



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 55th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. DIETZE (German Democratic Republic)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 81: SPECIAL ECONOMIC AND DISASTER RELIEF ASSISTANCE (continued)

(b) SPECIAL PROGRAMMES OF ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

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

(c) INDUSTRIALIZATION

(d) SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT

(m) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SUBSTANTIAL PROGRAMME OF ACTION FOR THE 1980s FOR  
THE LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES

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

AGENDA ITEM 79: OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued)

(e) UNITED NATIONS VOLUNTEERS PROGRAMME

(f) UNITED NATIONS SPECIAL FUND FOR LAND-LOCKED DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

(g) UNITED NATIONS CHILDREN'S FUND

UN LIBRARY

UN/SA COLLECTION

\*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.55  
23 December 1983  
ENGLISH  
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

The meeting was called to order at 8.45 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 81: SPECIAL ECONOMIC AND DISASTER RELIEF ASSISTANCE (continued)  
(A/C.2/38/L.99)

(b) SPECIAL PROGRAMMES OF ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

AGENDA ITEM 78: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued)  
(A/C.2/38/L.12, L.13, L.74, L.81, L.96, L.100, L.104, L.105 and L.107)

(c) INDUSTRIALIZATION

(d) SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT

(m) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SUBSTANTIAL PROGRAMME OF ACTION FOR THE 1980s FOR THE  
LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)  
(A/C.2/38/L.30, L.35 and L.106\*)

AGENDA ITEM 79: OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued) (A/C.2/38/L.93,  
L.95, L.103 and L.108)

(e) UNITED NATIONS VOLUNTEERS PROGRAMME

(f) UNITED NATIONS SPECIAL FUND FOR LAND-LOCKED DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

(g) UNITED NATIONS CHILDREN'S FUND

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.99 (agenda item 81 (b))

1. Mr. NDONG BINDANG (Equatorial Guinea) said he regretted that, owing to circumstances beyond his control, he was unable to introduce the draft resolution entitled "Assistance for the reconstruction, rehabilitation and development of Equatorial Guinea" during the consideration of the relevant agenda item. Recalling that the International Conference of Donors had taken place in April 1982, and that the situation in Equatorial Guinea was still critical, he urged that the draft be adopted by consensus, so that the Government could continue its reconstruction work. He announced that Spain had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

2. Mr. ELHASSAN (Sudan), introducing the draft resolution, recalled that at its thirty-sixth session the General Assembly had decided to hold a conference of donors, at which emphasis had been placed on the essential role played by international disaster relief assistance and the support it should provide for the reconstruction efforts in Equatorial Guinea. He therefore hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus. Lastly, he said that in the tenth line of paragraph 3 of the draft, the words "as appropriate" should be inserted after the words "to provide".

/...

3. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution, as orally revised.

4. Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.99, as orally revised, was adopted.

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.100 (agenda item 78 (d))

5. Mr. ZIADA (Iraq), speaking as Vice-Chairman of the Committee, said that a consensus had been reached on the draft resolution during informal consultations, and that only two minor changes had to be made in the last preambular paragraph: in the second line, the word "significant" should be inserted before the word "number", and in the fourth line the word "concerted" should be deleted.

6. Mr. MILLER (United States of America) said that the members of his delegation had seen the draft resolution only a few minutes before the meeting began; he therefore proposed that a decision on the draft should be taken later, towards the end of the meeting.

7. Mr. DUN (United Kingdom) said it had been his understanding that the draft would be introduced at the current meeting and that a decision would be taken on it at a subsequent meeting.

8. The CHAIRMAN suggested that a decision on the draft resolution should be taken after the other drafts had been adopted.

9. Mr. PAPADATOS (Greece) said that the member States of the European Economic Community, which had only just received the draft resolution, would like to consult among themselves; consequently he, too, felt that the decision on the draft should be postponed until a subsequent meeting.

10. The CHAIRMAN, noting that delegations did not wish to take a decision on the draft resolution at the current meeting, suggested that its consideration should be deferred until the following meeting, so that delegations would have time for informal consultations.

