

oped countries and she did not think, therefore, that anything should be expected from further consultations.

69. The CHAIRMAN said that unless there was an objection or a formal proposal, he intended to put draft resolution A/C.2/L.1384 to the vote at the beginning of the afternoon meeting.

70. Mr. HEMANS (United Kingdom) asked the Chairman to reconsider his decision in the event that, after consultations, the delegations concerned recognized that it would be useful to prolong the negotiations.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

1635th meeting

Thursday, 21 November 1974, at 3.15 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Jihad KARAM (Iraq).

A/C.2/SR.1635

AGENDA ITEM 42

United Nations Conference on Trade and Development: report of the Trade and Development Board (*continued*) (A/9603/Add.1 (part I), A/9615, A/C.2/L.1359, 1366 and 1384)

1. The CHAIRMAN announced that Madagascar and Mexico had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1384, and informed the Committee that the second part of the third preambular paragraph, beginning with the word "suggesting", of that draft resolution should be deleted.

2. Mr. MADEY (Yugoslavia) announced that Iraq had become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

3. Mr. MBATCHY (Gabon) said that his delegation had also become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1384.

The draft resolution, as revised, was adopted by 104 votes to 12, with 7 abstentions.

4. Mr. EKBLOM (Finland), speaking in explanation of vote, stressed that at the first part of the fourteenth session of the Trade and Development Board his delegation had adopted a favourable position on the question of participation by the Secretary-General of UNCTAD in the multilateral trade negotiations. It had found the ideas put forward by the Secretary-General of the Conference at the third session of the Trade Negotiations Committee and the fourteenth session of the Board, regarding the presence of UNCTAD at the negotiations and its access to the relevant documents, were constructive and realistic. It had specifically noted his recognition that there were occasions during the trade negotiations when meetings and documentation should be private—a view which was in line with its own position. Since the operative paragraph of the draft resolution did not reflect that position, his delegation had felt obliged to abstain in the voting.

5. His delegation was seriously concerned at the procedure followed in submitting the draft resolution. Its abstention should not be regarded as signifying indifference with regard to that procedure.

6. Mr. GATES (New Zealand), speaking in explanation of vote, said his delegation very much regretted that it had been obliged to vote against the draft resolution. His Government wished developing countries to be given the maximum assistance in preparing for and participating in the multilateral trade negotiations, and it recognized the important role the Secretary-General of UNCTAD could play in that respect. It could have supported any text, including the compromise text, which would have led to the right result through legitimate and practical steps. The draft resolution just adopted, however, asked the General Assembly to take a decision which was not within its competence, but was a matter for the members of the Trade Negotiations Committee. He assured the developing countries that New Zealand, which was a member of that Committee, would support all efforts to ensure that the Secretary-General of UNCTAD was enabled to participate in its meetings as appropriate and to have access to all relevant documentation.

7. Mr. CROS (France), speaking on behalf of the members of EEC, said the fact that the members of the Community had voted against the draft resolution would have come as no surprise, since it was well known that they found the operative paragraph unacceptable. The reasons for their position had been explained at the fourteenth session of the Trade and Development Board at Geneva and in the informal consultations preceding the vote. The Community felt that there were times when the presence of the Secretary-General of UNCTAD in the Trade Negotiations Committee and its subsidiary bodies was appropriate and times when it was not. That had been officially recognized by the Secretary-General himself and had been accepted by all the members of the Group of 77 when they had joined in the consensus on Board resolution 116 (XIV). Moreover, the sponsors of the draft resolution had accepted that position the previous week during consultations on a compromise proposal very different from the text finally adopted. The Community could not but express its regret that, in supporting draft resolution A/C.2/L.1384, many of its friends had gone back on their word.

8. Mr. HUME (United States of America) recalled that his Government's position on the question covered in draft

resolution A/C.2/L.1384 had been explained in the negotiations preceding the votes on it and on Trade and Development Board resolution 116 (XIV). His delegation still felt that it was the Trade Negotiations Committee, rather than the General Assembly, which was competent to take decisions on the regulation of the multilateral trade negotiations, including the question of participation by the Secretary-General of UNCTAD. He regretted that it had not been possible to reach a compromise on that question and that longer notice had not been given of the situation which had arisen earlier in the day with regard to the text to be submitted to the Committee.

9. Mr. KUNIYASU (Japan) said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution because his Government had great difficulty in accepting any resolution that went beyond Board resolution 116 (XIV), which it viewed as representing the greatest possible concession. His delegation, like others, had been greatly surprised to see draft resolution A/C.2/L.1384, having understood that all participants in the informal consultations had agreed to the adoption by consensus of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1383 without the paragraph concerning attendance by the Secretary-General of UNCTAD at meetings of GATT. That understanding had not meant in any way that a new draft resolution, itself part of the former draft resolution A/C.2/L.1357, should be introduced separately. His delegation greatly regretted that the friendly atmosphere which had prevailed during the informal consultations had not led to a happier result.

10. Mr. WRIGSTAD (Sweden) said he very much regretted that it had not been possible to hold further consultations with a view to reaching a compromise on the text contained in document A/C.2/L.1384. In the circumstances, his delegation had had no choice but to abstain in the voting.

11. Mr. BERLIS (Canada) said his delegation had been compelled to vote against the draft resolution, since it did not take account of or meaningfully acknowledge, Trade and Development Board resolution 116 (XIV). His delegation fully recognized that the General Assembly had the right to take whatever decisions it considered desirable, but it felt that the compromise reached at the recent session of the Board had balanced equitably and reasonably the broadly-based interests represented within that body. His delegation had followed closely the informal consultations on the original draft resolution and would have been willing to accept any of the last few formulations which had emerged from them. Such acceptance would have clearly underlined the desirability of the presence of the Secretary-General of UNCTAD in the multilateral trade negotiations and of the receipt by him of documentation relating to his mandate and within his competence.

