

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**  
**THIRTY-SIXTH SESSION**  
*Official Records\**



COPY:  
DO NOT REMOVE  
FROM ROOM  
11-201 (WWRR)

SECOND COMMITTEE  
42nd meeting  
held on  
Friday, 20 November 1981  
at 3 p.m.  
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 42nd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. VERCELES (Philippines)  
later: Mr. ter HORST (Venezuela)

CONTENTS

- AGENDA ITEM 69: DEVELOPMENT AND ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued)  
AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)  
AGENDA ITEM 70: OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued)  
AGENDA ITEM 71: TRAINING AND RESEARCH (continued)  
AGENDA ITEM 72: SPECIAL ECONOMIC AND DISASTER RELIEF ASSISTANCE (continued)

\* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

81-58184

**Distr. GENERAL**  
A/C.2/36/SR.42  
8 December 1981  
ENGLISH  
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

/...

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 69: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION (continued)

(c) TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT (A/36/15)

(1) RESTRUCTURING OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL SECTORS OF THE UNITED NATIONS:  
REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/36/419 and Add.1)

1. Mr. BOYD (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the members of the European Economic Community, said that they were grateful to the Secretary-General of UNCTAD for his first Trade and Development Report, 1981, and were gratified by the debate, commentary and constructive criticism evoked by that report.
2. The EEC hoped that the Secretary-General's report would evolve into a vehicle giving greater coherence to the work of the Trade and Development Board and its subsidiary organs. It might, for example, become a basis for analysing trends in the world of particular concern to UNCTAD and complement the reports prepared by other bodies such as the World Bank, IMF and GATT. Although the EEC had not had time to study the report in detail, it had expressed some reservations on the analysis in the report and was looking forward to a fuller debate at the twenty-fourth session of the Trade and Development Board. It hoped that subsequent editions would take account of the views expressed by Member States of the Board during the debate.
3. With regard to some of the key areas of UNCTAD's activities, he said that the European Community attached great importance to further progress in the Integrated Programme for Commodities. As far as the Common Fund was concerned, he pointed out that all Member States of the Community, and the Community itself, had signed the Agreement on the Fund and were well on the way to completing the necessary procedures for ratification. They hoped that more developing countries and countries in other groups would shortly follow suit so that the Fund could be formally constituted by the end of the following year. The Fund would have an important role to play in charting a new approach to international co-operation in the field of commodities. He pointed out in that connexion that the member States of the EEC had recently announced voluntary contributions to the second window of the Common Fund. The European Community had always played an active role in negotiating commodity agreements in the context of the Integrated Programme for Commodities, some of which contained buffer-stocking provisions which would, it hoped, in due course enter into association with the first window of the Common Fund. The member countries of EEC were prepared to carry on work on other commodities and hoped that during the coming year there would be progress towards what might be called second-window-type agreements on other commodities. In any event, UNCTAD should intensify its work on the structure and operation of commodity markets.
4. The EEC was likewise prepared to work on other means of improving the export earnings of developing countries and to examine in a constructive spirit the most suitable means of responding to the recommendation of the United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries concerning the stabilization of their export earnings from commodities, particularly by studying what arrangements could be made to extend to the least developed countries not party to the second Lomé Convention provisions similar to those of STABEX.

/...

(Mr. Boyd, United Kingdom)