11. It was so decided.

12. Mr. EKBLOM (Finland) said he would have liked the draft resolution to be formally introduced.

13. The CHAIRMAN said that the draft had just been formally introduced by the Vice-Chairman of the Committee.

Draft resolutions A/C.2/38/L.35 and L.106\* (agenda item 12)

14. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the draft resolution, which had been introduced by Mr. Faruq Ziada (Iraq), Vice-Chairman of the Committee, following informal consultations on draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.35. A statement of the programme, administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution had been issued in document A/C.2/38/L.109.

/...

15. Mr. MILLER (United States of America) said he found nothing in the draft resolution under consideration which justified the travel mentioned in paragraph 5 of document A/C.2/38/L.109; he therefore proposed that that paragraph should be deleted.

16. Mr. PLECHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that during the consultations on the draft resolution it had been understood that it would have no financial implications. There was no reason why the consultations mentioned in the draft resolution should entail travel costs. He therefore proposed that the agreement reached during the consultations should be reverted to and the draft resolution adopted by consensus after the deletion of paragraph 5.

17. The CHAIRMAN requested the representative of the Budget Division to provide clarification concerning paragraph 5.

18. Mr. UY (Budget Division) said that the implementation of the draft resolution, and of paragraph 2 in particular, would make it necessary for Secretariat officials to consult with the relevant United Nations bodies and they would therefore have to travel to the headquarters of those bodies, which would inevitably entail travel costs. However, the Secretariat did not intend to ask for additional appropriations. It was indicated clearly in document A/C.2/38/L.109 that every effort would be made to meet those additional requirements from the resources already requested under various programme elements and that if that should prove impossible, the over-expenditure would be reported on in the context of the final report on the programme budget performance for the biennium 1984-1985.

19. Mr. BELLOSO (Brazil) said that since the draft resolution under consideration had been introduced after informal consultations on draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.35, he would like to know whether the latter draft had financial implications.

20. Mr. UY (Budget Division) said that the Department of International Economic and Social Affairs had indicated that draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.35 had no financial implications. With regard to document A/C.2/38/L.109, the Department had stated that it would indicate the way in which it would proceed, and that was why the statement of administrative and financial implications had been submitted. However, that did not mean that additional resources were being requested. Furthermore, it should be noted, as was clear from the title of document A/C.2/38/L.109, that the statement had been submitted to indicate the programme implications, in accordance with a recent decision of the Fifth Committee.

21. Mr. HUERTA (Mexico) thought that, since no additional sum was requested, it was time to proceed to the adoption of the draft resolution which had already been accepted by consensus.

22. Mr. DUN (United Kingdom) asked the representative of the Budget Division whether paragraph 5 would have made no reference to travel resources if document A/C.2/38/L.109 had simply been entitled "Statement of financial implications". Having heard the explanations given by the representative of the Budget Division, he expressed his support for those delegations that had called for the deletion of paragraph 5.

23. Mr. BAKALOV (Bulgaria) said that he thought that the text could be withdrawn entirely, since the Secretariat had indicated that draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.106 had no financial implications.
24. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the document dealt not only with the financial implications of the draft resolution but also with programme and administrative implications.
25. Mr. FAREED (Pakistan) suggested the deletion of the words "and financial" from the title; the other solution would, of course, be to withdraw the entire document.
26. Mr. UY (Budget Division) noted that the Fifth Committee had held lengthy informal consultations before arriving at an agreement on the title of the document and, in particular, on the need to indicate not only the administrative and financial implications but also the programme implications. Once again, no additional resources were being requested.
27. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should take note of the statement made by the representative of the Budget Division and adopt the draft resolution, on the understanding that it had no financial implications.
28. Mr. ELHASSAN (Sudan) said that he would like some clarifications from the representative of the Budget Division. That representative had referred to the consultations held in the Fifth Committee with a view to reaching an agreement on draft resolution A/C.5/38/L.18, concerning programme planning. He would like to know whether the Fifth Committee had adopted that draft resolution because, if not, the Secretariat would have no need to implement a resolution which had not yet been adopted by the Fifth Committee.
29. Mr. LEE (Canada) said that he saw no reason why the Committee should not adopt the procedure suggested by the Chairman. The Secretariat would, however, have to take note of the comments made concerning paragraph 5 of document A/C.2/38/L.109, which showed that draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.106 was being adopted only because delegations had been assured that there would be no future financial implications.
30. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) felt that it was not appropriate for the Second Committee to amend a document submitted by the Secretary-General. He would like to hear as soon as possible the Chairman's suggestions concerning the procedure to be followed with regard to draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.106.
31. Mr. ESAN (Nigeria) thought that the question which had been asked by the representative of the Sudan would make it possible to find a solution to the problem, which was actually of minor importance. The representative of the Budget Division should specify whether or not the draft resolution on programme planning (A/C.5/38/L.18) had been adopted by the Fifth Committee. If the answer was in the affirmative, his delegation would feel that the explanation given by the representative of the Budget Division was sufficient and that document A/C.2/38/L.109 was consistent with the procedure described in draft resolution L.18. Indeed, paragraph 7 (a) of document A/C.5/38/L.18 stipulated that "each statement should be an integrated statement of programme, financial and

