



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 39th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. DIETZE (German Democratic Republic)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 78: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued)

- (a) INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY FOR THE THIRD UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT DECADE (continued)
- (b) TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT (continued)
- (d) SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued)
- (f) ECONOMIC AND TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION AMONG DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (continued)
- (j) EFFECTIVE MOBILIZATION AND INTEGRATION OF WOMEN IN DEVELOPMENT (continued)
- (k) UNITED NATIONS SPECIAL FUND (continued)
- (m) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SUBSTANTIAL NEW PROGRAMME OF ACTION FOR THE 1980s FOR THE LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 78: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued)

- (e) FOOD PROBLEMS (continued)
- (g) ENVIRONMENT (continued)
- (h) HUMAN SETTLEMENTS (continued)
- (i) INTERNATIONAL YEAR OF SHELTER FOR THE HOMELESS (continued)
- (n) NEW INTERNATIONAL HUMAN ORDER: MORAL ASPECTS OF 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 DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, 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.2/38/SR.39
18 November 1983

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

190

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 78: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued) (A/38/3 (parts I and II)), A/38/57, 68, 106, 132 and Corr.1 and 2, 168, 186 and Corr.1, 209, 302, 303, 324, 325, 329, 425, 479, 494, 495, 529, and 537; A/C.2/38/3, 5 and 6):

- (a) INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY FOR THE THIRD UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT DECADE (continued);
- (b) TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT (continued) (A/38/15, vols. I and II, A/38/363, 487, 557 and 580; TD/325 and Add.1; A/C.2/38/L.2 and L.3);
- (d) SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT; REPORT OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued) (A/38/37 (part I and Corr.1 and part II));
- (f) ECONOMIC AND TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION AMONG DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (continued) (A/38/39 and 493);
- (j) EFFECTIVE MOBILIZATION AND INTEGRATION OF WOMEN IN DEVELOPMENT (continued);
- (k) UNITED NATIONS SPECIAL FUND (continued);
- (m) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SUBSTANTIAL NEW PROGRAMME OF ACTION FOR THE 1980s FOR THE LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES; REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/38/471).

1. Mr. FERRARI (Executive Director, Centre for Science and Technology for Development) said that the question of science and technology for development must be given high priority because of the important and pervasive role which science and technology played in the development process and of their impact on the interdependence of nations. Although the Vienna Programme of Action represented a landmark in the international community's recognition of that fact, its implementation remained a challenging task.

2. Negotiation of the terms under which international co-operation in science and technology for development might be sustained and increased should focus on the common permanent interests of all parties. With the adoption of such an approach, and viewed from the perspective provided by the Vienna Conference, international co-operation should gain momentum, despite, or perhaps because of, the urgent need for solutions to world problems. Progress would continue to be made, not only with respect to such issues as the United Nations Financing System for Science and Technology for Development, but also in according science and technology for development its proper place in future international negotiations at the United Nations or elsewhere.

3. Referring to three aspects of the implementation of the Vienna Programme of Action, namely, the development and updating of its policy framework; the

/...

(Mr. Ferrari)

performance of co-ordinating and promotional activities needed to enhance its execution at the national, regional and international levels; and the performance of follow-up and evaluation activities, he said, with regard to the first aspect, that an important step had been taken by the Intergovernmental Committee when it had incorporated guidelines for the formulation of specific projects and programmes into the Vienna Programme. The guidelines provided further orientation regarding desired objectives for strengthening the endogenous scientific and technological capacities of developing countries; they had been prepared on the basis of Governments' responses to a questionnaire and reflected the views of the Advisory Committee on Science and Technology for Development and the experience gained by the ACC Task Force on Science and Technology for Development in designing and implementing joint activities within the United Nations system. The adoption of the guidelines represented the completion of an important stage in the development of specific policies and measures for implementing the Programme in such a way as to ensure appropriate intersectoral programming and co-ordination of scientific and technological activities, with due regard for the development priorities of individual States. An initial in-depth study of critical themes relating to the Vienna Programme had been completed by means of a series of five discussion panels conducted throughout the world in 1982 and 1983, two additional such panels would be organized in 1984. The panels had provided inputs for the joint activities of United Nations agencies and had offered guidance for the assistance and support rendered by those agencies in their respective fields of specialization to Member States. It was to be hoped that their findings and recommendations would furnish new information to promote implementation of the Programme.