12. It was in that context that Canada had been able to accept the consensus on Board resolution 116 (XIV), upon which it had put a positive and permissive interpretation. The unqualified language of the draft resolution just adopted, however, represented a simplistic approach to what would be a particularly complex set of negotiations and had obviously been formulated with a view to establishing a principle without full consideration of all the implications.

13. His delegation had considerable sympathy with the remarks made by the United Kingdom representative at the preceding meeting concerning the way in which the situation with respect to the texts in documents A/C.2/L.1383 and A/C.2/L.1384 had evolved. It was only fair to say that an agreement to permit consensus on a particular text did not normally, and should not, infer that the same contentious text should almost immediately appear in an even more controversial form, particularly with no notice of the intention of participants in the negotiations to proceed in such a fashion.

14. Mr. CAVAGLIERI (Italy) recalled that the representative of France had already explained the votes of the members of EEC on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1384. He wished, in addition, to express his delegation's regret at the circumstances surrounding the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1383.

15. Mr. WORKU (Ethiopia), Mr. CHABALA (Zambia) and Mr. FLEMING (Argentina) said that, if their delegations had been present during the voting, they would have voted for the draft resolution.

16. Mr. STURKEY (Australia) said that his delegation would have been obliged to abstain if it had been present during the voting.

17. Mr. MURANGO (Burundi) said that his delegation would have voted for the draft resolution if it had been present.

18. Mr. KANDÉ (Senegal) welcomed the adoption of the proposal in document A/C.2/L.1384. He hoped that those who had opposed the draft resolution would not regard it as something dramatic, and that their votes did not signify intransigent opposition to the participation of the Secretary-General of UNCTAD in the multilateral trade negotiations. He requested that Senegal should be added to the list of sponsors of the draft resolution.

19. Mr. MADDY (Guinea) said that, had his delegation been present during the voting, it would have voted for the draft resolution.

20. Mr. O'RIORDAN (Ireland) recalled that the representative of France had already explained the votes of the members of EEC. He wished to record his delegation's concern at the circumstances surrounding the introduction of the draft resolution, and especially at the implications for the negotiating process. He shared the views of the United Kingdom representative in that respect.

21. Mr. VAN DER TAK (Netherlands) said that he fully shared the opinions that had been expressed on behalf of EEC.

Organization of work

22. Mr. SINGH (Malaysia) asked when the Committee would begin its discussion of the item on the World Population Conference, under agenda item 12.

23. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Committee) said the report of the World Population Conference would be

introduced the following day. He hoped that by the end of the week the Committee would be able to complete its consideration of the item on UNCTAD and would have received as many draft resolutions as possible under item 12.

24. During the week of 25-29 November, the Committee would try to complete its consideration of item 12—with the exception of the report of the World Food Conference—and of items 46, 47 and 50. It would also take up item 48, with the draft Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States which would be introduced on 25 November by the Chairman of the UNCTAD Working Group, and item 98, beginning with the statements on 27 November by the Chairman of the Committee and the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the United Nations Emergency Operation. There would be no meeting on 26 November, to accommodate two meetings of the Economic and Social Council on the reports of IMF and the World Food Conference.

25. During the week of 2-6 December, it was hoped to complete items 48, 98 and 51 and that part of item 12 concerning the World Food Conference, the report of which would be introduced on 2 December.

26. Night meetings would be required to meet that schedule, and appropriate arrangements would be announced the following week.

27. The CHAIRMAN asked the representative of the Sudan to report on the status of the consultations on the draft resolutions submitted under item 12.

28. Mr. HAMID (Sudan), Vice-Chairman, said that informal consultations had taken place on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1354/Rev.1, but it would seem that another round of consultations was needed. It should be possible to introduce the draft resolution by Monday, 25 November. Consultations were still in progress concerning draft resolution A/C.2/L.1374, but he suggested that those delegations which wished to speak on that draft resolution should do so at the current meeting. Draft resolution A/C.2/L.1371 would be introduced by the representatives of Finland and Norway. In view of the special importance of the substance of that draft resolution, further negotiations on the text should be carried out so that a unanimous decision could be reached on it. He hoped that the Committee would be able to vote on the draft resolution by Monday, 25 November. Draft resolution A/C.2/L.1372 had been introduced by the representative of Pakistan on 15 November. He had consulted the sponsors of that draft resolution who had submitted a revised version in document A/C.2/L.1372/Rev.1, which they wished the Committee to act upon at the current meeting. The representative of Peru had introduced draft resolution A/C.2/L.1373, concerning reform of the international monetary system, on 15 November; so important a subject deserved thorough negotiations before a decision was taken on it, and the draft resolution would be given priority in the informal consultations. He hoped that action could be taken on the draft resolution early in the following week. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1375 had established contact with interested delegations in order to try to accommodate their views. A few days would be needed before a decision could be taken on that

draft resolution, and the same was true of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1376. The representative of the United States had informed him that he would be able to introduce draft resolution A/C.2/L.1378 on 22 or 25 November, and the Committee would soon be in a position to take action on it.

AGENDA ITEM 12

Report of the Economic and Social Council [chapters II, III (sections A to D), IV, VI (sections A to D and G) and VII (sections 1 to 3)] (continued)* (A/9588, A/9592, A/9599, A/9633, A/9648, A/9649, A/9656, A/9699, A/9716 and Corr.1, A/9761, A/9813, A/9855, A/C.2/289, A/C.2/291, A/C.2/L.1342, E/5425 and Corr.1 and Add.1, E/5467, E/5473, E/5499, E/5501, E/5519, E/5585 and Corr.1, E/C.8/21)

ORGANIZATION OF THE WORK OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (A/C.2/L.1371)

29. Mr. EKBLOM (Finland), introducing draft resolution A/C.2/L.1371 on behalf of the sponsors, said that efforts to reorganize and streamline the work of the Economic and Social Council had been virtually continuous and had been reinforced by the enlargement of the Council. Council resolution 1768 (LIV) was a major achievement in that respect but, like previous resolutions, it was a piecemeal solution and had not been adhered to by the Council. Furthermore, it had been overtaken by the remarkably speedy developments in the fields of economic and social relations and human rights and by actions of the General Assembly.