(Mr. Esan, Nigeria)

administrative implications". Consequently, if document A/C.2/38/L.109 was in conformity with paragraph 7 (a) of draft resolution L.18, there would be no need to delete paragraph 5 of document A/C.2/38/L.109.

32. Mr. SEKULIC (Yugoslavia) and Mr. EKANEY (United Republic of Cameroon) supported the request for clarifications made by the representative of the Sudan and wished to hear from the representative of the Budget Division whether draft resolution A/C.5/38/L.18 had been adopted by the Fifth Committee or not.

33. Mr. UY (Budget Division) said that the draft resolution on programme planning had not yet been adopted by the Fifth Committee. However, at the time of the consultations held among the groups dealing with that question, the Secretariat had been specifically asked to draw up, on a trial basis, a statement on the programme, financial and administrative implications. It was clearly understood that criticisms would be taken into consideration when deciding whether that practice should be continued. However, he thought that after the consultations held in the Fifth Committee with a view to reaching an agreement on draft resolution A/C.5/38/L.18, there was a good chance that the text would be adopted at the next meeting devoted to its consideration.

34. Mr. VELIOSO (Brazil) pointed out that a resolution did not exist as such until it had been adopted at a plenary meeting of the General Assembly. In the opinion of his delegation, there was therefore no text to justify the preparation of document A/C.2/38/L.109 by the Secretariat.

35. Mr. SZEREMETA (Poland) said that, whether or not document A/C.5/38/L.18 had been adopted by the Fifth Committee, it was illogical, on the part of the Secretariat, to state that the draft resolution would have no financial implications and then to draft an entire paragraph concerning those very financial implications. In future, it would be best to avoid such an ambiguous practice which could give the impression that, even though there were no financial implications, there could be some. His delegation would feel much more comfortable if the second part of paragraph 5 of document A/C.2/38/L.109, which began with the words "However, should this not become possible ...", were deleted.

36. Mr. KUMLIN (Sweden) said he was very sorry about the confusion created by paragraph 5 of document L.109. He associated himself with the representative of Belgium, who wished to follow the Chairman's suggestion that note be taken of the fact that there would be no financial implications and that a decision be taken as soon as possible on the draft resolution as it stood.

37. Mr. MILLER (United States of America) said that he would like to have confirmation from the representative of the Budget Division that the Secretary-General had no intention of incurring travel or any other expenses which could not be absorbed by the resources already requested, and that he would not have to report, in the final report on the programme budget performance, on any over-expenditure incurred in the implementation of the draft resolution.

/...

38. Mr. UY (Budget Division) confirmed that the Secretariat had no intention of exceeding the limits provided for in the budget.

39. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Committee) noted that in paragraph 3 of the French text of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.106, the word additionnelles should be inserted after the word technologiques.

40. Mr. PLECHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) drew the attention of the Secretariat to an error in the title of the Russian text of the draft resolution, which dealt with energy resources and not economic resources.

41. The CHAIRMAN said that if there was no objection he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution under consideration.

42. Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.106 was adopted.

43. Mr. PAPADATOS (Greece) said that he had received instructions from his Government to inform the Committee of the suggestion made to the Secretariat of the United Nations concerning the organization, in implementation of paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.106, of an international symposium on the resources and funding needed to explore and develop the energy resources of the developing countries; the symposium would be held in Athens for one week in the spring of 1985. His Government would provide facilities for the symposium which, it was to be hoped, would attract experts from all Member States of the United Nations to exchange information on their experience in that crucial area and study forms of co-operation which could accelerate the rate of exploration and development of the energy resources of the developing world. Documents E/1983/91 and A/38/512, drawn up by the Department of International Economic and Social Affairs, had enabled considerable progress to be made in that process. His delegation was convinced that the symposium, which would be organized with the co-operation of the Department of International Economic and Social Affairs and all the competent bodies of the United Nations system, would provide a solid basis for further progress in the exploration and development of energy resources.

44. Mr. HUERTA (Mexico) said that his delegation welcomed the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.106 by consensus. However, the Group of 77 considered it regrettable that it was a document with programme, financial and administrative implications that were without any legislative basis. Had the text been worded differently, many difficulties could have been avoided.

45. Mr. DON NAJIRA (Kenya) said that his country, which attached great importance to the question of energy in general, was extremely pleased that draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.106 on the development of the energy resources of developing countries had been adopted by consensus. Kenya welcomed the proposal put forward by the delegation of Greece concerning the hosting of a colloquium on that topic. Moreover, the question of energy was taking on increasing importance in the United Nations system and an integrated approach must be taken to the issue so that it could be dealt with effectively.

46. Mr. ORLANDO (United States of America) said that he recognized that the developing countries' growing energy requirements called for large-scale investment. However, the United States believed that investment in energy should come largely from the private sector and not from national and international financial institutions and that policies likely to promote private-sector investment in energy should be developed at the national level.

47. With regard to the draft resolution that had been adopted, he wished to stress that the number of loans made by the World Bank and some other similar international agencies had risen considerably in recent years and that every possible effort was being made to channel resources to the priority sector in question. In that connection, the United States had repeatedly outlined its position on the proposal on the establishment of an energy affiliate at the World Bank. The United States was unable to support the establishment of or participate in such an affiliate.

48. Mr. DE LA TORRE (Argentina) said that his delegation had joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.106, even though it shared the view expressed by the representative of Mexico, on behalf of the Group of 77, regarding the validity of document A/C.2/38/L.109. His delegation believed that that document had no legislative basis whatsoever and that there was no reason why it should be issued in conjunction with the draft resolution.

49. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.35 was being withdrawn by its sponsors.

50. It was so decided.

Draft resolutions A/C.2/38/L.81 and L.107 (agenda item 78)

51. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.107, entitled "Special measures for the social and economic development of Africa in the 1980s", submitted by the Vice-Chairman of the Second Committee, Mr. Faruq S. Ziada (Iraq), on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.81. He wished to point out that the French version of the text had been distributed in document A/C.2/38/L.101. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution.

52. Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.107 was adopted.

53. Mr. PAPADATOS (Greece), speaking on behalf of the States members of the European Economic Community, said that the delegations of those States had joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.107 because they were in favour of special measures for the social and economic development of Africa in the 1980s. However, the States members of the EEC wished to make it clear that their support for the draft resolution did not mean that they were willing to contribute to the United Nations Trust Fund for African Development, to which reference was made in paragraphs 3 and 7. The EEC countries' reservations with regard to an increase in the number of multilateral assistance funds were well known. The EEC countries would continue to contribute to the social and economic development of Africa through other existing multilateral and bilateral programmes.

/...



54. Mr. BENMOUSSA (Morocco) said that his delegation and the Group of African States welcomed the consensus that had developed on the important draft resolution under consideration. Both the continent of Africa and the oceans off its coasts, which represented over one quarter of the surface of the world, contained immense natural and human resources and had considerable economic potential in the area of international co-operation. However, Africa remained the least developed continent, in his delegation's view. Moreover, that opinion was in line with the view expressed by the Secretary-General in his report (A/38/275).