4. With regard to co-ordination and promotional activities, the Centre had assisted in following up those provisions of the Major Programme on Science and Technology of the Medium-Term Plan that would entail the preparation of budget proposals for the 1984-1985 biennium. The major new activities to be carried out by the Department of International Economic and Social Affairs, the Department of Technical Co-operation for Development, UNEP, UNIDO and the Centre on Transnational Corporations appeared in the relevant sections of the proposed programme budget before the General Assembly. Those activities supplemented the activities of the Centre, UNCTAD and the five regional commissions, which constituted the core of the Major Programme. The relevant 1984-1985 programmes of FAO, UNESCO and WHO also contained significant innovations.

5. Turning to the crucial problem of co-operation and co-ordination within the United Nations system, he noted that the four working groups established by the ACC Task Force had completed their work and had formulated 24 joint activities. The Task Force had endorsed those activities and had agreed on a number of measures to facilitate their financing and implementation; those measures had subsequently been endorsed by ACC at its regular session in March 1983. In June 1983, the Intergovernmental Committee had decided that the proposed joint activities should serve as a basis for consultations with Member States; with regard to the financing of those activities, the Committee had decided that the relevant organizations of the United Nations system should mobilize resources from their programme budgets, and that lead agencies should seek extrabudgetary resources whenever necessary.

(Mr. Ferrari)

Moreover, the Financing System for Science and Technology for Development should support those joint activities so far as possible. The Intergovernmental Committee had requested the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation, in co-operation with the Centre, to monitor the overall implementation of those activities and report on them to the Committee annually. The Centre should also continue to identify additional fields for joint activities. Following those decisions, the Centre had actively sought to facilitate the implementation of those activities; the lead agencies concerned were finalizing detailed project reports and would submit them to external sources of funding as necessary.

6. At the request of the Intergovernmental Committee, the Centre had continued to maintain close co-operation and interaction with the network of national focal points. A meeting of representatives of national focal points for the African region had been held at Brazzaville and the Centre was preparing similar meetings for other regions with a view to strengthening the endogenous scientific and technological capacities of the developing countries. The Centre had also worked to promote the participation of the scientific community and appropriate non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in the implementation of the Vienna Programme. A preliminary consultation of such organizations from all regions had been organized jointly by the Centre and the Society for International Development at Rome in March 1983. After considering the report of that meeting, the Intergovernmental Committee had recommended that NGO involvement should be encouraged further. As part of its direct responsibilities for the implementation of the Vienna Programme, the Centre had launched the Advanced Technology Alert System (ATAS); national and regional ATAS-related activities and an international network of ATAS-related institutions were being promoted.

7. In the matter of follow-up and evaluation, the Director-General was scheduled to submit a report on a global mid-decade review of the implementation of the Vienna Programme to the Intergovernmental Committee at its seventh session in 1985. On the basis of that evaluation, the Intergovernmental Committee was expected to recommend additional measures for the implementation of the Programme during the remainder of the decade as part of the current review of the implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade.

8. The global review would draw extensively on national and regional progress reports being prepared by the regional commissions in co-operation with the Centre. In Africa, the review would be carried out by ECA and should provide an overall picture of achievements and setbacks in the implementation of the Monrovia Strategy and the Lagos Plan of Action as they related to the Vienna Programme. The results of the review would be submitted to ECA at its nineteenth session in April 1984. The central theme of the fortieth session of ESCAP, to be held in April 1984, would be technology for development. At the eleventh session of ECE, held at Geneva in September 1983, the Commission's Senior Advisers on Science and Technology had discussed arrangements for reviewing implementation of the Vienna Programme in Europe; the review would cover assistance from the countries of the region to

/...

(Mr. Ferrari)

developing countries in addition to scientific and technological developments in Europe. At ECLA, the Committee of High-Level Governmental Experts would meet in January 1984 to consider science and technology for development. The ECLA secretariat and the Centre had prepared a study on the progress achieved in Latin America since the Vienna Conference. The review by the Committee of High-Level Governmental Experts would be submitted to ECLA at its twentieth session, to be held in April 1984. In the ECWA region, specialized meetings on science and technology were to be held in 1983 and 1984, following the eleventh session of ECWA, to be held in April 1984, the review would be continued with a view to its completion by the end of that year.

