

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-EIGHTH SESSION

SECOND COMMITTEE

**Summary records of the 1514th to 1585th meetings,
held at Headquarters, New York, from 19 September to 12 December 1973**

1514th meeting

Wednesday, 19 September 1973, at 8.55 p.m.

Temporary Chairman: Mr. Leopoldo BENITES (Ecuador).

A/C.2/SR.1514

Election of the Chairman

1. Mr. RANKIN (Canada) nominated Mr. Zewde Gabre-Sellassie (Ethiopia) as Chairman.
2. In the absence of further nominations and in accordance with rule 105 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN declared Mr. Gabre-Sellassie elected Chairman by acclamation.

Mr. Gabre-Sellassie (Ethiopia) was elected Chairman by acclamation.

The meeting rose at 9 p.m.

1515th meeting

Tuesday, 25 September 1973, at 10.55 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Zewde GABRE-SELLASSIE (Ethiopia).

A/C.2/SR.1515

Statement by the Chairman

1. The CHAIRMAN welcomed the members of the Committee to the twenty-eighth session and pledged his readiness to work with them in making the session a very fruitful one. He paid tribute to his predecessor as Chairman, Mr. Rankin (Canada).

2. On behalf of the Committee, he welcomed the representatives of three new Member States, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, and the Commonwealth of the Bahamas, to the Committee.

3. He suggested that the election of the other officers should be postponed in order to allow more time for consultations.

It was so agreed.

4. Mr. ZACHMANN (German Democratic Republic) thanked the Chairman for his expression of welcome. His country's admission to the United Nations, in implementation of the principles of the Charter, gave it the opportunity to make a constructive contribution to efforts to solve the complex problems facing the United Nations, and in particular the wide range of economic and social problems. His Government had proved its readiness to contribute constructively in ECE,

UNCTAD, the Governing Council of UNEP and the specialized agencies.

5. Mr. ROUGET (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation was grateful for the warm welcome extended to it and intended to make a positive contribution to the Committee's work in a spirit of compromise and mutual understanding. His delegation had followed with great interest the efforts to streamline the work of the Economic and Social Council and, accordingly, of the Second Committee.

Organization of the Committee's work (A/C.2/279, A/C.2/L.1285 and Corr.1, A/C.2/L.1286)

6. The CHAIRMAN said that if there was no objection he would take it that the Committee agreed to the plan of work proposed in document A/C.2/L.1285 and Corr.1.

It was so decided.

7. Mr. VAN GORKOM (Netherlands) said that the Committee should consider how it would deal with what his delegation believed was the most important item on its agenda: the review and appraisal of the objectives and policies of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade (item 46). At its fifty-fifth session, the Economic and Social Council had established a working group which had prepared a working paper on the subject; the Council had been unable to reach full agreement on the contents of the paper and, in resolution 1827 (LV), had transmitted it to the General Assembly for further consideration. He suggested that the Committee should establish an informal open-ended working group as soon as possible to consider the working paper and any amendments which delegations might wish to propose. His delegation considered it of the utmost importance that full agreement be reached on the contents of the working paper at the current session. He asked the Secretariat whether conference facilities would be available for the proposed working group on review and appraisal; if there were difficulties, some other solution might be sought.

8. Mr. BRITO (Brazil) said that, although he had no objection to the Netherlands representative's suggestion, the Committee might wish to consider a less formal arrangement, bearing in mind that some delegations would find it difficult to attend an informal working group concurrently with Committee meetings. Delegations would have the opportunity to express their views on item 46 at the beginning of the session during the general debate, and again in November. The best course might be to proceed with the general debate, during which the positions of Member States on the review and appraisal exercise would emerge. The Committee could then decide in the third week of the session what course of action to follow with respect to the Netherlands suggestion.

9. Mr. HAMID (Sudan) said that the developing countries had a particular interest in the review and appraisal exercise because they were disappointed with the results so far attained in the implementation of the International Development Strategy. Some countries had not taken part in the fifty-fifth session of the Economic and Social Council or in the preparation of the working paper. Accordingly, the item should be

accorded priority and should serve as the theme of the general debate.

10. He agreed that an open-ended working group should be established at an early date and should meet while the general debate was in progress. The Committee could review its findings once the general debate was concluded.

11. Mr. RANKIN (Canada) endorsed the suggestions of the Sudanese and Netherlands representatives.

12. Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta) said that his delegation, which was not a member of the Economic and Social Council or of the Committee on Review and Appraisal, considered that the proposal for the establishment of a working group to evaluate the implementation of the International Development Strategy was premature; such a proposal would be appropriate after the general debate and preliminary consideration of item 46. The Committee should have the opportunity fully to exercise its responsibilities in the matter, and should not merely act as a letterbox for the Committee on Review and Appraisal and the Council.

13. Mr. SHEMIRANI (Iran) said that his delegation, like that of Upper Volta, was not a member of the Council or of the Committee on Review and Appraisal. It agreed that the item was one of the most important on the Committee's agenda and that it should receive full consideration. For the moment, it would be preferable to pursue informal consultations in order to gain an impression of delegations' positions, with a view to reaching a formula acceptable to all.