55. In view of that disturbing situation the international community had already adopted a coherent set of resolutions on transport and communications, industrial development and food and agriculture, which had now judiciously been supplemented by the draft resolution that had just been adopted. In the last paragraph of the draft resolution the Secretary-General was requested to submit a report containing an evaluation of the situation of Africa in the various organizations of the United Nations system, as well as exact figures on Africa's position in and share of the various sectors of international economic activity.

56. In addition to expressing its natural and sacred solidarity with the developing world as a whole, his delegation wished to see that special attention was devoted to Africa and its least developed regions, in order to reverse the trend that was becoming apparent in the continent, in other words, the trend towards a situation where Africa might be excluded from international economic developments.

57. In his delegation's view, that was the fundamental significance of the resolution. It was to be hoped that all States would respond positively to the resolution's worthy message and that the resolution would have the desired effect.

58. The CHAIRMAN said that, since draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.107 had been adopted, if he heard no objection, he would take it that draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.81 was being withdrawn by its sponsors.

59. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.95 (agenda item 79 (e))

60. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Committee) said that in the third preambular paragraph of the English version of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.95 the word "recommendation" should be replaced by "recommendations" and that the delegation of Liberia had joined the sponsors of the draft.

61. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.95, as orally revised.

62. It was so decided.

Draft resolutions A/C.2/38/L.93 and L.108 (agenda item 79 (g))

63. The CHAIRMAN invited delegations to consider draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.108 submitted by Mr. Gibson, Vice-Chairman of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.93, which had also been sponsored by Bangladesh, Bhutan, Denmark, Norway and Sweden.

64. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Committee) announced that the delegation of Liberia had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.93.

65. Mr. OSBORNE (Barbados) said that his delegation had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution under consideration.

66. The CHAIRMAN said that he understood that draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.93 had been withdrawn by its sponsors. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.108.

67. It was so decided.

Draft resolutions A/C.2/38/L.74 and L.96 (agenda item 78 (m))

68. The CHAIRMAN invited delegations to consider draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.96, submitted by Mr. Gibson, the Vice-Chairman of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations concerning draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.74, and noted that the administrative and financial implications submitted in document A/C.2/38/L.84 also applied to draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.96. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.96.

69. Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.96 was adopted.

70. Mr. KEYES (United States of America) said that his delegation had supported draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.96 because it was extremely interested in the future of the least developed countries and was aware of the importance of the consensus which had emerged within the Second Committee regarding the disquiet caused by the situation of those countries. Nevertheless, the United States Government thought that the financial implications of the draft resolution should have been absorbed in the programme budget for the biennium 1984-1985, since it firmly adhered to the objective of zero growth in the United Nations regular budget.

71. Mr. MULLER (German Democratic Republic), speaking on behalf of the Eastern European States, said that they had not opposed the adoption by consensus of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.96, and that they provided considerable aid to the least developed countries. Yet in their view the difficulties experienced by those countries were largely the results of colonization, the crisis in the world capitalist system, and the neo-colonialism practised by the imperialist countries in their international economic relations.

72. With regard to the Substantial New Programme of Action for the 1980s for the Least Developed Countries, the Eastern European States reaffirmed the validity of

(Mr. Muller, German  
Democratic Republic)

the principles set forth in the joint statements which they had made at the United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries, held in Paris, and at the time of the adoption of General Assembly resolutions 36/194 and 37/224.

73. With respect to the proposal to convene a third meeting of multilateral and bilateral financial and technical assistance institutions with representatives of the least developed countries, the socialist States adhered to the principles contained in UNCTAD resolution 142 (VI). Decisions concerning the dates and mandate of the conference should be taken at the twenty-eighth session of the Trade and Development Board. In any event, it would not be desirable to convene the conference before the comprehensive mid-term review of progress made in implementing the New Programme of Action.

74. The Eastern European States considered that the activities provided for in paragraph 23 of the draft resolution just adopted did not necessitate the recruitment of additional temporary staff.