5. Moreover, questions such as the participation of developing countries in processing, marketing and distribution should be more fully explored. The EEC was also in favour of developing countries increasing their exports of partly or fully processed goods. It believed that it was essential, if solutions were to be found to the problems of poverty and under-development, to work for stability in commodity trade.
6. UNCTAD should, in analysing patterns of world trade, take a practical view of over-all trade trends and patterns of production and of their impact on international trade, taking careful account of the parallel and complementary work undertaken by GATT.
7. The European Community, which supported economic co-operation among developing countries, hoped that that co-operation would enjoy universal support. It likewise hoped that the consultations to be held by the President of the Trade and Development Board would be fruitful and that no action would be taken that might prejudice their outcome.
8. It was gratifying that so interesting a debate had taken place at the most recent session of the Trade and Development Board and that consensus had emerged on the venue for the sixth session of UNCTAD.
9. Turning to the question of the restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system, he said that resolution 32/197 had been a major achievement and that the time had perhaps come to analyse its implementation.
10. A substantial effort had undoubtedly been made to reorganize and consolidate the items to be considered and to allocate them more sensibly between the committees, but the question of documentation, unfortunately, remained unsolved. There was no easy solution to that problem. In its desire to reduce the volume of documentation, the European Economic Community intended to propose that a number of reports should be submitted to the General Assembly on a biennial basis and that some agenda items should be dealt with every two years instead of every year. The EEC was, moreover, acutely concerned about the failure to distribute documents within the accepted time-frame and the failure to issue them simultaneously in the two working languages of the United Nations.
11. On the question of the relationship between the Second and Third Committees, which had a bearing on the role of the Economic and Social Council, he said that Member States had so far failed to apply the Charter and section II of the annex to resolution 32/197, which defined the role of the Council. The Economic and Social Council should enjoy the full confidence of Member States and undertake its full role as the co-ordinating body for the economic and social sectors. The Economic and Social Council would have greater impact if there were a more rational allocation of items between the General Assembly and the Council, if some of its subsidiary bodies were eliminated and if the practice of subject-oriented sessions were instituted.
12. Section IV of the annex to resolution 32/197 set out in great detail the role of the regional commissions and steps should be taken with regard to the

/...

(Mr. Boyd, United Kingdom)

commissions. The members of EEC favoured some decentralization of activities to the regional commissions and, accordingly, a rational distribution of tasks and responsibilities in such spheres as the environment, water and inland transport. The regional commissions could also play a useful role in the gathering of statistical information. However, devolution of authority should be based on a rational analysis of where tasks could most appropriately be performed. There should also be a corresponding transfer of resources. The European Economic Community welcomed the steps taken by the regional commissions with regard to the implementation of the International Development Strategy and recognized that they would have an important role to play in the review and appraisal of the Strategy.

13. With regard to the operational activities of the United Nations system (General Assembly resolution 32/197, annex, sect. V), he said that the holding of an annual pledging conference for development activities had proved a useful step. The same applied to the designation of resident co-ordinators with over-all responsibility for, and co-ordination of, operational activities for development at the country level. The EEC countries warmly welcomed the designation by the Secretary-General of a further nine resident co-ordinators.

14. Referring to the appointment of a Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation, he observed that, as the Secretary-General noted, the post was designed to provide a catalytic and leadership function and to establish guidelines designed to ensure coherence and co-ordination of economic and social activities throughout the United Nations system. The members of EEC favoured an enhancement of the Director-General's authority: they endorsed the Secretary-General's view (A/36/419/Add.1) that a clearer specification of the Director-General's authority was necessary and that his authority should correspond to his responsibilities. He was pleased to note from the report of the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) on the relationships between the Director-General and entities of the Secretariat (A/36/419) that a revised version of the Bulletin on the organization of the Secretariat would emphasize the role of the Office of the Director-General in exercising leadership and co-ordination and would provide some clarification of the relationship between the Director-General and the entities concerned, without seeking to elaborate all the minutiae of his mandate. The recommendation concerning the Director-General must be implemented with flexibility. It would also be sensible, as the Secretary-General indicated in his comments (A/36/419/Add.1), for the Office of the Director-General to benefit from substantive contributions by Secretariat units either directly or through participation in task forces, while staff resources would be made available in special circumstances. The essence of co-ordination and co-operation lay in a continuing process of collaboration over time. The members of EEC congratulated the Office of the Director-General on the steps taken so far and would, for their part, endeavour to promote consistency in their approach to the issues affected by restructuring.

Draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.82

15. Mr. ATTAF (Algeria), introducing, on behalf of the Group of 77, draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.82 on industrial development co-operation, said that the draft resolution consisted of two parts, concerning respectively the report of the

(Mr. Attaf, Algeria)

Industrial Development Board at its fifteenth session and the Industrial Development Decade for Africa. The first part centred on three main ideas: the first idea concerned certain principles of general policy relating to the International Development Strategy, the Lima Declaration and Plan of Action, and the New Delhi Declaration and Plan of Action; the second idea concerned institutional issues, and the third dealt with financial problems. The second part of the draft resolution focused on the over-all prospects for the implementation of the Lagos Plan.

