



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

**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/C.2/L.1211/Rev.1)**

1. Mr. SPENCER (Canada), introducing draft resolution A/C.2/L.1211/Rev.1 relating to protein resources, said that the sponsors had based their text on the Strategy Statement prepared by the high-level Panel of Experts in response to General Assembly resolution 2684 (XXV).

2. Recalling that the Economic and Social Council, at its fifty-first session, had adopted a resolution concerning protein, he said that the draft resolution before the Committee, in addition to "launching the strategy", would allow the provisions of that resolution to be implemented in more detail. All the technical proposals contained in the draft resolution were derived from the Strategy Statement and had been verified by the experts, *inter alia*, so that the abridged form of the Statement in the annex to the draft resolution reflected the complete text as accurately as possible. The draft resolution had deliberately been worked out with representatives from every geographical group and therefore represented what he believed was the best possible compromise between the views of the various delegations. He hoped, therefore, that the compromise would be acceptable to all.

3. He then explained the draft resolution itself. He orally revised the third preambular paragraph, which illustrated the complex and multidisciplinary context of the problem, by inserting the words "and social" after the word "economic". He emphasized that the fourth preambular paragraph described the current factual, and tragic, situation and explained the rationale for submitting the draft. The fifth preambular paragraph drew attention to the fact that high-priority expenditures on protein were economically justified; the sixth preambular paragraph distinguished between the equally essential short and long-term actions required. With regard to the seventh preambular paragraph, he observed that, while the efforts of FAO, WHO, UNICEF and IBRD were already being co-ordinated through the assistance of the Protein Advisory Group, further integration of the efforts of the entire United Nations system was necessary. The eighth preambular paragraph was designed to emphasize the need for both donor and recipient countries to make greater efforts with regard to the protein problem if a solution was to be found.

4. With regard to the operative part of the draft resolution, paragraphs 1 and 3 dealt with domestic short-term and administrative actions respectively, while paragraph 2 was designed to help ensure that adequate international resources would be made available in the field. He hoped that paragraph 4, the "key" paragraph relating to the elements of the Strategy itself, was addressed to Governments of both developed and developing countries, although each Government would take action as appropriate. Paragraph 5 was designed to ensure support, within their competence, from the international agencies. With regard to paragraph 6, which had been taken from the Strategy Statement, he observed that the word "guidelines" in subparagraph (c) reflected the idea of orientation, not directives. Operative paragraphs 7 and 8, which illustrated the fact that the protein problem was a multidisciplinary issue, were amplifications of paragraph 5 of Economic and Social Council resolution 1640 (LI) which called for broader participation in the Protein Advisory Group, and took the first step towards implementation in the case of United Nations organizations directly related to the General Assembly. Certain technical changes should be made to paragraph 10: following the word "Requests", the phrase "the Economic and Social Council to instruct its" should be inserted, and the word "the" should be deleted. With regard to that paragraph, he observed that the United Nations alone, via the Council could take multidisciplinary co-ordinating action at the governmental level in the protein field. He then introduced two minor changes of an administrative nature to operative paragraph 11; the words "the Secretary-General, in co-operation with" should be inserted after the word "Requests" and the phrase "at the request of Governments" should be inserted after the words "to arrange". In view of that change, the phrase "on their request" further on in the paragraph should be deleted. The small funds entailed by visits from members of the Protein Advisory Group to be derived from the UNDP on request, could be a real "bargain" in terms of possible returns. Operative paragraph 12 represented a compromise between the views of those representatives who wished to see a special voluntary fund established and those who were opposed to such a fund.

5. The draft resolution had been carefully prepared from the technical and political point of view and he hoped that it would be adopted unanimously.

6. Mr. MILNER (Executive Secretary of the Protein Advisory Group) said that he appreciated the opportunity to acquaint the Second Committee with the role of the Protein Advisory Group and the assistance which it provided to United Nations agencies in combating one of the most serious obstacles to international economic and social development.

\* Resumed from the 1434th meeting.

7. He recalled that, from the early 1950s on, FAO, WHO and UNICEF had individually and jointly initiated programming with Governments to deal with protein scarcity and its grave nutritional consequences. In that connexion, he emphasized the unique role of proteins in all biological systems, including that of man. The implications of protein scarcity for the physical welfare and development of the child, not only during the critical period of weaning but also during the pre-natal period when mothers might be deprived of adequate diets, were not yet fully known. Research in that field was intensely active and there was an increasing realization of the damaging effects of protein scarcity, particularly when associated with difficult socio-economic conditions, on the physical and mental development of young children.