9. Ms. ZHANG Zhong-an (China) said that the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade was important in that it represented a consensus reached following negotiations between North and South in the early 1980s. At the time of its adoption, her delegation had called on all Member States to work towards strategic targets. At present, the significance of the Strategy was further heightened by the fact that the North-South dialogue had reached a stalemate. Her delegation consequently attached special importance to the first comprehensive review and appraisal of the Strategy and hoped that it would lead to the adoption of concrete measures to reverse the current trends of declining international co-operation. The review should also strengthen the efforts of the United Nations and its agencies to implement the strategy with due regard to the prolonged world economic crisis.

10. She drew attention to the importance of international trade and development for the world economy. The recent world economic crisis had had serious effects on world trade which continued to be felt and, given those circumstances, UNCTAD had failed to make progress at its sixth session in important areas, thus missing an opportunity to contribute to the solution of the problems of developing countries. Discussion of international trade and development in the General Assembly should lead to action reflecting the spirit of the sixth session of UNCTAD and should address issues not solved during that session, focusing on the formulation of emergency measures to solve the problems of developing countries and on long-term measures for the establishment of a new international economic order.

11. The Common Fund for Commodities was an important means of promoting trade in the staple products of developing countries but it had yet to enter into operation. Her delegation hoped that the countries concerned, especially the developed countries playing an important role in international trade, would sign and ratify the agreement so that the Common Fund could start operating as soon as possible. In recent years, some countries had been talking of free trade but were resorting to quotas in their bilateral negotiations, particularly with developing countries; such practices violated the spirit of the resolutions adopted concerning protectionism and structural adjustments.

12. China appreciated the work of the Centre for Science and Technology for Development and favoured the establishment of a long-term financing system for enhancing the scientific and technological capacity of developing countries.

(Ms. Zhang Zhong-an, China)

The establishment of the Interim Fund had helped to meet the needs of the developing countries and had been welcomed by them. At its fifth session, the Intergovernmental Committee had agreed on voting rights for the Bureau, thereby eliminating obstacles to the institutional arrangements and she therefore hoped that agreement could be reached during the current session of the General Assembly on full consultations on financing.

13. She appealed to the developed countries to adopt a more positive attitude towards multinational co-operation in science and technology. China had always supported long-term financing for that purpose and within its limited resources would endeavour to do its share if the developed countries would do likewise.

14. The least developed countries had suffered most from the world economic crisis; there had been no real per capita increase in their GNP, and their food production, exports and purchasing power had all declined over the past two years, while their balance-of-payments situation had deteriorated because their export earnings were insufficient. That situation must be a cause of concern to the international community. The Substantial New Programme of Action for the 1980s for the Least-Developed Countries had been in operation for two years, and those countries had held round-table discussions with potential donors, but to little effect. She hoped that the major developed countries would soon reach the programmed target for official development aid, and implement the Trade and Development Board's resolution on foreign debts, thus creating favourable conditions for the economic development of the least developed countries.

15. South-South economic co-operation would make the developing countries collectively more self-reliant and would be of long-term significance. Her delegation supported South-South co-operation particularly in the present economic situation and already enjoyed good economic and technical co-operation with developing countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America. When the President of China had visited Africa earlier in 1983, he had enunciated four points of principle governing co-operation with African countries, namely, equality and mutual benefit; variety in the forms to be adopted; emphasis on effectiveness; and joint development. In the light of those principles her Government would increase its economic co-operation with the developing countries of Africa and other regions.

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (A/C.2/38/L.23/Rev.1, L.24/Rev.1 and L.34) (continued)

16. The CHAIRMAN recalled that draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.23/Rev.1 had been introduced by the representative of Senegal (A/C.2/38/SR.34). A statement on the relevant administrative and financial implications had been issued in document A/C.2/38/L.34.

17. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Committee) said that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.23/Rev.1 had made the following amendments: in paragraph 10 the word "colonies" should be replaced by the word "settlements" and the words "including a comparison between the practices of Israel and its obligations under international law" added at the end of the paragraph.

