



Chairman: Mr. Narciso G. REYES (Philippines).

AGENDA ITEM 47

**United Nations Conference on the Human Environment:
report of the Secretary-General (concluded)**

EXPLANATION OF VOTE

1. Mr. SWARTZ (Sweden), speaking on behalf of his own delegation and those of Iceland and Norway, said that they had abstained in the votes on amendments A/C.2/L.1202 and A/C.2/L.1212 to draft resolution A/C.2/L.1195, because they believed that a solution to the problem of invitations to Governments to the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment should be sought through consultations between the parties concerned. Their abstention did not mean that they had altered their opinion that the Secretary-General should not be put in the position of having to decide what constituted a State.

2. Mr. ISAKSEN (Denmark) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on amendments A/C.2/L.1202 and A/C.2/L.1212 because it did not feel that a vote should have been taken on the question of participation at the present stage, when there was still time to seek agreement on the matter.

3. Mr. WOLTE (Austria) said that, as a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1195, his delegation had hoped that the question of participation in the Conference could have been dealt with separately and solved in a generally acceptable manner. It had voted in favour of amendment A/C.2/L.1202 on the understanding that consultations could continue and hoped that a solution would be found, in the interest of ensuring the widest possible participation in the Conference.

4. Mr. CONSTANTIN (Romania) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution because it contained a restrictive formula which limited participation in the Conference. His delegation hoped that an equitable solution would be found before the Conference to enable all interested countries, including the German Democratic Republic, to participate.

5. Mr. MUOGO (Cameroon) said that in its vote on the draft resolution his delegation's main concern had been to avoid any violation of the Charter.

AGENDA ITEM 12

Report of the Economic and Social Council [chapters III to VII, VIII (sections A to E), IX to XIV, XXI and XXII] (continued) (A/8403, A/8403/Add.1 (parts IV and V); A/C.2/L.1206/Rev.1)

6. Mr. DE RIVERO (Peru) said that the purpose of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1206/Rev.1, like the text on the same

subject, which the Committee had adopted at its 1434th meeting, was to call upon the market-economy countries to adopt measures to improve the international monetary situation. His delegation believed that the two documents—both of which had been introduced by developing countries—should be complementary, and therefore had certain difficulties with the draft resolution now under consideration. Firstly, the third preambular paragraph failed to mention resolution 84 (XI) of the Trade and Development Board. Secondly, the operative paragraph was too broad in scope, for it did not call for a realignment of the currencies of the market-economy countries within narrow margins; moreover, that paragraph also implied that the Group of 10 would initiate monetary reforms without taking into account the interests of the developing countries. His delegation would be unable to support the draft resolution unless the operative paragraph was amended along the following lines:

"Calls upon the developed market economy countries, in conformity with resolution A/C.2/L.1199/Rev.1 on the international monetary situation, to reverse the recent restraints on trade, such as import surcharges, and the level of assistance to the developing countries and to arrange the realignment of their currencies, taking into account the needs of the developing countries, with a view to eliminating the present degree of uncertainty and the adverse consequences which have resulted therefrom and with a view to initiating the reform of the international monetary system with the full participation of the developing countries and the international community as a whole."

7. Mr. ZELAYA (Nicaragua) said that it was essential to determine whether draft resolution A/C.2/L.1206/Rev.1 related to the same question as the draft resolution on the international monetary situation already adopted by the Committee. If it did, then rules 124 and 132 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly should be applied.

8. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that it was not unusual for a number of draft resolutions to be submitted on the same item; such had been the case for the item on the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment. Rule 124 precluded the reconsideration at the same session of a proposal which had been adopted or rejected at that session. In the present case, no action had yet been taken on the draft resolution under consideration, and rule 124 therefore did not apply.

9. Mr. FLEMING (Argentina) said that the Nicaraguan representative's remarks were most relevant. The draft resolution under consideration did not differ from that which the Committee had already adopted. In the view of his delegation, the adoption of that text precluded consideration of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1206/Rev.1.

10. Mr. MANDERSON-JONES (Jamaica) said that his delegation supported the views expressed by the representative of Nicaragua.

11. Mr. KUMI (Ghana) urged the Committee to abandon the procedural debate in which it was engaged, since it was confronted—as it had been before—with the very difficult task of determining whether the two questions were exactly the same. The relevant section of the rules of procedure did not help in that regard.