8. From the time when FAO, WHO and UNICEF had started to take an interest in that problem, it had been recognized that, because of the prevalence and severity of malnutrition, traditional high-protein foods were not sufficient to meet protein needs. It had therefore been agreed that new and unconventional sources of protein needed to be investigated and developed. Accordingly, attention had been given to the possibility of utilizing materials in respect of which little prior experience existed in terms of use as human food; such materials included soya protein concentrates, peanut, cottonseed and other oilseed flours, fish, and protein from micro-biological sources.

9. It was in that context that, in 1955, WHO had appointed a Protein Advisory Group, which in 1960 had been expanded into the FAO/WHO/UNICEF Protein Advisory Group. Initially, the Advisory Group had consisted of a small group of eminent nutritionists and paediatricians, who provided advice on the safety and nutritional usefulness for infants and young children of various protein foods. Almost immediately, the Group had developed concern for problems relating to the formulation, manufacture and marketing of new protein foods and food mixtures. Since 1965, the Advisory Group had included food technologists and, in recent years, specialists in industrial research, agricultural production, economics and plant breeding, as well as individuals who were well informed on governmental food policies and regulations and persons concerned with food marketing and promotion.

10. Recently, IBRD had joined the agencies sponsoring the Protein Advisory Group, which had been renamed the Protein Advisory Group of the United Nations System. In that connexion, he noted that, during the following week, additional agencies would probably indicate their interest in sponsoring the Advisory Group or participating in its work.

11. He then described some of the specific activities of the Protein Advisory Group. The Group issued statements on a number of critical questions such as those related to the problems of protein scarcity, the status of new techniques or other aspects of the production of unconventional proteins. It also issued guidelines on such matters as the processing, quality and safety criteria required for the production of safe, palatable peanut flour as a protein supplement for infant foods. The Advisory Group published a quarterly bulletin in which many of its studies and documents were disseminated.

12. In order to give members of the Committee a better understanding of the role of the Protein Advisory Group, he referred to a case in which a decision taken by the Group in 1961 had produced a critical impact on an urgent global problem. The United Nations agencies had at that time been faced with a difficult dilemma: on the one hand, there was an urgent need to demonstrate the nutritional benefit for young children of a useful protein resource, namely peanut flour; on the other hand, there was undoubtedly a risk of endangering the health, if not the lives, of infants by continuing to recommend the use of that food. The question had been referred to the Protein Advisory Group. After having evaluated the chemical, toxicological and pathological information then available, the Group had decided that the gravity of protein malnutrition among young children was such that, notwithstanding the risk arising from aflatoxin, it was prepared to propose a tolerance limit within which that risk could be accepted. In retrospect, that decision of the Advisory Group could be seen to be a valid landmark of pragmatic judgement.

13. The Protein Advisory Group and the agencies which it served were convinced that the problem could not be solved simply by expanding food production. Notwithstanding the encouraging prospects offered by the green revolution, there was a growing realization that new resources, techniques and initiatives must be brought to bear if any headway was to be achieved. It was for that reason that, in May 1971, the Secretary-General had convened the Panel of Experts on Protein Strategy, which had published a report on the basis of which the Economic and Social Council had formulated an important resolution.

14. The great strength of the Protein Advisory Group lay not only in the technical competence of its members, but also in the independence which it had to maintain in order to provide objective counsel to its sponsoring agencies. In conclusion, he assured the members of the Committee that the Protein Advisory Group and its secretariat were ready to provide services within the limits of their resources to all agencies which wished to call on them.

#### AGENDA ITEM 47

**United Nations Conference on the Human Environment: report of the Secretary-General (continued)** (A/8308, A/8309, A/8403, chap. XI; A/8509 and Add.1; A/C.2/269; A/C.2/L.1185/Rev.2, A/C.2/L.1195, A/C.2/L.1213-1215; A/CONF.48/PC/13 and Corr.1; E/4991 and Add.1, E/5003)

15. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that the sponsors of the draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1185/Rev.2) should have remembered the classic warning "*ne rebus omnibus*". In his view, the text was very repetitive, contained superfluous words and was a veritable blend of provisions taken from the Strategy, the Lima Declaration, the report of the Special Committee on problems of the environment and the reports of the regional economic commissions and other bodies. It was obvious that even the sponsors did not have a very clear picture of the relationship between development and the environment.