(Mr. Sevan)

18. Mali and Upper Volta had become co-sponsors of the draft resolution.
19. Mr. SALLAM (Yemen) and Mr. KITIKITI (Zimbabwe) said that they wished to join the sponsors of draft resolutions A/C.2/38/L.11 and A/C.2/38/L.23/Rev.1.
20. Mr. HILLEL (Israel), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.23/Rev.1 presented a distorted picture and was as one-sided as the corresponding resolutions of previous years. He rejected the condemnation of Israel in a draft resolution which merely sought to impose an irrelevant decision of no practical significance and was motivated solely by hostility to Israel and intentionally based on distorted information and a predetermined decision to deny any of the positive achievements in the administered territories. The situation there was in complete contrast to what could be inferred from the text of the draft resolution, the adoption of which would not affect the existing situation in any way. It was a matter for regret that the Committee had to waste so much time and energy every year in a futile exercise because the Arab sponsors showed flagrant disregard for the achievements of the Palestinian residents of the area.
21. Paragraph 10 called for a further elaboration of the report of the Secretary-General and was a further example of the professional legal services of the United Nations being abused to produce one-sided reports to satisfy the political aims of a majority, regardless of the true state of affairs. Israel had been trying to develop the resources of the territories and improve the standard of living there, in contrast with the inactivity of the Arab States which cared nothing for the plight of the Palestinians.
22. At the request of the representative of Jordan a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.23/Rev.1 as orally amended.
- In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey,

Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Botswana, Burma, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

23. The draft resolution was adopted by 110 votes to 2, with 20 abstentions.

24. Mrs. MARTINHO (Portugal) said that she had voted for the draft resolution but, as in previous years, her delegation reserved its position with regard to paragraph 7.

25. Mr. MAQUIEIRA (Chile) said that he had voted for the draft resolution because he was in agreement with its basic principles but, if paragraph 3 had been voted upon separately, he would not have supported it because he did not think it would contribute to the kind of co-operation which his delegation wished to achieve.

26. Mr. LEIFER (Austria) said that his delegation supported the general thrust of the draft resolution but agreed with its specific wording only in so far as it conformed to relevant norms of international law.

27. Mr. TOKCE (Turkey) said that he had supported the draft resolution in accordance with the well-known views of the Turkish Government on questions concerning the Middle East and Palestine.

28. Mr. MONSHEMVULA (Zaire) said that, although he had voted for the draft resolution, he had reservations on paragraph 3 which seemed to condemn Israel as a country, whereas the general practice was to condemn the policy of a country and not the country itself.

29. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) said that he had voted against the annual draft resolution on permanent sovereignty over natural resources which was wholly political both in content and in intent and raised issues which could only be solved by direct negotiations between the parties concerned. The expenditure of United Nations resources for a further report on the matter was unjustified.

30. Mr. AKAO (Japan) said that he had voted in favour of the draft resolution and generally supported the Arab States and peoples in the matter of their natural resources in the occupied territories. He hoped that that problem would be solved expeditiously by the parties concerned, in conformity with international law. His Government's views on the general question of permanent sovereignty over natural resources had been made clear on many previous occasions and had not changed.

31. Mr. BOYD (United Kingdom) noted from document A/C.2/38/L.34 that there would be financial implications of \$35,700 and hoped that there would be some offsetting savings.

32. Mr. YANE (Botswana) said that, although the print-out recording the vote showed him as abstaining, he had in fact voted for the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.24/Rev.1

33. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.24/Rev.1 which had been introduced by the representative of Bangladesh on behalf of the sponsors (A/C.2/38/SR.36); a recorded vote had been requested.

34. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Committee) said that the sponsors of the draft resolution had made the following amendments to the text: in paragraph 2: insert the word "assistance" between "UNDP" and "programme". In paragraph 3 (b), delete the words "to invite" and insert "to provide for the participation in the meeting of"; and, in the past line, delete "potential sources of co-operation to participate in the meeting" and insert "relevant intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations".

35. He announced that China, Madagascar, Mali and Viet Nam had become co-sponsors of the draft resolution.

36. Mr. KHATIB (Jordan), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that his delegation supported any assistance to the Palestinian people in the West Bank and Gaza and to Palestinian refugees, but his support for the draft resolution did not imply any endorsement of the imbalance in paragraphs 5 and 6. His Government had sole responsibility for the initiation, planning and organization of social and economic services to all Jordanian citizens, and any assistance to them must be subject to acceptance by the Jordanian Government, which would continue to assume responsibility for providing assistance to its people in the occupied territories.

