, had his delegation been present for the votes on draft resolutions A/C.2/37/L.24 and L.96/Rev.1, it would have voted in favour of both and would also have joined in the consensus on the other draft resolutions adopted in the course of the day.

Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.118/Rev.1

62. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to adopt resolution A/C.2/37/L.118/Rev.1 by consensus and to take note of the statement (A/C.2/37/L.119/Rev.1) of the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution.

63. It was so decided.

64. Mr. BAKALOV (Bulgaria), speaking on behalf of the Group of Eastern European States, said that they had joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.118/Rev.1 on the understanding that all the measures it provided for would be funded from existing UNIDO funds.

Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.73/Rev.1

65. Mr. FAREED (Pakistan), Vice-Chairman, said that the status of the proposal before the Committee was that of a draft resolution submitted by the Vice-Chairman after intensive informal consultations. The text of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.73/Rev.1 was to be revised as follows: in paragraph 7, the words "the aggravation of" should be deleted; in paragraph 8 the words "an integrated" should be replaced by "a comprehensive and interrelated" and the words "continue in particular" by ", in particular, continue"; in paragraph 9 the word "particular" should be added before the word "contribution", in the second line "a" should be added after "ensuring" and in the seventh line the words "establishment of the" should be replaced by "attainment of a".

66. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to adopt draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.73/Rev.1, as orally revised by the Vice-Chairman.

67. It was so decided.

68. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) observed that a laudable degree of effort and willingness to compromise had made possible the consensus on the resolution just adopted. His delegation had sought a resolution on the sixth session of UNCTAD that would not prejudice its preparatory phase, its agenda or its outcome, one whose descriptions of the economic situation would be fair and neutral and not merely representative of the views of a single group of countries; one that confined itself to the sixth session of UNCTAD without speculating on the seventh session, and one that did not specifically endorse a new international economic order or connect the sixth session of UNCTAD to its implementation. While draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.73/Rev.1 still fell short of its wishes on some points, his delegation had looked at the totality and joined the consensus, a fact that testified to its willingness to participate actively and constructively in the Conference.

69. Mr. SOBHAV (Bangladesh), on behalf of the Group of 77, said that the Group had engaged in intensive consultations with other members of the Committee in the hope of achieving consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.73/Rev.1. The revised wording of paragraph 9 concerning the new international economic order had been agreed to by the Group solely in order to bring the language into line with that of the provisional agenda of the sixth session of UNCTAD. The expression "establishment of the new international economic order" had been embodied in a number of General Assembly resolutions, including that containing the International Development Strategy, and the Group wanted to use it in all subsequent draft resolutions.

70. Mr. ZHONG Shukong (China) said that he concurred with the view of the Group of 77 that the revision to which the previous speaker had referred in no way detracted from earlier General Assembly resolutions regarding the establishment of the new international economic order.

Draft resolution A/C.2/37/76/Rev.1.

71. Mr. CHOWDHURY (Bangladesh), speaking as Chairman of the Group of 77, said that major changes had been made in paragraphs 4, 5 and 7 of section A and paragraph 2 of section B of the revised text, which was the result of extensive consultations. Regrettably, consensus had not been achieved. The Group of 77 had gone to great lengths to meet the concerns of a number of delegations, particularly with regard to the financing of the appointment of senior industrial development field advisers. The compromise reflected in paragraph 4 of section A of the revised draft resolution followed the recommendation in decision 82/38 of the UNDP Governing Council that UNIDO should bear an increased share of the cost of the senior industrial development field advisers programme and the Economic and Social Council's recommendation that the General Assembly should provide the resources needed to finance those advisers. Industrial development field advisers were due

(Mr. Chowdhury, Bangladesh)

to be appointed in the least-developed countries, particularly in Africa, and the Group of 77 considered it very important to take a decision to finance up to 10 additional posts for 1983. It therefore hoped that the Committee would vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole, and, specifically, of paragraphs 4, 5 and 7, dealing with the industrial development field advisers programme.

72. Mr. IVERSEN (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the member countries of the European Economic Community, said that the Community also regretted that it had not been possible to reach a consensus. The EEC strongly supported the Industrial Development Decade for Africa, the subject of part B of the draft resolution. If section B was put to the vote separately, the EEC countries would vote in favour of it. The Community attached great importance to industrial development activities, especially by UNIDO, but some of the operative paragraphs of the revised draft resolution posed major difficulties. In paragraph 4 of section A, for instance, the operational activities described should be financed from voluntary contributions. The Community also felt that the statement of financial implications contained in the document (A/C.2/37/L.106) went far beyond anything agreed to or even discussed in the relevant subsidiary political organs of the United Nations. With regard to paragraph 6 of the revised draft resolution, the Community felt that no decision should be taken at the current session of the General Assembly that would prejudice discussions still to be held by the competent bodies in Vienna regarding technical and political preparations for the fourth General Conference of UNIDO.

73. On behalf of the member States of the European Economic Community, his delegation requested a separate vote on paragraphs 4 and 7 of section A of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.76/Rev.1.