16. His delegation therefore supported the amendments contained in document A/C.2/L.1214. That was not a

partisan attitude since, although Greece belonged to Group B, it was a developing country. Moreover, the attitude of various delegations with regard to the draft resolutions on the environment denoted no partisan spirit. Some delegations from countries in the Group of 77 had criticized the draft resolution although it had been submitted by the developing countries. Furthermore, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1195 included delegations from developed as well as developing countries. His delegation therefore supported the amendments contained in document A/C.2/L.1214 out of sheer conviction and a concern for objectivity.

17. In operative paragraph 1, his delegation would like to see the words "the international community" replaced by "national Governments". In operative paragraph 2, the word "full" should be deleted: it was superfluous and it was important to break the habit of dramatizing and exaggerating. The phrase "to determine its own environmental standards and criteria", in subparagraph 3 (d), should also be deleted; if that proposal was not acceptable, his delegation would ask for a separate vote on the phrase. It would also like to see the phrase "and in such a manner as to avoid producing harmful effects on other countries" replaced by the following phrase: "provided that such action does not produce harmful effects in neighbouring or other countries"; if that proposal was not acceptable, his delegation would ask for a separate vote on the phrase. Furthermore, if the proposal in amendment A/C.2/L.1214 to delete operative paragraph 5 was not accepted, it would also ask for a separate vote on that paragraph. It would also ask for a separate vote on operative paragraph 7 if the proposal in the same amendment to delete that paragraph was not accepted. His delegation would also like to see the words "in the exclusive judgement of those countries" in operative paragraph 7 deleted, since if one was to rely on the exclusive judgement of various countries there would no longer be any objective criterion; if that proposal was not accepted, his delegation would ask for a separate vote on those words. Operative paragraph 8 should be replaced by the text proposed A/C.2/L.1214; there again, if the sponsors did not accept the amendment, his delegation would be forced to ask for a separate vote on the paragraph. His delegation supported draft resolution A/C.2/L.1195 which it considered simple, sound and brief.

18. Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America) said that his delegation endorsed the amendments proposed by the delegations of Venezuela and the United Kingdom and that it agreed with the statements by the representatives of the United Kingdom, Australia and Ghana on that question. It also supported the revision of operative paragraph 2 proposed by Brazil, on behalf of the sponsors.

19. He believed that, as in the case of the two resolutions on the third session of UNCTAD, an effort should be made to smooth over divergencies of views in preparing for the Conference. He felt, however, that draft resolution A/C.2/L.1185/Rev.2 in its present form tended to arouse such divergencies. In the case of the monetary situation, it was understandable that the representatives of the various regional groups should express very divergent views as to the ways and means of attaining common goals, but he was of the opinion that the same should not apply in the case of the environment. It was in fact possible to reach agreement

on the ways and means to be used in that field and he urged the sponsors to make an effort to do so. In that connexion, it should be pointed out that the report prepared at Founex took account of the needs of the developing countries and in particular of the least developed among them. The opinions expressed on that subject by the representatives of the developed countries were sincere and the representatives of the developing countries should accept them as such.

20. His delegation could not accept operative paragraph 9 since it reflected the fear that action taken to combat pollution might run counter to development, a fear that seemed to him to have no foundation. Operative paragraph 8 was not very clear but what little of it was comprehensible was unacceptable. In fact, it was impossible to lay down rules for the additional financing to be provided to the developing countries for the purpose of protecting the environment, and the method proposed in that paragraph would be divisive; the paragraph should therefore be deleted. Operative paragraph 7 could not fail to be inoperative since the international financial institutions could not operate in a manner to implement such a directive. His delegation had some difficulty with regard to paragraphs 2 and 3 because it feared that they preselected the way in which the Conference should be conducted and thereby prejudged the work it would achieve. Those two paragraphs should therefore be amended. He also failed to understand why it was so difficult for the sponsors to accept a formula whereby additional technical assistance would be provided within the framework of the International Development Strategy.

21. Mr. VIAUD (France) said he thought that there was a fundamental contradiction between two objectives of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1185/Rev.2. In the twelfth and thirteenth preambular paragraphs and in operative paragraph 3, subparagraphs (a) and (d), the draft resolution emphasized the fact that the policies, standards and criteria relating to the human environment should be determined at the national level, whereas elsewhere, in operative paragraph 1 in particular, the text was an appeal to international solidarity. It was possible that, in the matter of the environment, the industrialized countries were more threatened than other countries, that any action would have consequences which would spread beyond national frontiers, and that the problem of the environment was a question of life or death which required urgent measures at the national and regional level; but if the industrialized countries were called upon to finance measures to prevent the deterioration of the environment in the developing countries, they should be entitled to have some say in the policies pursued by those countries in that area. His delegation was not proposing that, but the possibilities for United Nations action would be restricted if action was to be taken at the national level. On the other hand, if action was to be mainly international, all countries should accept the inevitable constraints. It was normal that the industrialized countries should make a greater contribution to such action, but that contribution should not be defined in the terms of the draft resolution under consideration.