37. Mr. HILLEL (Israel), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that his delegation continued to favour legitimate aid to the Palestinian Arab inhabitants of the administered territories and had co-operated with UNDP and other United Nations bodies to assist the Arab populations of Judea, Samaria and Gaza. Recent decisions by the UNDP Governing Council had tended to intensify such co-operation. Israel was endeavouring to help the Palestinian Arabs and had improved their standard of living in all respects, but would continue to oppose any form of co-operation with the PLO. The international community should dissociate itself from the so-called International Conference on the Question of Palestine referred to in the third paragraph of the preamble. His delegation would vote against the draft resolution.

38. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.24/Rev.1 as orally amended.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, 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, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

39. The draft resolution was adopted by 131 votes to 2.

40. Mr. PLECHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), explaining his delegation's vote on draft resolutions A/C.2/38/L.23/Rev.1, A/C.2/38/L.24/Rev.1, and A/C.2/38/L.11 about to be voted on, said that his vote was based on his Government's consistent position of principle regarding the need for a just and comprehensive settlement of the Middle East situation. He supported the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and national independence and sovereignty, and to create their own State under the leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization which had achieved broad international recognition as their sole legitimate representative. He resolutely condemned Israel and its accomplices for impeding the achievement of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, whose demands and those of the other Arab peoples to exercise the inalienable right of sovereignty over their natural resources in occupied Arab lands he fully supported. He condemned Israel for colonizing and continuing to occupy those lands

(Mr. Plechko, USSR)

and to perpetrate hostile acts against their peoples. His Government was concerned at the increased tension in the region resulting from the aggressive acts of Israel whose expansionist policy involved genocide against the Palestinian and Lebanese civilian populations. The road to peace in the Middle East lay through collective efforts by all interested parties, including the PLO as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestine people, and the best means to achieve peace was the convening of an international conference.

41. The Secretary-General's report on living conditions in those territories (A/C.2/38/278) confirmed the fact that the Palestinian people's lands were still occupied and that they were deprived of the right to control their own State. Therefore, on the principle of support for the just cause of the Arab people in Palestine, he would vote for draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.11. The Secretary-General, within existing resources, should continue his efforts in the area and should submit through the Economic and Social Council to the General Assembly at its thirty-ninth session a comprehensive analytical report on the living conditions of the Palestinian people in the occupied territories.

42. Mr. EXARCHOS (Greece), speaking on behalf of the States members of the European Economic Community, said that they had voted in favour of the draft resolution. The members of the Community would continue to offer assistance to the Palestinian people directly and through the Community and to the competent agencies of the United Nations, which could best decide on the channels through which to assist the Palestinian people.

43. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) said that his delegation had voted against the resolution because it contained references to the PLO, which was not recognized by his Government and which, through its refusal to recognize Israel, had impeded the peace process in the Middle East. His delegation would have supported a resolution on humanitarian assistance to the Palestinian people. The United States had contributed more than \$1 billion to UNRWA; the Soviet Union had contributed nothing. The United States would continue to express its concern for the Palestinian people through deeds, not words.

44. Mr. QUINLAN (Australia) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the resolution because it supported the issue of substance in it. The resolution did, however, contain a reference to the International Conference on the Question of Palestine; Australia had not participated in that Conference and was not, therefore, bound by the Declaration and Programme of Action adopted by it.

45. Mr. AKAO (Japan) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the resolution. He reaffirmed his delegation's position, namely that assistance to the Palestinian people by UNDP and other United Nations bodies should be provided by the same procedure as assistance to national liberation movements, in other words in close co-operation with the countries concerned.

46. Ms. DANIELSEN (Norway) said that by voting for the resolution her delegation had wished to express its support for the activities of the United Nations and specialized agencies to assist the Palestinian people. Nevertheless, the position of her Government towards the PLO remained unchanged.

47. Mr. ABU-KOASH (Observer, Palestine Liberation Organization) thanked those delegations which, by voting in favour of the resolutions, had supported the just cause of the Palestinian people. The representative of the United States had implied that deeds spoke louder than words. That was precisely the point at issue. According to the representative of the United States, his Government had contributed \$1 billion to UNRWA. The Committee should know, however, that the United States annually gave Israel \$2.5 billion in addition to material, military and moral assistance. No amount of money contributed to UNRWA could compensate the Palestinian people for the occupation of their homeland.