30. The World Population Conference, held in August 1974, the World Food Conference, the second stage of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea which was to take place in March/May 1975, the Second General Conference of UNIDO, International Women's Year and the preparations for the fourth session of UNCTAD in 1975 would all have implications for the Council's work. What was more important, however, was that the major changes in the economic field resulting from the resolutions of the sixth special session of the General Assembly would have to be dealt with in parallel with the mid-term review and appraisal of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade, perhaps on the basis of new concepts in a Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States. The Council would also have to review the success of the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination and would acquire new human rights responsibilities if the International Covenants of Human Rights entered into force. All that would be in addition to its regular work.

31. The sponsors of the draft resolution therefore believed that the time had come to implement the basic structural and procedural changes affecting the calendar of conferences, the documentation and the agenda of the Council. Their task was made both easier and more timely by the forthcoming seventh special session of the General Assembly devoted to development and international economic co-operation, which would deal with the necessary changes

* Resumed from the 1633rd meeting.

in the existing structures and institutions of the United Nations system. Draft resolution A/C.2/L.1371 was in no way intended to compete with draft resolution A/C.2/L.1374 or to prejudge the outcome of the seventh special session; its purpose was, rather, to assist in the preparations for the latter, the main responsibility in that respect having been assigned to the Economic and Social Council. It should also help the Council to face up to the probable further increases in its responsibilities.

32. The text of the draft resolution contained a short-term and a long-term approach. The short-term approach concerned arrangements for the work of the Council in 1975, when its programme would be extremely heavy. It was essential that the time left before the opening of the seventh special session of the General Assembly should be used efficiently, so as to provide the special session with the best possible input. The preparatory machinery for that session included the Council and its Preparatory Committee as well as national administrations, representatives of States in various subsidiary bodies, international civil servants in the Secretariat and members of permanent delegations in New York. All those components must make an optimum contribution if the special session was to be a success. His delegation therefore hoped that at its organizational session for 1975 the Council would study the programme of work for the year very carefully and take the necessary measures to permit the best possible use of all the components involved in the work of the Council in 1975.

33. The long-term approach in the draft resolution was also linked to the special session, at which the General Assembly would probably give the Economic and Social Council a specific role as a result of decisions on restructuring the United Nations in the economic field. It was possible that the special session would only be able to draw up the main guidelines for that restructuring and that the Council would have to work out the details to make the new system operational. It was also possible that the special session would not cover two important fields of the Council's activities, namely, social development and the promotion of human rights. In conjunction with preparation for the special session, the Council must initiate a longer-term comprehensive study of how to reorganize its own future work and that of its subsidiary organs.

34. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1371 had deliberately made no reference to the convening of the Council in continuous session. The concept was still somewhat vague, and the ultimate decision on the matter must be taken by the Council itself.

35. Mr. ARVESEN (Norway) said that he would like to add a few comments to those made by the representative of Finland on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1371, of which Norway was also a sponsor. The main purpose was to enable the Economic and Social Council to discharge its functions, in the light of new tasks and urgent problems, as efficiently and responsibly as possible. In connexion with the first preambular paragraph, he referred to Chapters IX and X of the Charter of the United Nations, particularly Articles 55 and 60. The second, third and fourth preambular paragraphs recalled the most important decisions taken recently by the General Assembly in the field of development and international economic and social co-operation. In using the

words "adequate machinery" in the fifth preambular paragraph, the sponsors had in mind not additional machinery, but a greater streamlining of existing machinery to deal with the new challenges and urgent problems to be met by the end of the Second United Nations Development Decade. If the goals and objectives set were to be achieved, the international community must have appropriate and adequate machinery. The sixth preambular paragraph endorsed the fourth preambular paragraph of Council resolution 1768 (LIV). The seventh preambular paragraph listed some of the major tasks confronting the Council in 1975; however, these tasks could not all be completed in 1975, and follow-up action would obviously remain on the Council's agenda beyond that date. The eighth preambular paragraph referred to Council resolution 1907 (LVII), paragraphs 2 and 3.

36. Paragraph 1 expressed a general belief which the sponsors hoped was shared by the entire membership of the United Nations. Paragraph 2 contained a specific request to the Secretary-General, in connexion with which the sponsors had raised the possibility of convening Council meetings as necessary throughout the year. The aim was flexibility. The sponsors believed that most Member States wished to preserve the system of convening regular sessions of the Economic and Social Council for the time being, but it might be necessary to arrange for additional meetings during the year without having to resort to the rather cumbersome process envisaged in the Council's rules of procedure. In the view of the sponsors, additional meetings of the Council should be convened on the initiative of its President after consultation with the other officers of the Council. With such meetings, it might be possible to reduce the length of the Council's regular sessions.

37. Paragraph 3 referred specifically to 1975, during which intersessional meetings might well be required if the Council was to complete consideration of its agenda in a responsible manner. Paragraph 4, which was intended to complement paragraph 3, referred to the Council's work beyond 1975. In that context, it was essential that the Council should delegate authority, within certain specified limits, to its subsidiary organs, if it was to deal responsibly with the major problems concerning development issues and genuine interagency co-ordination that required policy formulations and decision-making on the part of the Council. The sponsors had not reached a conclusion as to when the Council should make its progress report to the General Assembly, referred to in paragraph 4. A blank space had therefore been left in the draft resolution. Speaking on behalf of his own delegation, he suggested that the Council should be requested to report to the Assembly at its thirty-first session, so as not to add to the Council's already heavy work programme for 1975 and to enable it to take into account the decisions of the seventh special session of the General Assembly on structural changes in the United Nations system. The sponsors had an open mind on the matter and would consult members informally. Paragraph 5 called for a streamlining of the Council's subsidiary machinery.