22. His delegation supported the amendments proposed by the United Kingdom and Venezuela as well as most of the suggestions made orally by the Greek delegation. It

could not accept the ninth, eighteenth and nineteenth preambular paragraphs unless they were amended. Nor could it accept operative paragraph 3, subparagraph (d), operative paragraph 4, subparagraph (b), or operative paragraphs 5, 7 and 8. With regard to the last paragraph, he observed that while some countries might have attained the target set within the framework of the International Development Strategy, that was far from being the case in general. His delegation also could not approve operative paragraph 9 which, like paragraphs 5 and 7, attributed too exclusive responsibilities with regard to the environment. His country could support the draft resolution if some of the amendments that had been proposed were accepted. If that did not happen, it thought that the Conference would begin under unfavourable auspices and it would resume its freedom of judgement on the problems which would be raised at the Conference as well as on the solutions which would be proposed there.

23. Mr. FRANCO-HOLGUIN (Special Representative of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development), replying to a question put by the representative of the United Kingdom during the previous meeting with regard to operative paragraph 7 of the draft resolution, said, with regard to the responsibility of the World Bank Group to determine cases in which it could provide financing, that the initiative was taken by the borrower, as in all other cases, and the preliminary process of appraisal and analysis was conducted in co-operation with the borrower. As the trustees of funds, the financial institutions naturally had to make a judgement on the feasibility of a project from the financial point of view. In that connexion, he said it was his understanding that paragraph 7 in no way affected the right of the financial institutions to make such a judgement.

24. As to the volume of financial assistance, the institutions could obviously only lend the funds that they either had or could borrow; soft loans, in particular, were in short supply, as they could only be granted in the context of over-all priorities, taking special account of the interests of the least developed among the developing countries. In the absence of additional funds, therefore, it was difficult to foresee how the World Bank Group could comply with the recommendation contained in paragraph 7.

25. As to the terms of assistance, the most effective manner in which softer financing could be provided was by the use of IDA funds, either alone or in conjunction with Bank loans, which were determined by considerations relating to the countries concerned and not by the circumstances of the project itself. In any event, it seemed quite clear that, in respect of both terms and volume of assistance, the determining factor was the availability of funds.

26. Mr. BRITO (Brazil) remarked that the draft resolution had twice been revised and that a number of suggestions had been taken into account, including some that had been made by representatives of developed countries. He stressed that the sponsors had spared no effort to allow for the various points of view expressed without departing from the basic tenor of the text; they were therefore unable to understand why some delegations should go so far as to accuse them of working against international co-operation. A few years before, when concern for the environment had

come to the fore, one of the first reactions had been to ask how developing countries could avoid pollution and it had been quite clear at the time that the trend was contrary to development. Since then, however, considerable progress had been made and it was even being recognized that certain problems could only be solved through development.

27. In connexion with the ninth preambular paragraph, one representative had stated that it had not been scientifically proved that pollution had a world-wide impact. Yet all the documents of the secretariat referred to the fact and the spread of pollution throughout the world was precisely one of the major problems that the Conference would have to consider. It was undoubtedly a cause for concern. At the previous meeting, the representative of the United Kingdom, in submitting her amendment to the ninth preambular paragraph, had said that the text was accusatory and offensive. In fact, however, the sponsors of the draft resolution had merely stated a fact that had to be faced; moreover, their claim was that pollution of world-wide impact was caused not by all highly developed countries but only by some of them and that it was logical that the latter should bear the main responsibility for financing corrective measures.

28. With regard to the amendment to the eighteenth preambular paragraph submitted by Australia and the United Kingdom, he observed that the proposed new text omitted an extremely important aspect of the original, namely, the need for developed countries to provide the developing countries with additional technical assistance and financing beyond the targets indicated in the International Development Strategy. If the developing countries were, by the nature of things, compelled to take additional environmental measures while the volume of aid they received remained the same, they would have to revise their order of priorities, which meant that their development programmes would suffer.