AGENDA ITEM 78: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued)

(e) Food Problems (continued) (A/C.2/38/L.4)

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.4

48. The CHAIRMAN said that the draft resolution entitled "Food and agriculture" in document A/C.2/38/L.4 had been transmitted by the Assembly for consideration at the thirty-seventh session and then deferred at that session to the current one. Informal consultations had been held and it had been agreed that no action should be taken.

49. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee decided that no action be taken on the draft resolution.

50. It was so decided.

(g) ENVIRONMENT (continued) (A/C.2/38/L.10, L.15, L.20, L.37, L.38)

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.10

51. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Committee) said that the sponsors of the draft resolution were those listed in document A/C.2/38/L.10 plus Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Comoros, Congo, Ghana, Maldives, Mali, Nigeria, Peru, Rwanda, Togo and Zambia.

52. Mr. de ROJAS (Venezuela) proposed two amendments: The words "States affected" in the first line of paragraph 3 should read "developing countries affected" and the words "affected countries" in the fourth line of paragraph 5 should read "affected developing countries".

53. The Venezuelan amendment to paragraph 3 was adopted.

54. The Venezuelan amendment to paragraph 5 was adopted.

55. A separate vote was taken on operative paragraph 5.
56. Operative paragraph 5, as orally amended, was adopted by 105 votes to 6, with 18 abstentions.
57. Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.10 as a whole, as orally amended, was adopted by 111 votes to none, with 23 abstentions.
58. Mr. WORKU (Ethiopia) said that his delegation had supported the resolution as a matter of principle for it realized the dangers posed by remnants of war even though Ethiopia had not been a major battlefield during the Second World War.
59. Mr. ASTAFIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had supported the draft resolution because of its consistent support for the just demands of the developing countries which were suffering from the remnants of imperialist colonial wars. He was merely reconfirming his delegation's position.
60. Ms. ERIKSSON (Sweden) said that, despite its belief that something should be done about the problem of remnants of war, her delegation had again been compelled to abstain in the vote. The possibility of achieving practical results in that field would be furthered if the controversial question of international responsibility and the related demand for compensation were left aside. The problem could be solved only by analysing factual information on the various aspects of the matter. Her delegation had studied with great interest the report of the Secretary-General on the problem of remnants of war (A/38/383). The study on explosive remnants of conventional war, annexed to the report, suggested a number of practical means of addressing the problem of clearing the remnants that constituted a threat to the environment. Finally she pointed out that a practical non-controversial approach to the problem was more likely to obtain the consensus of the international community.
61. Mr. TEP (Democratic Kampuchea) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution and would work for its implementation. However, one of the sponsors - Viet Nam - was conducting a war of aggression against his country, laying mines in rice-fields and spraying toxic chemicals on the land. Viet Nam had sponsored the resolution simply in an effort to present itself as a peace-loving country with a view to justifying its criminal invasion and occupation of Kampuchea.
62. Mr. ZUCCONI (Italy), speaking on behalf of the Federal Republic of Germany and the United Kingdom as well as Italy, said that they had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.10 and had voted against paragraph 5 because of the reservations expressed in respect of a similar text considered at the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly. The question of the remnants of war was important and had a humanitarian aspect. However, the wording of the draft resolution was not acceptable for it referred to bilateral negotiations and at the same time stated that developing countries affected might be entitled to compensation thus prejudging the outcome of the negotiations.

63. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote and had voted against paragraph 5 because the language of that paragraph was prejudicial to the outcome of any bilateral negotiations which might be held.

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.37

64. The CHAIRMAN said that draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.37, entitled "Study on financing the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification", had been submitted by the Vice-Chairman on the basis of informal consultations held on the draft resolution in document A/C.2/38/L.15.

65. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.37.

66. It was so decided.

67. Mr. GOTTELMANN (Federal Republic of Germany) said that, although his delegation had joined in the consensus on the draft resolution, his Government wished to reiterate its position on the establishment of an international financial corporation to finance international action to combat desertification. As it had stated at the eleventh session of the UNEP Governing Council, automatic transfers of resources such as additional taxes established under international law would have an adverse effect on the economy and on the availability of funds for official development assistance. His Government would not be able to contribute to such a corporation. It would, however, continue to combat desertification through its bilateral aid programme and had allocated considerable resources for that purpose.

68. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, in view of the adoption of draft A/C.2/38/L.37, draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.15 could be considered withdrawn.

69. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.38

70. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.38, entitled "Implementation in the Sudano-Sahelian region of the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification", had been submitted by the Vice-Chairmen on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.20.

71. If he heard no objection he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution.

72. It was so decided.

73. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, in view of the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.38, the draft resolution in document A/C.2/38/L.20 could be considered withdrawn.

74. It was so decided.

(h) HUMAN SETTLEMENTS (continued) (A/C.2/38/L.11 and L.25)

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.11

75. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.11, which had been introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the Committee's 30th meeting. A statement on the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution appeared in document A/C.2/38/L.25. A recorded vote on the draft resolution had been requested.

76. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Committee) said that Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Viet Nam, Yemen and Zimbabwe were also sponsors of the draft resolution.

77. In the third line of paragraph 3, the word "colonies" should be replaced by the word "settlements". In the fourth line of the same paragraph, the word "forcible" should be replaced by the words "displacement and" and the words "the Palestinian people" should be replaced by the word "Palestinians". In paragraphs 7 and 8, the word "colonies", wherever it occurred, should be replaced by the word "settlements".

78. Mr. ELIASHIV (Israel), explaining his delegation's vote before the vote, said that the biased nature of the draft resolution could not escape any objective observer. The draft was one-sided and based on false allegations. The motives behind it were obviously political in nature and formed part of a relentless campaign of political warfare against Israel in the United Nations. The main purpose of the sponsors was to enhance the status of the so-called PLO, a terrorist organization which was committed to the destruction of Israel, a State Member of the United Nations. It was absurd to speak of the deterioration in the living conditions of the Palestinian people when it was common knowledge that substantial progress had been made in every aspect of human life in Judea, Samaria and Gaza. Even the authors of the report in document A/38/278 could not ignore the continuing rapid growth rate of income per capita in the territories. By perpetuating the lies contained in the draft resolution, the Arab States themselves discredited the significant achievements made by Palestinian Arab inhabitants of the areas. Rather than the comparative study called for in paragraph 8 of the draft resolution, a study should be made comparing the living conditions of the Palestinian Arabs in the territories before and after 1967. By referring to the areas as "occupied Palestinian territories" the sponsors obviously sought to deny the Jewish people their inalienable rights to their land, the Land of Israel. The assertion in the text that a few thousand Israeli individuals in the midst of 1,186,000 Arabs constituted a "demographic change" or a "major obstacle to peace" was ludicrous. The presence of the Israelis created the form of coexistence which was essential to peace between the two peoples.

79. The CHAIRMAN, invoking rule 128 of the rules of procedure, requested the representative of Israel to limit his statement.

80. Mr. ELIASHIV (Israel) said that the settlements in Judea, Samaria and Gaza had been set up by volunteers, not by any forcible transfer of population.

(Mr. Eliashiv, Israel)

Agricultural production in the areas had doubled between 1970 and 1980 and the area under irrigation by Arab farmers had increased by 60 per cent since 1968. Moreover, Israel was encouraging and facilitating industrial development and free trade.

81. The draft resolution was completely uncalled for and his delegation would vote against it.

82. Mr. KAABACHI (Tunisia) asked how, since the authors of document A/38/278 had not been able to visit the occupied territories, they could testify to the improvement of living conditions in those territories.

83. A recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.2/38/L.11 as orally revised.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, 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, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

84. Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.11, as orally revised, was adopted by 131 votes to 2.