38. The sponsors were aware that the Council had devoted considerable attention in recent years to the question of rationalization and improved efficiency with regard to the organization of its work. The draft resolution should be

seen as an expression of appreciation of those efforts. The sponsors felt that it was time for the General Assembly to pronounce on those important issues by giving the Council some additional guidelines for further work in the field. The draft resolution was intended to be an expression of concern regarding the enormous tasks facing the international community, which must have the proper tools if it was to accomplish those tasks successfully. The sponsors trusted that the draft resolution would be adopted unanimously.

PERMANENT SOVEREIGNTY OVER NATIONAL RESOURCES IN THE OCCUPIED ARAB TERRITORIES (concluded)* (A/C.2/L.1372/REV.1 AND 1385)

39. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should take action on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1372/Rev.1. In accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure, a statement of the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution had been submitted in document A/C.2/L.1385.

40. Mr. LEGHARI (Pakistan), introducing the revised draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1372/Rev.1), announced that Togo had become a sponsor of it. Although Zaire had been a sponsor of the original draft, the Zairian delegation had not yet received instructions from its Government regarding the revised version, and the name of Zaire should therefore be temporarily deleted from the list of sponsors.

41. The revision of paragraph 5 was intended to underline the need to seek the assistance of relevant United Nations organizations in preparing the report requested of the Secretary-General. UNCTAD had the machinery needed to carry out studies and research which would be useful in preparing the report. Similarly, UNESCO was expected to assist the Secretary-General in assessing the damages to educational, cultural and scientific institutions and infrastructure in the Arab territories subjected to Israeli aggression and occupation, since such damages had a bearing on the economies and development efforts of the countries concerned. UNESCO should also take into account the loss of items of cultural and national heritage, whether in Arab Jerusalem, on the West Bank of the Jordan, in the Sinai Peninsula or on the Golan Heights. The sponsors of the draft resolution wished to emphasize that other organizations within the United Nations system were also expected to participate in the preparation of the report.

42. He recalled that, when introducing the original version of the draft resolution at the 1630th meeting, he had stressed the concept of wealth referred to in several paragraphs. That reference was in line with the wording of General Assembly resolution 3005 (XXVII). The sponsors of the draft resolution wished to clarify that wealth meant all forms of wealth, including items of cultural or national heritage, personal wealth of the Arab peoples, and so on. The sponsors requested that his introduction of the draft resolution be recorded extensively in the official records of the Committee, to serve as a reference for the Secretary-General in preparing the report. Since the draft resolution had been introduced several days previously and the

revision was designed to enable the United Nations system to assist the Secretary-General in the preparation of his report, he requested that a decision should be taken immediately on the revised text.

43. Mr. AL-KHUDHAIRY (Iraq) said that his delegation attached great importance to draft resolution A/C.2/L.1372/Rev.1, because it concerned a problem which had occupied the attention of the international community for many years. The problem it dealt with was of crucial importance to the developing countries in general and to the peoples struggling to liberate themselves from foreign occupation, aggression, oppression, colonial rule, *apartheid* and racial discrimination in particular. The legitimate rights of such peoples to independence and sovereignty over their natural resources and wealth must be recognized and reaffirmed. The international community must not stand by as a disinterested spectator or ineffective commentator while the wealth and natural resources of rightful owners were exploited and depleted for the sole benefit of the oppressor. It was high time that the usurper, the occupier, the colonial master and the advocates of *apartheid* and racial discrimination were made to account for their plundering and exploitation of other peoples' wealth and resources. He requested roll-call votes on operative paragraphs 3 and 4 and on the draft resolution as a whole. The time had come to find out exactly which States supported the inalienable and legitimate rights of peoples. The draft resolution called for the righting of a grievous wrong and for support for justice and legitimacy. His delegation wanted to see which States stood on the side of the oppressed and the exploited and which were willing to be the champions and advocates of injustice, oppression, aggression, colonialism, *apartheid* and racial discrimination.

44. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the right of the Arab States to sovereignty over the occupied territories and to full compensation from Israel had been confirmed in General Assembly resolution 3175 (XXVIII), which Israel continued to ignore, and in numerous other resolutions of the General Assembly and other organs. The report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories,¹ which was before the Special Political Committee, showed that Israel was deriving \$400 million per year from its exploitation of Arab oil in the Sinai Peninsula and was exploiting the labour of some 80,000 Arab workers. Occupation of the Peninsula denied Egypt access to various raw materials, and the great damage done to Egypt and to international trade, particularly that of developing countries, by the closing of the Suez Canal as a result of the Israeli aggression had been clearly shown in the document entitled *The economic effects of the closure of the Suez Canal*.² Israel had also done irreparable damage to the Syrian town of Quneitra in contravention of article 53 of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War. That was why paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of the draft resolution read as they did and why the Soviet Union would vote for the draft resolution. His delegation also

¹ A/9817.

² TD/B/C.4/104/Rev.1 (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.73.II.D.13).

* Resumed from the 1630th meeting.

supported the proposal contained in paragraph 5 but would address itself further in the Fifth Committee to the financial implications of that proposal, as set out in document A/C.2/L.1385.

45. He recalled that, in his statement on the recent fifty-seventh anniversary of the October Revolution, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR had declared that just and lasting peace in the Middle East would be impossible until Israel withdrew from the occupied territories and the lawful national rights of the Arab people of Palestine were restored. The Soviet Union would continue its support for the just struggle of the Arab peoples, including the people of Palestine.