75. Mrs. MORENO (Mexico), speaking on behalf of the States members of the Group of 77, welcomed the fact that the draft resolution had been adopted by consensus. It represented further progress in the efforts to improve the economic situation of the developing countries and the living conditions of their inhabitants.

76. Mr. PACHECHI (Iraq) said that he had supported the draft resolution just adopted. That said, he wished to stress his country's position on paragraph 13 (a) of UNCTAD resolution 142 (VI). That provision should not under any circumstances lead to the annulment or revision of certain agreements concluded by his country at the bilateral and regional levels which provided for the implementation of preferential schemes. The decision to conform to paragraph 13 (a) could be taken only after bilateral negotiations between the parties concerned.

77. Mr. BOYD (United Kingdom) welcomed the fact that the draft resolution had been adopted by consensus. However, the United Kingdom wished to reiterate its position concerning development aid. While aware of the needs of the least developed countries - the United Kingdom had substantially increased its aid to such countries compared to the period 1976-1980 - it felt that other developing countries, which were very poor but not among the least developed, should not be neglected. The United Kingdom would strive to attain the objective stated in paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, while taking account of that principle and the United Kingdom's budgetary difficulties.

78. The CHAIRMAN said that, in view of the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.96, he understood that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.74 wished to withdraw it.

79. It was so decided.

/...

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.30 (agenda item 12)

80. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Committee) read out the amendments to draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.30. In the sixth preambular paragraph, the phrase "Referring further to" should be replaced by the word "Noting". In paragraph 3, the phrase "with satisfaction" should be deleted. In paragraphs 4 and 5, the word "satisfaction" should be replaced by "interest". In paragraph 6, the phrase "Commends the parties concerned in the preparation of the plan of action for the second phase of the Decade for their efforts" should be replaced by "Commends the efforts undertaken for the preparation of the plan of action for the second phase of the Decade". Subparagraph 9 (c) should be deleted and replaced by the following new paragraph: "To draw up urgently programmes on transport and communications of special importance to the land-locked developing countries in Africa;". In subparagraph 9 (e), the phrase "to implement the resolutions on freedoms of the air" should be replaced by "to promote inter-African air links". In paragraph 10, the phrase "the financial resources to enable it" should be replaced by the phrase "\$US 1 million from the regular budget of the United Nations to enable it". The same paragraph should read "... paragraphs 7 and 9 ..." rather than "... paragraphs 7 and 8 ...". Further, the phrase "additional support from extrabudgetary sources should also be sought" should be inserted at the end of the paragraph.

81. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.30, as orally amended.

82. At the request of the representative of the Soviet Union, a recorded vote was taken on paragraph 10 of the draft resolution.

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

/...

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

Abstaining: Australia, Canada, Morocco, New Zealand.

83. Paragraph 10 of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.30 was adopted by 116 votes to 9, with 4 abstentions.

84. At the request of the representative of the United States, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.30 as a whole.

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

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

85. Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.30 as a whole was adopted by 119 votes to 1, with 8 abstentions.

86. Mr. UY (Budget Division) pointed out that the financial implications of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.30, which were contained in document A/C.2/38/L.42, amounted to approximately \$2.3 million. Since new paragraph 10 of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.30 set a limit of \$1 million on the amount of additional appropriations allocated to the Secretariat and, in particular, to the Economic Commission for Africa, it would be impossible to finance all the activities described in the draft resolution.

/...

87. Mr. MILLER (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote, said that the United States attached great importance to the development of transport and communications in Africa. However, his Government had always specified that the activities undertaken in the context of the Decade should be financed by voluntary contributions. Moreover, his Government had provided substantial bilateral assistance to that end. Accordingly, his delegation had voted against the draft resolution, because it requested additional appropriations for the Decade.

88. Mr. FAREED (Pakistan) proposed that all the draft resolutions under consideration should be put to a vote and that speakers should then explain their votes.

89. Mr. PLECHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked the Chairman to remind members of the rules of procedure in that regard.

90. The CHAIRMAN, after reading out rule 128 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, suggested that the discussion should continue without any change of procedure.