12. Mr. SOMERHAUSEN (Belgium) said he was impressed by the Nicaraguan representative's remarks. Draft resolution A/C.2/L.1206/Rev.1 was almost exactly the same as the draft resolution which had been adopted at the 1434th meeting.

13. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said that the draft resolution under consideration was not at all contrary to or identical with the other resolution on the international monetary situation which the Committee had already adopted. Nothing in the rules of procedure precluded the consideration of the draft resolution now before the Committee. When it came time to vote on it, the question of whether it was identical with or contrary to the other resolution could be raised; the present debate was out of order.

14. Mrs. DERRE (France) agreed with those representatives who maintained that the draft resolution did not differ from the draft resolution which the Committee had already adopted on the international monetary situation; it merely rephrased certain points and referred to the Declaration and Principles of the Action Programme adopted at Lima. There was therefore no need to hold a debate on the draft resolution.

15. Mr. Fleming (Argentina) proposed that, under rule 132 of the rules of procedure, the Committee should vote on whether or not to continue consideration of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.2/L.1206/Rev.1.

16. Mr. SOMERHAUSEN (Belgium) supported that proposal.

17. Mr. SANTA-CRUZ (Chile) said that, if necessary, he would support the proposal. However, he was confident that the sponsors of the draft resolution would instead withdraw it. The representative of Peru had suggested a very useful amendment relating to the question of currency alignment in the interests of developing countries. In addition, the Secretary-General of UNCTAD had recently stated that it was uncertain at the present time how far any impending agreement on exchange rate realignment would take the concerns of the developing countries into account. That question was one of the highest importance and should not be decided upon lightly by the Second Committee. He accordingly requested the sponsors to withdraw their draft resolution.

18. Mr. ARUEDE (Nigeria) said that the rules of procedure did not exclude the possibility of two draft resolutions being submitted on the same subject. His delegation deplored the polarization in the Committee on a draft resolution which had been explained by three of the co-sponsors, discussed by other delegations and considered

in informal negotiations. Moreover, those fellow members of the Group of 77 who opposed consideration of the draft resolution had not taken part in the negotiations. The co-sponsors had been prepared to consider the suggestion of the representative of Peru, as well as any other amendment which might be submitted, and in no way intended that there should be any conflict between their draft resolution and that previously adopted by the Committee.

19. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said that unfortunately the sponsors had not had time to consult all delegations which had contacted them; moreover, some of the changes suggested had been so substantial as to alter the whole nature of the operative paragraph. Nevertheless, his delegation did not condone the use of the rules of procedure by certain delegations against fellow members of the Group of 77. He proposed that the Committee should adjourn discussion of the draft resolution in order to allow time for consultations, and go on to the next item on its agenda.

20. Mr. SOMERHAUSEN (Belgium) pointed out that the proposal by the representative of Argentina had been made before that by the representative of Pakistan.

21. Mr. SANTA-CRUZ (Chile) said that the proposal for adjournment of the debate on the item should take precedence. In any case, he appealed to the representatives of Argentina and Belgium to accept the proposal of the representative of Pakistan; in his view, consultations held in a spirit of co-operation could only conclude with the withdrawal of the draft resolution.

22. The CHAIRMAN confirmed that a proposal to adjourn the debate under rule 117 of the rules of procedure had precedence over a proposal under rule 132.

23. Mr. FLEMING (Argentina) said that, on the understanding that adjournment was intended to enable the co-sponsors to withdraw their draft resolution, he withdrew his proposal.

24. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said that, whether or not the representative of Argentina withdrew his proposal was immaterial, since the proposal for adjournment of the debate had precedence. In any case, to withdraw the proposal on the understanding that the co-sponsors would withdraw their draft resolution prejudged the issue.

25. Mr. MANDERSON-JONES (Jamaica) said that throughout the debate in the Committee, his delegation had taken up very little time with its statements. As far as it was concerned, when it clearly indicated that it wished to address the Committee, it expected its right to do so to be respected, and it further expected the Secretariat staff to be sufficiently competent to note such indications.

26. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the representative of Jamaica had been given the floor when he requested it.