Draft resolutions A/C.2/36/L.15 and L.108

16. Mr. TSUI (Secretary of the Committee) explained that the administrative and financial implications of draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.15, which were contained in document A/C.2/36/L.43, also applied to draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.108, it being understood, however, that if the fifth session of the United Nations Conference on an International Code of Conduct on the Transfer of Technology was convened in 1983 and not 1982, the conference servicing costs were estimated to be \$810,700, not \$772,700.

17. The CHAIRMAN announced that draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.15 had been withdrawn by its sponsors.

18. Draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.108 was adopted without a vote.

19. Mr. SZEREMETA (Poland), speaking also on behalf of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR, said that the Socialist States had always supported the efforts of the developing countries to be independent of the capitalist countries in the technology field. Consequently, they supported draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.108 aimed at expediting the elaboration of an international code of conduct on the transfer of technology, which had been delayed by the Western States. The Socialist States hoped that the interim committee of the Conference would discharge its mandate within the prescribed time. He emphasized that the setting up of the interim committee should not entail an increase in the resources allocated from the United Nations regular budget.

Draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.26/Rev.2 (and the amendment in document A/C.2/36/L.81)

20. The CHAIRMAN said that, in the third preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.26/Rev.2, entitled "Comprehensive outline of a world survey on the role of women in development", the word "decisions" should be replaced by the word "documents". He announced that the USSR had withdrawn the amendment it had proposed in document A/C.2/36/L.81.

21. Revised draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.26/Rev.2, as orally corrected, was adopted without a vote.

22. Mr. SZEREMETA (Poland), speaking also on behalf of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR, said that the Socialist States supported draft

/...

(Mr. Szeremeta, Poland)

resolution A/C.2/36/L.26/Rev.2 in its current form. They considered that the Secretary-General, in preparing the survey, should take into account, in accordance with the third preambular paragraph, the provisions of the documents adopted at the World Conference of the United Nations Decade for Women, including the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. The preparation of the survey, which was an integral part of the activities of the Decade, should be aimed at guaranteeing the equality of women in the political, economic and social fields, as well as their participation in the struggle to promote international peace, security and co-operation and to combat colonialism, apartheid, all forms of racism and racial discrimination, aggression and foreign occupation and all forms of foreign domination. In the survey, account should also be taken of the experience of all countries relating to the participation of women in economic and social activities and of the problems which they currently encountered in that regard. On the basis of those principles, the General Assembly would be able, at its thirty-seventh session, to assess the results of the Secretary-General's work in connexion with the world survey.

23. Mr. ZIMMERMAN (United States of America) said that his delegation had joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.26/Rev.2, because development planning could not be effective without taking into account the role of women as agents and beneficiaries of development. Its position was in keeping with its support for the implementation of the objectives of the Programme of Action adopted at the World Conference of the United Nations Decade for Women. His delegation, however, was opposed to those provisions of the Programme which were unconnected with the real problems of women.

24. Mr. PLECHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thanked the sponsors of the draft resolution for the understanding they had shown regarding the amendments introduced in order to find a wording acceptable to all delegations, adding that the text had thereby been improved.

25. Mr. BEN-HAIM (Israel) stated that his delegation had joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.26/Rev.2 on the understanding that the third preambular paragraph referred exclusively to the agreed measures concerning the integration of women in development. He pointed out that the Israeli representative in the Third Committee had already explained the reasons for Israel's opposition to certain ill-advised provisions in the Copenhagen Programme, their aim being to politicize the question.

26. The CHAIRMAN suggested, with reference to agenda item 69 (1), of the note by the Secretary-General transmitting to the General Assembly the report of the Executive Director of UNIDO on the integration of women in development (A/36/470); the report of the Secretary-General on the role of the United Nations agencies and organizations in assisting Governments to facilitate the integration of women in rural development (A/36/475) and the report of the Secretary-General on women, science and technology (A/36/591).

27. It was so agreed.



Draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.63 and L.94

28. The CHAIRMAN announced that draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.63 had been withdrawn by the sponsors.

29. Draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.94 was adopted without a vote.

30. Mr. SZEREMETA (Poland), speaking on his own behalf and on behalf of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, the Ukrainian SSR and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, said that the Socialist States supported the legitimate claims of the developing countries concerning the flow of skilled manpower, referred to as the "reverse transfer of technology" in the United Nations. That problem was linked with the neo-colonialist policy of the monopolists in the capitalist countries, especially the transnational corporations. The flow of skilled manpower undermined the efforts of the developing countries to mobilize their national resources in order to ensure their economic independence. The Socialist countries considered that draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.94 dealt not only with the specific problem of the reverse transfer of technology but also with basic problems of the brain-drain in all its aspects. The practical measures to be taken by the United Nations in that connexion should be aimed principally at obliging countries which attracted skilled manpower from the developing countries to compensate them. They were convinced that stopping the reverse transfer of technology would help the developing countries to introduce progressive reforms and to escape from the influence of transnational corporations. The Socialist States had supported draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.94 on the understanding that the implementation of the measures therein would be financed from resources already included in the United Nations budget. With regard to the intergovernmental group of experts to examine the feasibility of measuring human resource flows, referred to in paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, he confirmed the position of the Socialist States as described during the adoption of General Assembly resolution 35/62.

31. Mr. TIERNEY (United States of America) explained that, by joining the consensus in the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.94, paragraph 1 of which took note of the report on the establishment of an international labour compensatory facility, his delegation was not signifying its support of the report which dealt with the desirability, rather than the feasibility, of establishing such a facility.

Draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.66

32. Draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.66 was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.76

33. Draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.76 was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.90

34. Draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.90 was adopted without a vote.

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

Draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.7/Rev.3

35. The CHAIRMAN announced that the following countries were co-sponsoring draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.7/Rev.3, which had been introduced at a previous meeting: Algeria, Bahrain, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal and the United Arab Emirates.

36. Mr. PLECHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) remarked that the Soviet Union's position of principle on the question of assistance to the Palestinian people was well known as it had been set forth frequently in the General Assembly and other United Nations bodies. Referring to resolution ES-7/2, in which the General Assembly at its seventh emergency special session had confirmed the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, he stressed that his delegation had consistently upheld the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people whose political organ, the PLO, had been recognized world-wide as the sole legitimate representative of that people. The militarist policy of the United States and the growing aggressiveness of Israel which had openly proclaimed a strategic union between Washington and Tel Aviv were grounds for concern. It was also unfortunate that the United States was using Israel to put into effect its plan for establishing its own political and economic domination of the Middle East, encouraging Israel to pursue its expansionist policy, to tread the rights of the Palestinian people underfoot and crushing all resistance movements, thereby preventing the creation of an independent Palestinian State.

37. He then drew attention to the statement made at the end of the twenty-third session of the Trade and Development Board by the representative of the Group of 77 who had pointed out that the occupied Palestinian territories were merely a source of cheap manpower for Israel and a market for Israeli exports. The distribution to the General Assembly by the Government of Israel of a report on "development through promotion of the transitional economy" (A/36/497), covering Israel's economic programmes, was ironic when it was remembered that one of the main objectives of that programme was to exploit still further the natural and human resources of the Palestinian people in the occupied territories. Quite clearly the Soviet Union fully supported draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.7/Rev.3.

38. Mr. HILLEL (Israel) observed that his Government was not opposed to the rendering of assistance to the Palestinians provided that the assistance was for the direct benefit of the population and not of the PLO. It was important that economic and social criteria, on the basis of which certain UNDP projects were executed, should take precedence over political criteria. His Government had encouraged the economic and social of the Palestinians and it had co-operated with some of the United Nations specialized agencies on a purely professional basis. It was unfortunate that draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.7/Rev.3 before the Committee had been worded in such a way as to jeopardize the attainment of its very objectives, namely, the provision of practical assistance. If the draft were adopted, it would do no more than join the long list of resolutions doomed to be dead letters; over the long term that host of politically-oriented resolutions would weaken the capacity of the United Nations to meet urgent development needs. It was in that spirit that his delegation would vote against

/...