46. Mr. ELIASHIV (Israel) said that his delegation had explained its position on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1372 on 15 November, at the 1630th meeting, and had made full statements on the factual situation in the administered areas in both the Second Committee and the Special Political Committee. It had also refuted the baseless allegations made against Israel, and it utterly rejected them once more. He did not wish to take up the Committee's time by repeating what he had already said. The draft resolution established a negative and non-productive pattern of work for the Second Committee by engaging it in bilateral political disputes. The draft resolution was completely uncalled for, it was biased, and it ignored the extremely adverse economic effects on Israel of constant Arab aggression since 1948. It was based on utterly false legal premises, sought to prejudge any forthcoming negotiations and would serve no purpose in the quest for peace in the Middle East. For those reasons and the reasons previously stated by his delegation in the Committee, Israel completely rejected draft resolution A/C.2/L.1372/Rev.1 and would vote against it.

47. Mr. DIETZE (German Democratic Republic) said that, since its inception, the United Nations had been concerned with the permanent violation by Israel of the rights of the Palestinian people. In violation of the Charter of the United Nations, Israel had occupied the territories of Arab States. The United Nations had called upon Israel to terminate its exploitation of the human and natural resources of the Arab territories, but Israel had continued its policy of aggression. The wasteful exploitation of resources was part and parcel of the policy of Israelization of the occupied territories, the extent of which could be seen from the report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices. Israel was bound to fail in any attempt to justify its action. Over the years, the peoples of the world had struggled for recognition of their right to permanent sovereignty over their natural resources. That right was now a universally accepted binding international rule, as shown in the resolutions of the sixth special session of the General Assembly. The occupation of territories through armed aggression, and the plundering of them, were typical of imperialist and colonial Powers. His delegation would support any decision by the Committee to end Israel's unlawful occupation and plunder of the Arab territories. It therefore whole-heartedly supported draft resolution A/C.2/L.1372/Rev.1.

48. Mr. OLZVOI (Mongolia) said that the Government and people of Mongolia firmly opposed Israel's policy of

aggression towards its Arab neighbours and its illegal occupation of their territories. That occupation was contrary to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and to many resolutions of the General Assembly, particularly those concerning the right to permanent sovereignty over natural resources, which was a fundamental concept of the International Development Strategy and the Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order. In that respect, he wished to emphasize yet again the importance of compliance by Israel with the provisions of General Assembly resolution 3175 (XXVIII). In continued defiance of that resolution, Israel was mercilessly exploiting the human and natural resources of the occupied Arab lands and amassing huge profits. The continued occupation of the Arab territories by Israel and its aggressive and expansionist policies were a major obstacle to settlement of the Middle East question and a threat to international peace and security. Consequently, his delegation fully supported draft resolution A/C.2/L.1372/Rev.1, which should help to restore the rights of the Arab peoples and rebuff Israel's expansionist aspirations.

49. Mr. AL-JEEAN (Kuwait) supported the request for roll-call votes on paragraphs 3 and 4 and on the draft resolution as a whole, for the reasons stated by the representative of Iraq.

50. Mr. KASASA (Zaire) said he wished to make it quite clear that the reason why his delegation had been temporarily removed from the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1372/Rev.1 was that it had not yet received the necessary authorization. However, there was no doubt about Zaire's position on the Middle East situation and the Arab-occupied territories. Zaire could not accept the occupation of a territory by force or the plundering of the natural resources of an occupied territory to the detriment of its peoples. His delegation would vote for paragraphs 3 and 4 and for the draft resolution as a whole, because the issue was of great concern to his Government.

51. Mr. CHANG Hsien-wu (China) said that his delegation resolutely supported the Arab people in their struggle against the aggression and plunder carried out by Israeli Zionism, to strive for and safeguard their national independence and to protect their State sovereignty and economic rights and interests. His delegation fully endorsed draft resolution A/C.2/L.1372/Rev.1 and agreed that a roll-call vote should be taken on it. The Israeli aggressors had slandered the Arab people's just struggle against aggression, thus showing their true colours. In his delegation's view, paragraph 4 of the draft resolution was very important, in that it strongly supported all countries and peoples subjected to aggression, plunder and threats by imperialism, social imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism. His delegation fully supported that paragraph.

At the request of the representative of Iraq, a vote was taken by roll-call on paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1372/Rev.1.

Luxembourg, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Para-

guay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, 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, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia.

Against: United States of America, Israel.

Abstaining: Malawi, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Sweden, Thailand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, El Salvador, Finland, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Grenada, Guatemala, Haiti, Ireland, Italy, Laos.

Operative paragraph 3 was adopted by 93 votes to 2, with 29 abstentions.

At the request of the representative of Iraq, a vote was taken by roll-call on paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1372/Rev.1.

Egypt, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, 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, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: El Salvador, Finland, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Grenada, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Ireland, Italy, Laos, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom of

Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark.

Operative paragraph 4 was adopted by 95 votes to 2, with 27 abstentions.

At the request of the representative of Iraq, a vote was taken by roll-call on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1372/Rev.1 as a whole.

Malawi, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, 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, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar.

Against: United States of America, Israel.

Abstaining: Malawi, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, El Salvador, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Grenada, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Ireland, Italy, Laos.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 95 votes to 2, with 28 abstentions.

52. Mr. EKBLOM (Finland) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution as a whole because Finland had never accepted the measures taken by Israel in the occupied territories. It had consistently been opposed to any attempts by Israel to change the structure of the occupied territories and had stressed the necessity of respecting the human rights of their inhabitants. It had voted in favour of two draft resolutions adopted by the Special Political Committee at the current session, for the same reason. His delegation had abstained in the separate votes on paragraphs 3 and 4 because their wording was vague and their meaning ambiguous.

53. Mr. MARTINEZ ORDOÑEZ (Honduras) said his delegation had abstained from voting because the draft resolution was not confined to the question of the exploitation of natural resources by the occupying force;

rather, in paragraph 4, it contained a statement which extended its scope to other situations. His Government was opposed to the acquisition of any territory by force or threat of force, and agreed with the principle that the national resources of any people belonged exclusively to them. No occupying nation had the right to use such resources for its own benefit.