85. Mr. MAQUIERIA (Chile) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the resolution because of its humanitarian character. It did not, however, share all the views expressed in the text and considered that political matters had no place in a text of a humanitarian nature.
86. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the resolution. It hoped, however, that implementation of the provisions of paragraph 8 would not involve extra allocations over and above those already requested by the Secretary-General in his 1983-1985 programme budget.
87. Mr. GOBEIL (Canada) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the resolution because it agreed with its basic thrust, namely, that there was a need to improve living conditions in the occupied territories. Also, his delegation had noted that the language that had created difficulties for Canada in previous years had been omitted from the text.
88. Mr. AARDAL (Norway) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the resolution. He pointed out, however, that his delegation understood the phrase "occupied Palestinian territories" as used in paragraphs 1, 3, 6, 7 and 8 to mean territories occupied by Israel since 1967.
89. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) said that his delegation shared the concern of the international community about the conditions under which Palestinians were living in the Middle East. Its concern was not, however, confined to Palestinians in the West Bank; it also extended to Lebanon, where the actions of Palestinian factions and of their supporters had inflicted suffering on Palestinian people. The text just adopted would further exacerbate tensions in the area. The new report called for in the resolution would cost \$81,000, not one cent of which would find its way to needy Palestinians.
90. Mr. ABU-KOASH (Observer, Palestine Liberation Organization) said that the representative of Israel apparently hoped to convince the Committee that occupation was necessary for social and economic development. The facts were that Israel had confiscated about 60 per cent of the occupied Palestinian territories, used 90 per cent of their water resources and caused more than 10,000 Palestinians to leave the territories every year. It was ridiculous for Israel to refer to the PLO as a terrorist organization when only the previous year Israelis had shelled Palestinian camps, razed several Lebanese towns and bombarded Beirut. Furthermore, had not the current and former Prime Ministers of Israel at one time been terrorists?
91. The representative of the United States had said that his country was concerned about the living conditions of the Palestinians, but was it not true that the military material used by Israel was manufactured and donated by the United States?
92. Mr. BOYD (United Kingdom) said that his delegation hoped that the financial implications of the resolution would be met from existing resources and that offsetting savings would be found.

- (i) INTERNATIONAL YEAR OF SHELTER FOR THE HOMELESS (continued) (A/C.2/38/L.9 and L.26)

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.26

93. The Chairman drew attention to draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.26, entitled "International Year of Shelter for the Homeless", submitted by the Vice-Chairman on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.9.

94. If he heard no objection he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.26.

95. It was so decided.

96. Mr. PLECHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had not opposed the adoption by consensus of the draft resolution, on the understanding that the criteria set forth by the Economic and Social Council in resolution 1980/67 would be adhered to and that the preparations for the International Year would be financed from voluntary sources.

97. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) said that his delegation had joined in the consensus on the draft resolution; however, if the text had been put to the vote, his delegation would not have been able to support it fully because the provision for two P-5 and two local posts in the budget of the Centre for Human Settlements to support the International Year of Shelter for the Homeless programme represented real programme growth amounting to \$175,000.

98. At the same time, his delegation supported the implementation principles outlined in paragraph 8, sub-paragraphs (a) through (j), of the report of the Secretary-General (A/38/233). The bilateral efforts of his Government would conform to the basic principles for demonstration projects outlined in that report and would represent some \$750 million in new financing and \$25,000 to \$30,000 in grant assistance.

99. Mr. BOYD (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had joined in the consensus. However, if the draft resolution had been put to the vote, his delegation could not have supported it fully for its support was based on the understanding that programmes for the Year would be funded entirely from voluntary contributions. He, too, had noted the two P-5 and two local-level posts included in the budget of the Centre for activities related to the International Year.

- (n) NEW INTERNATIONAL HUMAN ORDER: MORAL ASPECTS OF DEVELOPMENT (continued) (A/C.2/38/L.14 and L.36)

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.36

100. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.26, entitled "New international human order: moral aspects of development", submitted by the Vice-Chairman on the basis of informal consultations on draft resolutions

(The Chairman)

A/C.2/38/L.6 and L.14. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.36.

101. It was so decided.

102. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines) said that his delegation had come a long way from its original position. It had agreed that the Secretary-General should report to the General Assembly at its fortieth session rather than at the thirty-ninth and also that Member States' comments should be sought on the question, including on the draft resolution in document A/C.2/38/L.6. He expressed the hope that, in preparing the report, the Secretary-General would benefit from the contributions of various departments of the Secretariat and other bodies, including the United Nations University, the United Nations Institute for Training and Research and the University for Peace.

103. Mr. de ROJAS (Venezuela) said that, when the international community considered the moral aspects of development, it should give priority to the international component of those aspects, particularly to international economic co-operation. His delegation would comment further on the subject at the fortieth session.

104. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.14 had been withdrawn.

105. It was so decided.

106. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had thus concluded its consideration of sub-item 78 (n).

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.