(Mr. Hillel, Israel)

draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.7/Rev.3. The comments made concerning Israel by the Soviet Union representative in his statement on the subject had come as no surprise. Israel was constantly drawing attention to the subversive methods used by the Soviet Union which was only aggravating the conflicts in the Middle East and preventing the establishment of peace in the region.

39. Mr. GOKCE (Turkey) said that his delegation, which had always supported the principle of UNDP assistance to the Palestinian people, was glad that the Arab countries had reached a consensus on that important question. He would therefore vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.7/Rev.3.

40. Mr. ZWAYNE (Syrian Arab Republic) said it was regrettable that the occupation forces were deliberately standing in the way of UNDP's efforts to carry out its projects of assistance to the Palestinian people. Nevertheless, the Syrian Government was most grateful to UNDP for the efforts it had made in the region. He would vote for the draft resolution under consideration and he was confident that all the countries that were in favour of peace would do likewise.

41. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.7/Rev.3.

42. Draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.7/Rev.3 was adopted by 112 votes to 2, with 21 abstentions.

43. Mr. HAYFORD (Ghana) said that his delegation wished to correct its vote. Ghana had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.7/Rev.3; it had not abstained, as the recorded vote indicated.

44. Mr. WAKASUGY (Japan), explaining his vote, said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.7/Rev.3. Japan supported the assistance given by the United Nations to national liberation movements and accordingly continued to uphold the position it had set forth at the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly.

45. Mr. ALAKWAA (Yemen) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.7/Rev.3 despite the fact that no amount of assistance could make up for the losses and sufferings of the Palestinian people. The United Nations, which was the creation of the international community, should make sure that the various resolutions and decisions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council since 1947 concerning the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people were implemented. He announced that Yemen had joined in sponsoring draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.7/Rev.3.

46. Mr. FALKNER (United States of America) said that his delegation had voted against draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.7/Rev.3. As in the case of draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.31, his delegation rejected the introduction of political elements which were alien to the economic and humanitarian concerns of the Second Committee. The slanderous and unacceptable attack by the representative of the Soviet Union on the United States was a particularly representative example of those tactics, which *were detrimental to the work of the Second Committee.*

/...

47. Miss EVANS (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the States members of the European Economic Community, said that they had abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.7/Rev.3. The position of the countries of the European Community on paragraph 2 of the draft had not changed. With regard to paragraph 4, it should have specified, in the spirit of Security Council resolution 242 (1967), that it was the execution of projects in the territories occupied by Israel since 1967 that was meant. As to the question of Jerusalem, she recalled the declaration of the States members of the European Community dated 13 June 1980 in which it had been stipulated, inter alia, that they rejected any unilateral modification of the status of Jerusalem.

48. Mr. BARREIRO (Uruguay) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.7/Rev.3 and reaffirmed the position taken by his country on the occasion of the seventh special session of the General Assembly.

49. Mr. KOASK (Palestine Liberation Organization) expressed his thanks to the Member States which had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.7/Rev.3. With reference to the abstention of certain countries on paragraph 2 of the draft, he said that PLO had the mass support of the Palestinian population and that it was the sole authentic representative of the Palestinian people. The Governments of certain Western countries did not have the support of even half of their populations and yet they were considered as representing their countries.

50. Turning to the statement of the United States delegation, he challenged the Government of the United States to say whether it supported Israel within its frontiers as of 1948, 1966, 1967, 1973 or the present. With reference to the statement of the representative of Israel to the effect that the accumulation of resolutions similar to resolution A/C.2/36/L.7/Rev.3 would be harmful in the long run, he said he wondered if it was to be concluded that Israel intended to go on violating the United Nations resolutions indefinitely in defiance of the will of the international community.

51. In conclusion he cited a number of repressive actions carried out by Israel in the occupied territories and reported in The New York Times on 10 November 1981, and said that fine words could never mask the hideous reality of military occupation by a country which had no rightful place in the United Nations.

52. Mr. ter Horst (Venezuela) took the Chair.

#### AGENDA ITEM 70: OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued)

##### (a) OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

#### Draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.89

53. Mr. ATTAF (Algeria), introducing on behalf of the Group of 77 draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.89 on operational activities for development, said that it reflected the deep concern of the developing countries over the financial crisis which was hampering operational activities for development.