74. Paragraphs 4 and 7 of section A of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.76/Rev.1 were adopted by 91 votes to 19, with 11 abstentions.

75. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.76/Rev.1 as a whole.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, 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, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

76. Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.76/Rev.1 was adopted by 101 votes to 9, with 12 abstentions.

77. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) said that the United States regretted having had to vote against the draft resolution as a whole because it recognized the importance of UNIDO technical assistance. It had been unable, however, to accept the approximately \$4-million increases in total funding levels envisaged in document A/C.2/37/L.106, and was especially disappointed that a substantial portion of that amount related to the fourth General Conference of UNIDO, a meeting which might well not take place under General Assembly auspices since UNIDO might soon become a specialized agency. On matters concerning financing mechanisms such as those dealt with in draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.76/Rev.1, his Government felt strongly that the World Bank and the regional development banks were the competent organizations.

78. Mr. BAKALOV (Bulgaria), speaking on behalf of the Socialist countries, said that they had voted against draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.76/Rev.1 because they opposed further expansion of the System of Consultations, which aimed at attracting foreign private investment to developing countries under the United Nations flag. They could likewise not agree to transferring the financing of senior industrial development field adviser posts to the regular United Nations budget.

79. The Socialist countries believed that the fourth General Conference of UNIDO should be funded from the existing regular budget appropriations and that the expert group meetings proposed, which involved financial implications of \$684,000 for the regular budget, were unjustified. The Industrial Development Decade for Africa should be financed either from existing resources or from voluntary contributions so as to effect maximum savings and optimum use of United Nations resources. The Socialist countries saw draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.76/Rev.1 as an attempt to embody in UNIDO practice a trend that was against the interests of the industrialization of developing countries and was not likely to hasten the conversion of UNIDO into a specialized agency.

80. Mr. TANIGUCHI (Japan) said that his delegation had voted against paragraphs 4 and 7 of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.76/Rev.1 and abstained in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole. It believed that the work of the senior industrial development field advisers was operational and should therefore be financed from voluntary sources. It was convinced neither of the necessity of the five expert group meetings referred to in paragraph 7 nor of the heavy additional financial requirements for the preparation of the fourth General Conference. If section B of

(Mr. Taniguchi, Japan)

the draft resolution had been put to the vote separately, Japan could have voted in favour of it. It regretted that a draft resolution having such extensive financial and programme implications should have been adopted by a vote.

AGENDA ITEM 72: OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.123

81. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to adopt draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.123 without a vote; he took it that the sponsors had withdrawn draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.92.

82. It was so decided.

83. Mr. DIECKMANN (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation had joined in the consensus on the draft resolution as an indication of the constructive attitude of his Government regarding United Nations agencies. However, it had doubts about paragraphs 4 and 6 because it had always maintained that funds for operational activities for development should have no targets, merely indicative figures. Moreover, his delegation saw no need to request the Director-General to study the feasibility and usefulness of establishing targets for voluntary contributions.

84. Mr. BAKALOV (Bulgaria), speaking on behalf of the Socialist delegations, said that, in joining in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.123, they had reaffirmed their position with regard to full observance of the universal and voluntary nature of participation in all UNDP activities and of the principles contained in the 1970 Consensus and subsequent decisions of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council. Violations of those fundamental principles would change the nature of UNDP. The Socialist delegations also reaffirmed their disapproval of efforts to strengthen the role and impact of the World Bank and other pro-Western financial credit institutions within the United Nations system, since their activities were not consistent with the goals of the Charter. The aspirations of specific Western circles to channel the bulk of UNDP's efforts into pre-investment were intended to promote the penetration of foreign capital, especially from transnational corporations, into the economies of developing countries and infringed the sovereign right of recipient countries to decide on their own national development goals and plans.

Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.124

85. Mr. FAREED (Pakistan), Vice-Chairman, drew attention to the following revisions: in the seventh preambular paragraph, the word "negative" should be replaced by "serious"; in paragraph 2, a semicolon should be added after the words "forward planning" and "long-term" should be replaced by "longer-term"; and in paragraph 4 the words "approaching or exceeding" should be replaced by "approaching, equalling or exceeding".

86. Draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.124, as orally revised, was adopted.

87. Mr. BAKALOV (Bulgaria), speaking on behalf of the socialist countries, said that he had not objected to the adoption of the draft resolution without a vote. At the same time, the delegations reasserted their position on decision 82/5 of 18 June 1982 of the Governing Council of UNDP. Any proposals to change the voluntary nature of contributions to UNDP or to expand its involvement with private sources of financing were contrary to the fundamental principles of UNDP. The Socialist delegations reiterated their reservations with regard to the Intersessional Committee of the Whole and its mandate, as stated in their joint statement submitted at the second regular session of the Economic and Social Council in 1982.

88. The CHAIRMAN said that he took it that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.75 had withdrawn their proposal.

The meeting rose at 11.05 p.m.