91. Mr. FAREED (Pakistan) withdrew his proposal.

92. Mr. HUERTA (Mexico), speaking on behalf of the member States of the Group of 77, seriously regretted the fact that some delegations had not respected the gentleman's agreement reached in connection with the draft resolution, despite the lengthy consultations held and the large number of concessions granted by the sponsors in the hope it would be adopted either by consensus or at least with the support of certain countries.

93. Mr. ZAHID (Morocco) said that his country unreservedly supported the Transport and Communications Decade in Africa and was actively participating in the implementation of the programme. However, his delegation had abstained in the vote on paragraph 10 of the draft resolution because, in its opinion, setting a particular sum in advance might result in a reduction of the activities envisaged, as the representative of the Budget Division had indicated. The question of whether the cost of those activities had been overestimated should be discussed in the Fifth Committee.

94. Mr. LEE (Canada) said that his delegation had supported the draft resolution as a whole but had abstained in the vote on paragraph 10. Canada was entirely in favour of the Transport and Communications Decade in Africa and was also one of the principal bilateral and multilateral donors. However, in view of the considerable resources devoted to the Decade, he felt that those resources should have been provided in the context of the programme budget.

95. Mr. DON NANJIRA (Kenya) said that he had voted in favour of the draft resolution, because it dealt with a question that was very important for Africa. However, since the draft resolution had been put to a vote, his delegation would have preferred it if the original version had been retained. The Committee too

(Mr. Don Nanjira, Kenya)

often tended to limit the scope of draft resolutions in the hope of achieving a consensus. Frequently, however, consensus was not achieved, and the Committee thus voted on drafts that had been considerably weakened. That constituted a dangerous tactic, which Kenya could not accept.

96. Mr. MULLER (German Democratic Republic), speaking on behalf of the Eastern European States, said that those States endeavoured to promote economic, scientific and technical co-operation with the countries of Africa by providing them with substantial assistance, which was directed towards enabling them to develop independently based economies and to train national staff. They were also actively participating in the work of the Economic Commission for Africa, which they believed could help to solve the problems faced by the African countries. However, the socialist States wished to reiterate their position in principle with regard to the need to control the growth of the regular budget of the United Nations. For that reason, they had voted against paragraph 10 of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.30 and had abstained in the vote on the text as a whole.

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.103 (agenda item 79 (f))

97. Mr. PAPADATOS (Greece), speaking on behalf of the member States of the European Economic Community, requested that draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.103 should be put to a vote.

98. At the request of the representative of Australia, a recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, 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, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

/...

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

99. Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.103 was adopted by 105 to none, with 22 abstentions.

100. Mr. PAPADATOS (Greece), speaking on behalf of the States members of the European Economic Community, said that the position of those States with regard to the land-locked developing countries was well known. The States members of EEC felt that specific measures should be taken for those countries, in keeping with their different levels of development and directly aimed at offsetting their geographical disadvantage. The States of the Community had abstained in the vote, as they had generally done in the past on similar resolutions. They intended to continue to provide assistance to the various land-locked developing countries through bilateral channels or through the intermediary of multilateral institutions.

101. Mr. MALIK (India) said that he had intended to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.103.

Draft resolutions A/C.2/38/L.12, L.13, L.104 and L.105 (agenda item 78 (c))

102. Mr. GIBSON (New Zealand), speaking in his capacity as Vice-Chairman of the Committee, said that intensive consultations had taken place on draft resolutions A/C.2/38/L.12 and L.13. In order that those consultations might be brought to a successful conclusion, he requested that, for technical reasons, the meeting should be suspended.

103. The meeting was suspended at 11 p.m. and resumed at 12.25 a.m.

104. Mr. GIBSON (New Zealand), speaking in his capacity as Vice-Chairman of the Committee, introduced the revised texts of draft resolutions A/C.2/38/L.12 and L.13, which had just been distributed to delegations as documents A/C.2/38/L.104 and L.105. Draft resolutions A/C.2/38/L.12 and L.13 had been withdrawn by their sponsors. He recalled that, over the previous two weeks, the draft resolutions had been the subject of lengthy consultations in the course of which it had been agreed that a decision would be taken on the two texts together. He therefore suggested that the Committee should adopt such a course of action. He called attention to draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.105 and read out the text of paragraph 7, which should be added to the text. That paragraph read: "Decides further that the financial implications pertaining to paragraph 6 above will be considered at its thirty-ninth session."