54. Mr. GORITZA (Romania) said that the continued presence of Israel in the occupied territories was a permanent source of tension in the area. The security of a State could not be invoked as justification for acquiring territories through the use or threat of force. As at the twenty-eighth session, his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution on the same subject. His Government's position on the Middle East question had consistently been one of concern for the best interests of the inhabitants of the occupied territories. International co-operation was essential in order to force Israel to withdraw from the territories, to guarantee the sovereignty of all States in the area, and to restore the rights of the Palestinian people.

55. Mr. CHRISTOPHI (Cyprus) said his delegation had voted in favour of paragraphs 3 and 4 as well as the draft resolution as a whole. It supported the rights of the legitimate owners of the occupied territories to sovereignty over their own resources and deplored the measures taken by Israel to exploit them. His Government had always been on the side of the oppressed.

56. His delegation had taken due note of the fact that Turkey had voted in favour of paragraph 4 and of the draft resolution as a whole. It therefore held Turkey committed to the principles set forth in that paragraph and to their observance with regard to Cyprus.

57. Mr. YAMADA (Japan) said his delegation had voted for the draft resolution because it appreciated and sympathized with the basic position of those countries that were concerned about the protection of the human and natural resources of the occupied territories. His Government hoped that the problem would be expeditiously and amicably solved in accordance with the principles and resolutions referred to in the preamble of the draft resolution.

58. Mr. BERLIS (Canada) said that, while his delegation appreciated the strong feelings of many delegations on the Middle East question, it considered that political resolutions were not relevant to the work of the Second Committee, and especially to item 12. The question of the occupied territories was the major element in the continuing efforts being made to achieve a comprehensive settlement in the Middle East through negotiations between all parties. His delegation did not wish to participate in any action that might prejudice such negotiations. It had therefore abstained from voting on the draft resolution.

59. Mr. VALDES (Bolivia) said that his delegation had voted in favour of paragraph 4 because it agreed with the principles set forth therein. However, it had unfortunately found it necessary to abstain on paragraph 3 and on the draft resolution as a whole because they touched on bilateral problems that were beyond the competence of the Second Committee. His Government hoped that it would

be possible to obtain peace in the Middle East quickly and amicably.

60. Mr. CROS (France), speaking on behalf of the members of EEC, said that, although the States in question recognized the fundamental importance of the text of the draft resolution, they had abstained from voting on paragraphs 3 and 4 and on the draft resolution as a whole. They did not regard the Second Committee as the appropriate forum for a discussion on the issues raised by the draft resolution, which concerned the economic consequences of a political situation that was currently under consideration by the political organs of the United Nations. From the economic standpoint, the draft resolution stressed general principles on which there was not necessarily universal agreement.

61. Mr. GARCIA GRANADOS (Guatemala) said his delegation had consistently opposed all forms of foreign occupation and had also, on many occasions, reiterated its support for the principle of the permanent sovereignty of peoples over their national resources. It had also opposed the annexation of any territory by force. However, it had abstained on all three votes because it considered that the Second Committee was not the appropriate forum for discussion of the problem, which must be solved in all its political aspects for the good of humanity.

62. Mr. SANDERS (United States of America) said his delegation had voted against paragraphs 3 and 4 and the draft resolution as a whole. His Government's position was similar to that it had adopted with regard to General Assembly resolution 3175 (XXVIII). The subject of the draft resolution did not fall within the sphere of competence of the Second Committee. His delegation would express its views on the subject in the appropriate forum.

63. Mr. NUR YUSUF (Somalia) said his delegation had not been present during the vote on paragraphs 3 and 4; if it had been, it would have voted in favour of both paragraphs.

64. Mr. CZARKOWSKI (Poland) said his delegation had supported the draft resolution because it was consistent with Poland's position on the maintenance of international peace and security, on permanent sovereignty over national resources and on *apartheid*, colonialism and neo-colonialism in all its forms. His delegation could not be silent on the measures being taken by Israel to exploit the resources of the Arab territories.

65. Mr. AKSOY (Turkey) said his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution for the same reasons which had caused it to vote for General Assembly resolution 3175 (XXVIII). His Government also supported the principles set forth in paragraph 4. It was surprising that the just aspirations of the Arab peoples should have been used as an excuse to open an issue that had already been resolved by the General Assembly. The events in Cyprus were the result of an entirely different situation.

66. Mr. CHRISTOPHI (Cyprus), speaking on a point of order, said that he had confined his statement to the subject under discussion and had only referred in passing to

the similar situation in his country. Any discussion on that matter was irrelevant.

67. The CHAIRMAN requested the representative of Turkey to confine his remarks to his explanation of vote on the draft resolution.

68. Mr. AKSOY (Turkey) said that the Greek Cypriot representative's interpretation of paragraph 4 of the draft resolution was not relevant to the question that was before the Committee.

69. Mr. OMAR (Libyan Arab Republic) said his delegation had not been present during the vote on permanent sovereignty over national resources in the occupied Arab territories. Unfortunately, it was but another in a series of useless resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council which were not implemented because of the moral and material assistance received by the Zionist entity from imperialist countries, particularly the United States. His Government and people would never recognize the so-called State of Israel, which would inevitably be removed. The resources of the Arab countries, parts of which had been colonized by the Zionist gang, belonged by right to the Arab people. The rights and aspirations of the Palestinian people should be reaffirmed in every draft resolution submitted to the General Assembly.

70. It was important not to get caught up in side issues and forget the essence of the question: the restoration of the rights of the Palestinian people. He pitied the delegations that had voted against the draft resolution or had abstained, because they had chosen to ignore the realities of the situation.

71. Mr. HAMID (Sudan) said that the whole world was well aware of the crimes committed by Israel in usurping the lands which belonged to the Palestinian people. As the Chairman of the Palestine Liberation Organization had said in his recent statement, the events in Palestine were still fresh in the memories of many. The illegality of the Israeli occupation of Arab territories was clearly reflected in the draft resolution which had just been adopted and for which his delegation had cast an affirmative vote.