27. Mr. HEMANS (United Kingdom) said his delegation was disturbed to note that, although the draft resolution had been introduced some days previously, and amendments had since been incorporated in it, an attempt was being made to stifle debate on it. The draft resolution was substantially different from that already adopted by the

Committee at its 1434th meeting, which his delegation had opposed. It welcomed the attempt to provide a draft resolution which could be accepted by some delegations not members of the Group of 77, and, accordingly, opposed the proposal to adjourn the debate.

28. Mr. ALULA (Ethiopia) supported the proposal for adjournment. However, no conditions should be set with regard to withdrawal of the draft resolution by the co-sponsors, who should be given the opportunity to negotiate a compromise.

29. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said his delegation was opposed to the proposal for adjournment. Those delegations which had started the procedural discussion had apparently not read the text of the draft resolution carefully, and had failed to note the differences between it and the resolution adopted by the Committee. If they did so, the co-sponsors would be prepared to take their views into account.

30. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the proposal to adjourn the debate on the item.

The proposal was rejected by 24 votes to 13, with 35 abstentions.

31. Mr. SANTA-CRUZ (Chile), speaking in explanation of vote, said he would have supported the proposal for adjournment, but since one of the co-sponsors of the draft resolution had opposed it, he had felt obliged to abstain.

32. Mr. FLEMING (Argentina) proposed the closure of debate on the item in accordance with rule 118 of the rules of procedure.

33. Mr. KHALIL (Egypt) said that, although he did not strongly support the draft resolution under discussion, and would have found it much more acceptable if the suggestion of the representative of Peru had been incorporated, it constituted a valid proposal under the rules of procedure. It differed from the draft resolution already adopted in that it called for immediate action, whereas the other resolution laid down general guidelines for reform of the international monetary system, and went into less detail on the question of currency realignment. Moreover, it might win the support of delegations which had been unable to support the other resolution. Accordingly, his delegation opposed the proposal for closure of the debate.

34. The CHAIRMAN put the proposal for closure of the debate to the vote.

The proposal was adopted by 22 votes to 15, with 33 abstentions.

35. Mr. SOMERHAUSEN (Belgium) proposed, in accordance with rule 132 of the rules of procedure, that the Committee should vote on whether or not to abandon consideration of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1206/Rev.1.

36. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan) said that the situation was confused. On behalf of the co-sponsors, he requested

postponement of the vote on the draft resolution, in order to allow those delegations which had voted for a similar draft resolution at the 1434th meeting time to ascertain that the two texts were not mutually exclusive.

37. Mr. HEMANS (United Kingdom) pointed out that the Committee had voted in favour of closure of the debate and that any further consideration of the draft resolution would therefore be out of order and contrary to what the Committee had already decided. In the view of his delegation, the Committee should proceed forthwith to vote on the draft resolution.

38. Mr. SANTA-CRUZ (Chile) said that he did not agree with the interpretation of the United Kingdom delegation. The Committee had adopted a motion for closure of the debate, but it had not voted on the draft resolution and rule 132 clearly indicated that the Committee could decide whether or not to vote at any time.

39. Mr. ARUEDE (Nigeria) pointed out that the sponsors of the draft resolution wished the vote on it to be deferred.

40. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines) proposed that the Committee should proceed to vote on the draft resolution.

41. Mr. FLEMING (Argentina) supported the Belgian proposal and urged that the Committee should proceed to a vote under rule 132.

42. Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America) felt that some delegations were trying to dispose of the draft resolution by pressing for an immediate vote. However, the co-sponsors had stated that they did not wish a vote on the draft resolution at that stage. A further possibility, which appeared most reasonable to his delegation, would be to proceed to a vote after closure of the debate.

43. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) felt that the Committee was obliged to consider the proposal put forward by the delegations of Belgium and Argentina.

44. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should vote on the proposal by the delegations of Belgium and Argentina under rule 132.

45. Mr. OSMAN (Sudan), speaking on a point of order, proposed adjournment of the meeting under rule 120.

46. Mr. HEMANS (United Kingdom) said that in his delegation's view the process of voting had started and it felt that the motion to adjourn the meeting was therefore out of order at that stage.

47. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, in accordance with the proposal by the representative of Sudan, the meeting should be adjourned.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 11.20 p.m.