105. In the penultimate preambular paragraph of the English text of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.104, the word "efforts" should be replaced by the word "effects". It was understood that implementation of paragraph 5 of section II, concerning the Industrial Development Decade for Africa, would be funded through



(Mr. Gibson, New Zealand)

savings from the regular budget for 1984/1985 or through a transfer of resources. It was also understood that those activities would be undertaken within available resources. The Committee would inform the Fifth Committee that it should provide the necessary resources during the current session of the General Assembly. On that basis, the two draft resolutions could be adopted by consensus.

106. Mr. UY (Budget Division), speaking on behalf of the Office of Financial Services, said that, for draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.105, the Secretariat would not request additional appropriations at the current session of the General Assembly. Paragraph 5 of section I of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.104 would require additional appropriations of \$1 million. A detailed breakdown of those appropriations would be submitted in a statement to be issued later. With regard to paragraph 5 of section II, the Secretariat took note of the statement made by the Vice-Chairman and would not request additional appropriations under that item.

107. The CHAIRMAN suggested that those delegations wishing to explain their positions on the decision on draft resolutions A/C.2/38/L.104 and L.105 should do so at the following meeting.

108. It was so decided.

109. Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.104 was adopted without a vote.

110. Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.105 was adopted without a vote.

Draft decision introduced orally by the Chairman

111. The CHAIRMAN read out a draft decision that would include Saint Christopher and Nevis in the list of States eligible for election to the Industrial Development Board contained in annex C to General Assembly resolution 2152 (XXI). If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt that draft decision.

112. It was so decided.

#### PROGRAMME PLANNING

113. Mr. PAPADATOS (Greece), speaking on behalf of the States members of the European Economic Community, recalled that paragraph 7 of section II of General Assembly resolution 37/234, in which the Secretary-General was requested to take the necessary measures to provide the General Assembly, at its thirty-eighth session, with programme implications of draft resolutions being considered by the Assembly, had not yet been implemented because the Fifth Committee was continuing its deliberations on the question. The States members of EEC considered it extremely important that the Second Committee should give due consideration to those aspects of its work relating to programme planning, independently of the adoption of decisions on financial questions, which was the province of the Fifth Committee. Moreover, they wished to stress that programme planning was an

/...

(Mr. Papadatos, Greece)

essential element in the management activities of the United Nations regardless of the magnitude of the budget and its rate of growth. With regard to the draft resolutions under consideration, he regretted the absence of documents indicating their programme implications and hoped that resolution 37/234 would be implemented before the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly.

114. Mr. KUMLIN (Sweden), speaking on behalf of the five Nordic countries and supported by Mr. LEE (Canada), Mr. ZOLLER (Australia) and Mr. AKAO (Japan), endorsed the remarks of the representative of Greece concerning the non-implementation of General Assembly resolution 37/234. Although the Economic and Social Council decision on that question had envisaged the establishment, on an experimental basis, of a system whereby documents would be submitted indicating the implications of draft resolutions, the Nordic countries would have expected the Secretariat to provide, at the current session, at least a sample of an integrated statement of the programme implications of draft resolutions. They hoped that such statements would be submitted in a systematic manner at the thirty-ninth session.

115. Mr. DON NANJIRA (Kenya) said that he did not share the views expressed by the delegations that had preceded him, unless it was to be decided that, henceforth, Second Committee and Fifth Committee questions should be considered together, a situation which would not be very desirable. The Second Committee should therefore consider the draft resolutions before it and leave to the Fifth Committee the task of handling those questions which fell within its sphere of competence.

116. Mr. HUERTA (Mexico) said that he was surprised at such a series of statements on a question he had not known would be considered at the meeting. The Group of 77 reserved the right to make a statement on that question.

The meeting rose at 12.55 a.m.