72. The spokesman for the Zionist entity seemed to believe that members were naive enough to believe his remarks about so-called Arab aggression against Israel and the rights of Israel in the Arab territories. The vote on the draft resolution showed clearly who had voted in favour of Israel: only Israel itself and one other delegation. The support received by Israel was similar to that received by South Africa and Southern Rhodesia.

73. Mr. KACIMAIWAI (Fiji) said his delegation had voted for the draft resolution because it endorsed the general principles set forth in it. Nevertheless it wished to reserve its position on a few points.

74. In the first place, it reserved its position with respect to any legal interpretation that might be necessary with regard to the word "illegal" in paragraph 2 and the words "restitution" and "full compensation" in paragraph 3. Secondly, it considered that the words "full compensation" should have reference to the views of the parties concerned.

Thirdly, it felt that the application of the general principles embodied in the draft resolution to all colonial situations might not be entirely valid. It was conceivable that some territories might wish to remain colonies not because of any pressure by the administering Power but because of the economic implications of separation. It might be to the benefit of certain very small territories to retain their colonial status. His own country had made the transition from colonial rule to independence peacefully and had no doubt that other former colonies, such as Papua New Guinea, would do likewise.

75. Mr. MURANGO (Burundi) said that if his delegation had been present during the vote it would, as a sponsor of the draft resolution, have voted for paragraphs 3 and 4 and for the text as a whole.

76. Mr. MILLS (Jamaica) said the international community as a whole had come to accept fully the principle of permanent sovereignty over natural resources. It must be remembered however, that such acceptance represented a virtual revolution in thinking and had implications for relationships between States. The matter was so important that it formed a major foundation-stone of the new international economic order outlined in the Declaration and the Programme of Action adopted at the sixth special session of the General Assembly. The coming years would see the working out of differences of views on the question and the search for a new set of relationships, partnerships and understandings.

77. It was against that background that his delegation viewed the report of the Secretary-General on the subject of permanent sovereignty over natural resources (A/9716 and Corr.1). A number of developments, particularly those relating to recent actions and policies on energy, had radically changed the distribution of financial resources and reserves in the world.

78. The new situation had set the stage for new relationships in the establishment, location and financing of development projects. Furthermore, it had forced some of the countries which had formerly had almost unchallenged control of technological and financial resources to look with alarm at the possibility that their major enterprises might come under foreign ownership, and to begin to consider preventive action. It was to be hoped that the new situation would lead to a better appreciation of the fears and aspirations which developing countries, and indeed some developed countries, had been voicing for many years.

79. Those concerns had a strong bearing on another matter which was currently the subject of discussion—namely, the role of transnational corporations in international economic relationships. The Special Intersessional Committee set up by the Economic and Social Council was currently working out detailed proposals for the United Nations machinery that would keep under continuous review the operations of those corporations in the interest of the world community.

80. As a member of the Governing Council of UNDP and of the Committee on Natural Resources, Jamaica had been involved in discussions and decisions on the establishment of the United Nations Revolving Fund for Natural Re-

sources Exploration, which it regarded as a most important and timely extension of the work of the United Nations system. He hoped that Member States would respond to the invitation made by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 1837 (LVI) and contribute to the Revolving Fund, and that the World Bank and other United Nations agencies and bodies would give their full co-operation.

81. The movement toward the establishment of an equitable régime in regard to the benefits to mankind of the exploitation of the resources of the sea, and the efforts to conclude the consideration of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, represented further steps in the direction of a new system of world economic relationships and were clearly related to the question of permanent sovereignty over natural resources.

82. The report of the Secretary-General (A/9716 and Corr.1) covered recent developments in petroleum-exporting countries and bauxite-producing countries, as well as in other mineral-producing countries. The section on nationalization or take-over of foreign enterprises by region, by country, by sector, and so forth, contained much interesting information.

83. His delegation was particularly interested in the section of the report dealing with developments in regard to bauxite. The report related some of the events surrounding the move by Jamaica to establish a more equitable position for itself in the exploitation of that mineral, of which it was a major exporter. The negotiations concerned were still in progress. His purpose therefore was merely to acknowledge the report on the matter, in general, and to draw attention to certain parts of that section of the document which contained some erroneous information relating to very crucial aspects of the negotiations between Jamaica and the companies concerned.

84. The statement in paragraph 17 that the Government of Jamaica had enacted a bill on 15 May 1974 was incorrect. Such a bill had not been enacted on that date. In fact, the Bauxite (Production Levy) Act, 1974, had been enacted on 8 June 1974. In the context in which the statement in paragraph 17 of the report was given, the impression was conveyed that a bill had been enacted by Parliament the day after negotiations with the bauxite companies had been terminated. Furthermore, the statement that the bill contained the formula for royalty and production levies originally suggested by the Government was misleading. The original suggestion of the Government of Jamaica had been modified in the course of the negotiations.

85. Paragraph 19 referred to the action taken by three of the companies involved in the negotiations to bring the differences before the International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes. It stated that, after the Centre had registered the arbitration requests, Jamaica had notified the Centre that any of its investment disputes directly related to natural resources should not be subject to the jurisdiction of the Centre. That statement was most misleading and would reflect adversely on Jamaica's posture in the matter. The facts were the following: the bauxite

negotiations had been terminated, at that stage, on 14 May 1974. On 9 May 1974, the Government of Jamaica had notified the Secretary-General of the International Centre for the Settlement of Investment Disputes, in accordance with article 25 (4) of the Convention establishing the Centre, that the following class of disputes, at any time arising, would not be subject to the jurisdiction of the Centre, viz., legal disputes arising directly out of an investment relating to mineral or other natural resources. It had not been until 17 June 1974 that the bauxite companies had registered with the Centre requests for arbitration.