## (f) UNITED NATIONS VOLUNTEERS PROGRAMME

Draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.77

54. Mr. BRILLANTE (Philippines), introducing draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.77 on the United Nations Volunteers Programme on behalf of the sponsors, who had been joined by Bhutan, Bangladesh and Liberia, said he wished to draw attention to two changes that had been suggested: in paragraph 3 the words "reaffirms its conviction" would be replaced by "considers"; in paragraph 4 the words "the growth of" would be deleted.

55. He expressed his delegation's satisfaction with the activities of the Volunteers Programme, which could be regarded as a concrete and practical expression of technical co-operation between developing countries since more than 75 per cent of its recruits came from those countries. He would like to take the occasion of the tenth anniversary of that Programme to say that it was an innovative approach to providing technical assistance in a cost-efficient manner. He was awaiting with interest the contribution of the Programme to the preparations for International Youth Year. Speaking generally, he expressed the hope that the Programme would receive all the support it needed to enable it to realize its full potential. Lastly, he said he hoped that draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.77 would be adopted by consensus.

## (b) UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

Draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.107

56. Mr. LAZAREVIC (Yugoslavia), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, which had been joined by Algeria, Burundi, Liberia, the Netherlands, Niger, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Turkey, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe, introduced draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.107 concerning the United Nations Development Programme; he stressed the importance of the statement made by the UNDP Administrator in the Committee at the beginning of the current session on the subject of operational activities and multilateral co-operation in general. The text of the preamble of the draft resolution was clear and should not create any special difficulties, especially since an effort had been made in the informal consultations to accommodate most of the views expressed. The operative part of the draft resolution dealt primarily with the problem of UNDP's resources and emphasized the need to strengthen co-ordination between all organizations, both between headquarters and at the field level. He expressed the hope that the draft resolution could be adopted by consensus.

57. Mr. Verceles (Philippines) resumed the Chair.

Draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.64

58. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.64.

59. Draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.64 was adopted by 112 votes to none, with 20 abstentions.

60. Miss EVANS (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the member countries of the European Economic Community, said that those countries had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.64. Their reservations concerning the United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries were well known. The member countries of EEC felt that the assistance granted to land-locked developing countries should be proportionate to their individual levels of development. They therefore preferred to contribute to the development of land-locked countries through bilateral or multilateral programmes instead of contributing to the Special Fund.

61. Mr. IVERSEN (Denmark), speaking on behalf of Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden and his own country, said that they had abstained, as they had on several previous occasions in similar circumstances, because they were opposed to the proliferation of special funds. The Nordic countries preferred to channel their assistance through existing bodies, such as UNDP, and questioned the advisability of establishing a Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries.

62. Mr. PLECHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Soviet Union was aware of the difficulties experienced by the land-locked developing countries and took those difficulties into account in its relations with them. Accordingly, the Soviet Union was a party to several conventions concerning transit and provided the land-locked developing countries with assistance to help them to solve their particular problems relating to transit. By voting in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.64, his delegation had confirmed the position it had set forth in connexion with the adoption of the General Assembly and UNCTAD documents referred to in draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.64.

Draft resolutions A/C.2/36/L.70 and L.93

63. The CHAIRMAN announced that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.70, which had been joined by Mali, had withdrawn the draft resolution.

64. Draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.93 was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolutions A/C.2/36/L.71 and L.92

65. The CHAIRMAN announced that Bhutan, Canada, Ecuador, the Federal Republic of Germany, Lebanon, the Netherlands and Qatar had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.71 entitled "United Nations Children's Fund", and that that draft resolution had been withdrawn.

66. Draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.92 was adopted without a vote.

67. Mr. EKANEY (United Republic of Cameroon) said that his delegation had joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.92 because it firmly believed in the efficacy of the assistance UNICEF was providing for the establishment of basic services for children and mothers in the developing countries. He thanked the Executive Director and secretariat of UNICEF for their efforts. However, he found the discrepancy between the volume of resources provided for in resolutions concerning UNICEF and the volume of resources UNICEF actually received regrettable. While all those resolutions appealed to Governments to increase the amount of

(Mr. Ekaney, United Republic  
of Cameroon)

their contributions, the results fell far short of expectations, as was clear from the recent Pledging Conference for Development Activities. It was unpardonable that at a time when enormous sums were being spent on the arms race, millions of children in the developing countries were dying for lack of essential services. He expressed the hope that Governments and the agencies concerned would do their utmost to implement the provisions of draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.92, particularly paragraphs 5, 6, 7 and 8.

AGENDA ITEM 71: TRAINING AND RESEARCH (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.11/Rev.1

68. Miss LIANG (Singapore) said that China, Kenya, Lebanon and Senegal had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.11/Rev.1, entitled "United Nations Institute for Training and Research". As a result of informal consultations between the Chairmen of the Second and Fifth Committees, it had been agreed to refer the report of the Executive Director of the Institute (A/36/14) to the Fifth Committee for consideration. In view of that report and of General Assembly resolution 35/53 B of 5 December 1980, it had been decided that the statement of the administrative and financial implications (A/C.2/36/L.36) of draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.11 would be considered by the Fifth Committee. She asked the Secretariat to comment on that matter.

69. On behalf of the sponsors, she announced two changes to draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.11/Rev.1: at the end of paragraph 1, the words "which, inter alia, makes reference to the financial situation of the Institute in 1981 and 1982" should be deleted; and, in the fourth line of paragraph 5, the word "substantially" should be deleted.

70. Since the draft resolution, as orally revised, had no new financial implications, she hoped that it would be adopted by consensus.

71. Mr. UY (Chief, Economic, Social and Human Rights Section, Budget Division) said that, pursuant to the memorandum dated 17 November 1981 from the Chairman of the Second Committee to the Chairman of the Fifth Committee concerning draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.11 and the relevant statement of administrative and financial implications (A/C.2/36/L.36), the Secretary-General had sent a note (A/C.5/36/55) to the Fifth Committee, asking the General Assembly to approve an additional appropriation of \$352,592 to cover UNITAR's deficit for the biennium 1980-1981.

72. In view of the intent of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.11/Rev.1 and of the memorandum of the Chairman of the Second Committee, the Secretariat was therefore in a position to confirm that draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.11/Rev.1, as orally revised, had no new financial implications.

73. Draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.11/Rev.1, as revised, was adopted without a vote.

/...

74. Miss FORD (Canada) said that her delegation had joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.11/Rev.1. However, although the document just adopted had no financial implications, the debate on UNITAR had dealt largely with means of placing the Institute on a sound financial footing. Canada believed that in the long run the best means of achieving that result was to provide the Institute, like many other agencies within the system, with a modest contribution from the regular budget of the United Nations. Canada itself would make a special contribution of \$Can 132,000 to the Institute for 1981.

75. Mr. SINGER (United States of America) said that because of its austerity policy, his Government had regretfully decided not to renew its voluntary contribution in 1982 or, in all probability, in 1983. The United States was opposed to financing the Institute from the regular budget of the United Nations. Indeed, while it unreservedly supported the concept on which UNITAR was founded, his Government believed that the Institute must limit its expenditures and get its priorities right. It strongly urged the Institute to turn to private non-governmental organizations for funds.

76. Mr. PLECHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had not opposed the adoption by consensus of draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.11/Rev.1 because it believed that UNITAR's activities were constructive. The Institute had made laudable efforts to reduce its deficit, but it could go even farther in that direction. In that connexion, he particularly wished to draw the attention of the management of the Institute to paragraphs 3 and 4 of the draft resolution just adopted.

77. Mr. BAHADIAN (Brazil) said that Brazil had joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.11/Rev.1 but was opposed to financing the Institute from the regular budget of the United Nations. UNITAR should continue to be financed through voluntary contributions.

78. Mr. ZIMMERMAN (Federal Republic of Germany) said that it was extremely important for the Institute to balance its budget in 1982, and it was with that in mind that his delegation had joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.11/Rev.1.