14. Mr. NDUNG'U (Kenya) said that although his delegation was not a member of the Economic and Social Council, it had participated fully in the review and appraisal exercise in the sessional committees and in the Committee on Review and Appraisal. It therefore understood the difficulties of those delegations which had not taken part in the discussion of the working paper prepared by the Council's working group.

15. The Committee should start its general debate, in the course of which delegations could appraise the difficulties which had arisen in the working group and decide what further action was desirable.

16. Mr. ARVESEN (Norway) said that, while he basically agreed with the Netherlands and Sudanese representatives, he felt that the views of other delegations should be accommodated. In the interest of saving time, the item on review and appraisal should constitute the main theme of the general debate, so that when item 46 was considered, delegations would not have to repeat what they had already stated. In the preliminary discussion of that item, members could put forward specific proposals regarding the working paper transmitted by the Council. The Committee could decide at a later stage whether to set up a working group.

17. Mr. JOSEPH (Australia) endorsed those observations.

18. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Committee), in reply to a question asked by the representative of the Netherlands, said that while the Committee could use the facilities available to it for either formal or informal meetings, two meetings of the whole membership of the Committee could not be held concurrently. However, the Economic and Social Council Chamber had been placed at the Committee's disposal for working group

meetings, and could accommodate 50 delegations. Generally, that room would be available on working days, subject to certain restrictions as a result of, for example, meetings of the Security Council.

19. Mr. SHERMAN (Liberia) supported the views expressed by the representative of Upper Volta. Delegations would certainly need a background paper outlining the nature of the International Development Strategy and stating the objectives and policies which the Committee was required to appraise. If such a document was already available, it should be distributed before the debate on review and appraisal began.

20. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Committee) said that the report of the Economic and Social Council (A/9003) would be distributed shortly. In order to facilitate the work of the Committee, the text of resolution 1827 (LV), to which the working paper on review and appraisal was annexed, and of resolution 1762 (LIV), on the revolving fund for natural resources exploration would be distributed separately, under cover of notes by the Secretary-General.¹

21. Mr. KITCHEN (United States of America) said that the Committee had a very full time-table in which three weeks were allocated to discussing the review and appraisal exercise as could be seen from the note by the President (A/C.2/L.1285 and Corr.1). His delegation agreed that it would be desirable to complete a preliminary exchange of views on the subject before any decision to set up a working group was taken. The plan of work outlined in the note by the President was somewhat optimistic, in that it allocated only eight meetings to the resumed fifty-fifth session of the Economic and Social Council. The agenda for the resumed session was approximately one third as long as the agenda for the first part of the session, which had lasted six and a half weeks, and more than eight meetings might be required to consider all the items on the agenda.

22. In view of the very full time-table, it would be difficult to establish a working group not provided for in the plan of work. His delegation hoped that the debate on the review and appraisal exercise could be completed in the three weeks allocated to it. Otherwise it might be necessary to suspend the formal meetings of the Committee in order to allow time for intensive consultations. His delegation doubted whether it was advisable to convene open-ended working group meetings in a room which could accommodate only slightly over one third of the total membership; the results of any such discussion would have to be further considered by the Committee as a whole, and it would therefore be better to provide for such consideration from the beginning.

23. Mr. ARUEDE (Nigeria) noted that, according to the plan of work, both items 101 and 46 were to be discussed in the week of 8-12 October. When its general debate was concluded, the Committee should, in his delegation's view, proceed immediately to consider those items, deferring a decision regarding the establishment of a working group until the end of the week, when the first stage of its discussion of item 46 would have been concluded.

24. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to

postpone its decision on the proposed working group on review and appraisal until item 46 was discussed during the week of 8-12 October.

It was so decided.

25. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee's heavy programme of work could be implemented only if its discussions were conducted with maximum efficiency. He asked for the Committee's co-operation in enabling him to discharge effectively the functions assigned to him in rule 108 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. He drew attention to annex V to those rules, reproducing the conclusions of the Special Committee on the Rationalization of the Procedures and Organization of the General Assembly, as approved by the General Assembly in resolution 2837 (XXVI). He urged all Committee members to help make the best possible use of the available time by making it possible for meetings to begin promptly and by putting their names on the list of speakers for the various items as early as possible. In accordance with the recommendation in paragraph 69 of annex V to the rules of procedure, he intended to close the list of speakers for each item at the latest after one third of the meetings allocated to the item had been held, thus indicating to the Committee how many delegations intended to participate in the debate on the item. Meetings were frequently adjourned early because of the delayed submission of draft resolutions; paragraph 87 of annex V to the rules of procedure recommended, in that connexion, that draft resolutions should be submitted as early as possible so as to give debates a more concrete character. The Committee's work might be facilitated by applying a time-limit to statements if it appeared that the time-table would otherwise be seriously jeopardized. He would not, however, propose such limitations at the beginning of the debate on an item, and would do so only if he felt it necessary in the interests of the Committee's work. He wished to draw the attention of the Committee to the General Assembly's decision at its 2123rd plenary meeting, on the recommendation of the General Committee (A/9200, paras. 6 and 7), that delegations should exercise the right of reply at the end of the day whenever two meetings had been scheduled for that day, and that statements in the exercise of that right should be limited to 10 minutes.