86. The above sequence of events showed that the statement in the report that the notification of Jamaica to the Centre that investment disputes directly related to natural resources should not be subject to the jurisdiction of the Centre had been made after the Centre had registered arbitration requests from the bauxite companies was therefore completely inaccurate. At the time when Jamaica had made its notification, no requests for arbitration had been made by the bauxite companies and, indeed, none had been made until five weeks later. Nor had any legal dispute existed between the Government of Jamaica and the bauxite companies at the time of notification by the Government of Jamaica to the Centre.

87. The errors contained in the data in that section of the report had been corrected. The corrections were contained in document A/9716/Corr.1. It was because of the crucial nature of one or two of the matters concerned that he had spoken on the subject in some detail.

88. In conclusion, he wished to reiterate his delegation's appreciation for the work being done in the United Nations system on the question of permanent sovereignty over natural resources and related issues.

89. The CHAIRMAN announced the following additional sponsors of the draft resolution mentioned below: A/C.2/L.1368/Rev.1, submitted under item 46: Iran, Kenya, Peru, Uruguay; under item 12: A/C.2/L.1371: Bangladesh; A/C.2/L.1374: Colombia, Guinea, Guyana, Netherlands, Pakistan; A/C.2/L.1375: Cyprus; A/C.2/L.1376: Cyprus, Kuwait, Somalia.

90. Mr. ELIASHIV (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said his delegation rejected the groundless allegations that had been made by the representative of the German Democratic Republic, which were cynical in the extreme. The German Democratic Republic had never admitted its share in the crime of genocide that had been perpetrated against the Jewish people. His remarks deserved nothing but utter contempt and condemnation.

91. Mr. DIETZE (German Democratic Republic) said that the representative of Israel had slandered his country. No matter how often that representative took the floor, he could not alter the fact that Israeli practices were condemned by the democratic forces of the world, nor could he change the resolutions that had been adopted against the plundering of natural resources by the Israeli forces in the

occupied territories. His delegation had supported those resolutions because it could not accept the situation in the occupied territories. The German Democratic Republic had always supported the just aspirations of the Arab peoples and would continue to do so.

92. Mr. ELIASHIV (Israel) said that the additional statement by the representative of the German Democratic Republic only proved his feelings of guilt.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.

1636th meeting

Friday, 22 November 1974, at 3.15 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Jihad KARAM (Iraq).

A/C.2/SR.1636

AGENDA ITEM 12

Report of the Economic and Social Council [chapters II, III (sections A to D), IV, VI (sections A to D and G) and VII (sections 1 to 3)] (continued) (A/9588, A/9592, A/9599, A/9633, A/9648, A/9649, A/9656, A/9699, A/9716 and Corr.1, A/9761, A/9813, A/9855, A/C.2/289, A/C.2/291, A/C.2/L.1342, E/5425 and Corr.1 and Add.1, E/5467, E/5473, E/5499, E/5501, E/5519, E/5585 and Corr.1, E/C.8/21)

WORLD POPULATION CONFERENCE (A/9603/Add.1 (part IV), A/C.2/L.1387)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Secretary-General of the World Population Conference to introduce the report of the Conference (E/5585 and Corr.1).

2. Mr. CARRILLO FLORES (Secretary-General of the World Population Conference) said that of the three conferences on population sponsored by the United Nations, the World Population Conference held at Bucharest from 19 to 30 August 1974, had been the first to be of a political nature, and had brought together countries and recognized liberation movements representing more than 98 per cent of the world's population. The consideration of its agenda had required, firstly, scientific and technical preparation in which the United Nations Population Division, the specialized agencies and other United Nations bodies had participated; there had also been four symposia of scientists, at Cairo, Honolulu, Stockholm and Amsterdam. It had also required political preparations in the form of bilateral consultations with all countries, and regional meetings organized by the five United Nations regional economic commissions; that had permitted Governments themselves to work out more precisely the points of view which they would express later at Bucharest.

3. According to United Nations projections, the world was in an era in which the rate of population growth had reached its highest point ever: approximately 2 per cent annually. It was likely that in future the rate would tend to decline, but, because of the inertia of demographic phenomena, the world population would continue growing, and the predictions were that it would be stabilized only within a century, at between 12 and 14 thousand million people. Despite that fact, the dominant note at Bucharest had not been pessimism but the exaltation of life, which

did not mean that the challenge of offering existing and future generations reasonable access to food, housing and education for a larger population had been ignored.

4. He outlined some themes which, in his opinion, had predominated in the debate at the Conference.

5. In the first place, just as a great variety of demographic situations existed in the nations and regions of the world, the points of view of countries were also very varied, although there was a common awareness of the solidarity made necessary by contemporary reality. All States, and particularly developing States, had vigorously defended their sovereign right to define population policies. The suspicions created in many third world countries by the convening of the World Population Conference had abated, but it would be naive to suggest that they had disappeared completely. The statements made immediately after the adoption of the World Population Plan of Action (E/5585 and Corr.1, chap. I) showed that some countries, among them the most populous, were still concerned that some nations might try to impose restrictive population policies on the poor countries or, at least, to bring pressure on them to that end.

6. Secondly, there had clearly been unanimous agreement that population policies demanded sustained, vigorous and balanced economic and social development. The specific recommendations on population policy, which had received the approval of all the participants except the Holy See, had included the right of individuals and couples to obtain fertility control information and services, when they so requested. That presupposed the obligation of States to provide such services.

7. Thirdly, the Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order (resolution 3201 (S-VI)) adopted by the General Assembly at its sixth special session had been clearly reflected in the discussions and decisions of the Conference.

8. Fourthly, the developing countries' sense of urgency concerning the population problem was not, of course, the same in Asia as in Africa or in Latin America, which perhaps presented the greatest diversity in that, as in other matters. Among the Asian countries, the differences were mainly political, and concerned the interpretation of the causes of demographic problems, and the role these countries contemplated for the international community.