AGENDA ITEM 72: SPECIAL ECONOMIC AND DISASTER RELIEF ASSISTANCE (continued)

(b) SPECIAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAMMES

Draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.61/Rev.1

79. Mr. BIRIDO (Sudan), introducing draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.61/Rev.1, on assistance to the drought-stricken areas in Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, the Sudan and Uganda, on behalf of the sponsors, which had been joined by Bangladesh, Guinea and Lebanon, pointed out that Ethiopia and Kenya had been added to the list of countries to benefit from assistance for drought-stricken regions. In connexion with paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, he said that the multiagency mission sent to the drought-stricken regions had reported the great interest shown by the Governments of the region, in the establishment of an intergovernmental body as soon as possible. With respect to paragraph 7 (a), he said that the most

/...



(Mr. Birido, Sudan)

important recommendation made by the mission related to the need for the countries of the region to formulate national policies for dealing with drought, bearing in mind that the United Nations could provide substantial assistance for that purpose.

Draft resolutions A/C.2/36/L.78 and L.80

80. Mr. KATAWALA (Mozambique) said that the following countries had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.78 on assistance to Botswana: Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Central African Republic, Comoros, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Swaziland, Sweden, Zaire and Zimbabwe. The following countries had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.80 on assistance to Zimbabwe: Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Ethiopia, Gambia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Nigeria, Pakistan, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sweden, Uganda and Yugoslavia.

81. Zimbabwe's economic development had suffered as a result of the political struggle which had led Zimbabwe to independence in April 1980. The country had also repeatedly experienced economic sabotage and it shared with others the problem of being a land-locked country. As for Botswana, since much of its territory was desert, it was a drought-stricken country, and that affected its agriculture; it, too, was a land-locked developing country. It was for those reasons that the sponsors of the draft resolutions under consideration believed that both Botswana and Zimbabwe should receive sizable priority assistance.

Draft resolutions A/C.2/36/L.28 and L.98

82. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take up draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.98, entitled "Implementation of the medium-term and long-term recovery and rehabilitation programme in the Sudano-Sahelian region", submitted by Mr. Ringnald, Vice-Chairman of the Committee, following the informal consultations on draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.28.

83. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.28, which had subsequently been joined by the United States, had withdrawn their proposal.

84. Mr. BLAIN (Gambia), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.28, proposed the following change in paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.98: "Notes with appreciation the effective manner in which the United Nations is discharging its responsibilities in responding to the priority requests of the States members of the Permanent Inter-State Committee on Drought Control in the Sahel within the framework of their programme".

85. Mr. SZEREMETA (Poland), speaking on behalf of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and his own delegation, said that the Socialist countries supported draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.98. Those countries would continue to provide technical assistance to the countries of the Sahel in the context of bilateral

(Mr. Szeremeta, Poland)

programmes and by making contributions to certain multilateral programmes, including UNDP, and other economic and technical assistance programmes.

86. Draft resolution A/C.2/36/L.98, as orally revised, was adopted without a vote.

87. Mr. TSUI (Secretary of the Committee) announced that the following countries had become sponsors of the following draft resolutions: A/C.2/36/L.37, Belgium, Costa Rica, Djibouti, France, Jordan, Kuwait, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates, United States of America and Uruguay; A/C.2/36/L.38/Rev.1, Guinea and Pakistan; A/C.2/36/L.39, Bangladesh, Botswana, India, Malawi and Pakistan; A/C.2/36/L.46, Pakistan; A/C.2/36/L.47, Congo, France and Guyana; A/C.2/36/L.48, Benin, France, India, Mali and Pakistan; A/C.2/36/L.52, Gambia and Pakistan; A/C.2/36/L.54, Brazil, Denmark, France and Sweden; A/C.2/36/L.56, Gambia and Guinea; A/C.2/36/L.57, Afghanistan, Guinea and Nicaragua; A/C.2/36/L.58, Algeria, Guinea and Jordan; A/C.2/36/L.59, Pakistan; A/C.2/36/L.60, Guinea, Nigeria, Pakistan and the United Republic of Cameroon; A/C.2/36/L.73, Algeria, Guinea and Pakistan; A/C.2/36/L.74, Guinea, Indonesia, Japan, Mali, Qatar and the United Arab Emirates.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.