26. Experience showed that much time could be saved if delegations endeavoured to reach agreement through informal consultations; such consultations were particularly valuable in the case of draft resolutions. He himself would be willing to assist in any consultations when it was thought that his participation might be helpful.

27. He suggested that, as a general rule, no meetings of the Committee should be held on Monday afternoons, in order to provide time for meetings of the regional groups. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to that arrangement, on the understanding that it could meet if it should be found necessary.

28. The officers of the Committee would periodically review the progress of the work, and he would keep the Committee informed of their conclusions in order that remedial measures could be taken if necessary. In conclusion, he announced that he intended to close the list of speakers for the general debate at noon on Thursday,

¹ Circulated as documents A/C.2/L.1287 and A/C.2/L.1288, on 26 September.

27 September. The general debate would begin on Wednesday, 26 September.

29. Mr. MAKEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said his delegation could agree to the proposed date for the opening of the general debate subject to agreement having been reached by that time on the appointment of the officers of the Main Committees. Otherwise, his delegation would propose the postponement of the general debate, since the Committee could hardly operate efficiently with no Vice-Chairmen or Rapporteur.

30. Mr. SHERMAN (Liberia) said that the Committee could not wait indefinitely for agreement to be reached. It might become necessary for the names of the candidates from the various regional groups to be put to the vote, in order that the Committee could proceed with its work.

31. Mr. JOSEPH (Australia) said his delegation did not intend to discuss whether it would be appropriate

for the Committee to vote on its officers. It did, however, endorse the view of the representative of Liberia that it would be unfortunate if the Committee had to delay its work because agreement had not been reached on that issue.

32. Mr. MAKEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the President of the General Assembly was currently holding consultations with the regional groups concerning the nomination of officers for the Main Committees; it was to be hoped that those consultations would soon lead to an acceptable solution. In the meantime, he hoped that no delegation would insist on a vote being taken on the nomination of the officers of the Committee, since such a departure from the usual practice would create an atmosphere of confrontation at the very outset of the Committee's work.

The meeting rose at 12.05 p.m.

1516th meeting

Wednesday, 26 September 1973, at 3.20 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Zewde GABRE-SELLASSIE (Ethiopia).

A/C.2/SR.1516

Tribute to the memory of H. E. Mr. Mirceta Cvorović, Permanent Representative of Yugoslavia to the United Nations Office at Geneva

1. The CHAIRMAN said that it was his sad duty to announce the death of Ambassador Cvorović on the previous day in Geneva, where he had been the Permanent Representative of his country to the United Nations Office. His death deprived the Organization of the services of an eminent diplomat, whose friends were legion.

On the proposal of the Chairman, the members of the Committee observed a minute of silence in tribute to the memory of H. E. Mr. Mirceta Cvorović, Permanent Representative of Yugoslavia to the United Nations Office at Geneva.

2. Mr. ČABRIĆ (Yugoslavia) said that he was very touched by the condolences expressed by the Chairman on behalf of the Second Committee. Mr. Cvorović's death was both a great loss to the Yugoslav Government and the United Nations and a great personal loss. He would transmit the Committee's expressions of sympathy to the Yugoslav Government and people

Organization of the Committee's work

3. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the general debate should begin while the Committee was awaiting the completion of the consultations on the election of its officers.

4. Mr. MITIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), supported by Mr. ZACHMANN (German Democratic Republic), said that it would be best not to start the Committee's work until the results of the consultations were known.

5. Mr. JOSEPH (Australia), supported by Mr. DELIVANIS (Greece) and Mr. MACKENZIE (United Kingdom), said that his delegation, unlike that of the Soviet Union, believed that the best course would be to start the general debate immediately, in view of the Committee's very heavy agenda.

6. Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta) said that the Soviet delegation's stand reflected the opinion of a group of countries which believed they would suffer if the deliberations began before all the officers were elected. There was much merit, however, in the view of the Australian delegation. He proposed that, as a compromise, the Committee should hear the statement by the Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs, and defer the remainder of its work.

7. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines) supported that proposal.

8. Mr. MITIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) agreed that the Committee had a very heavy agenda. Because his country always sought constructive solutions, his delegation supported the proposal of the Upper Volta representative.

9. Mr. JOSEPH (Australia) thanked the representatives of Upper Volta and the Philippines for their proposal. However, he saw no real conceptual difference between hearing the statement of the Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs and hearing that of Mr. Frazão, President of the Economic and Social Council and representative of Brazil, whose name was on the list of speakers.

10. Mr. FRAZÃO (Brazil) pointed out that his name appeared on the list of speakers as representative of Brazil and not as President of the Economic and Social Council.