29. As to operative paragraph 1, the sponsors were unfortunately unable to accept the oral amendment to the effect that the words "the international community" should be replaced by "national Governments", as they did not consider that it improved the original. Since paragraph 1, like subparagraph 4 (d) and the fifteenth preambular paragraph, reflected the need for international co-operation, the amendment, if accepted, would limit the scope of paragraph 1.

30. He had already revised operative paragraph 2 orally at the previous meeting in order to take into account certain points that had been raised by members of the Committee. He considered that the amendment to that paragraph submitted by Australia and the United Kingdom would impose an extremely dangerous and quite unnecessary restriction on the text.

31. The same was true of the amendment of Australia and the United Kingdom to operative paragraph 3 which would, *inter alia*, limit respect for the exercise of sovereignty over natural resources, the development possibilities of the developing countries and the sovereign right of each country over economic planning and environmental policies. It went without saying that the amendment submitted

by Australia and the United Kingdom to paragraph 3, as well as their amendment to paragraph 2, was not acceptable to the sponsors of the draft resolution.

32. With regard to amendments which a previous speaker had proposed orally to subparagraph 3 (d), he pointed out, on the one hand, that the text of that subparagraph had been the outcome of lengthy consultations and, on the other, that it was the indisputable right of each country to determine its own environmental standards and criteria, since those standards and criteria were bound to vary from country to country just as the level of development varied.

33. Like their amendment to the eighteenth preambular paragraph, the amendment of Australia and the United Kingdom to subparagraph 4 (b) had the effect of eliminating from the original text the concept that environmental assistance should be in addition to the targets of the Strategy.

34. The delegations of Australia and the United Kingdom had requested the deletion of operative paragraph 5 on the grounds that it was irrelevant. Yet it was undeniable that the testing of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons was harmful to the environment, particularly in terms of marine pollution and radio-activity. He was not prepared to accept any amendment whatsoever to that paragraph.

35. With regard to operative paragraph 7, he emphasized that the sponsors in no way intended to issue a kind of ultimatum to the international financial institutions. It was undeniable that it was the countries concerned which should determine whether environmental projects were necessary.

36. On behalf of the sponsors, he revised the beginning of paragraph 7 to read:

*"Indicates the advisability that, without affecting adversely their operations in other spheres, the international financial institutions be enabled to consider favourably the increase of the volume and the softening of the terms of their economic assistance . . ."*

Although they were modifying the beginning of the paragraph, the sponsors were anxious to retain the idea that the recipient countries should be the sole judges of the need for and the feasibility of projects.

37. With regard to operative paragraph 8 which dealt with a scheme of voluntary contributions, the amendment submitted by Australia and the United Kingdom eliminated the principle of additional financing to be calculated on a percentage basis of expenditures incurred by the developed countries, which was an important element of the original text. Since the key words of the paragraph were "voluntary contributions", he hoped the developed countries would show their understanding.

38. As to operative paragraph 9, he regretted that some delegations did not appreciate the fears of the developing countries, fears which were perfectly justified since international development assistance and trading prospects were of vital importance to them.

39. Turning to the oral amendments, he accepted, on behalf of the sponsors, the amendment submitted by Venezuela (A/C.2/L.1213), as orally revised by the Cuban representative at the 1435th meeting.

40. As to the oral amendment submitted by the Spanish delegation, the sponsors, although favourably disposed towards it, had unfortunately not managed to reach agreement.

41. They accepted the amendment submitted orally by the representative of Ghana at the 1435th meeting to the effect that operative paragraph 7 of the draft resolution A/C.2/L.1195, as modified by the Brazilian amendment contained in document A/C.2/L.1215, should be inserted after operative paragraph 2.

42. He hoped that the draft resolution, as revised, would be supported by a very large majority.

43. Mr. TAN (Singapore) said he was still not convinced that a draft resolution on the substance of the problem of the environment could serve a useful purpose at that stage. Discussion of the substance should be kept for the Conference. Moreover, his delegation was not satisfied with a number of proposals and would therefore abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1185/Rev.2 and on amendments thereto.

44. Mr. ZAHEDI (Iran) said that his delegation was, on the whole, in favour of the draft resolution but he wished to make a number of suggestions to the sponsors, since the text could still be considerably improved. His delegation did not support the amendments proposed by the United Kingdom delegation. In making his suggestions, he was not trying to obtain concessions from the sponsors but rather to improve the text so that it would command wider support.

45. In the ninth preambular paragraph, he suggested the deletion of the phrase "as a consequence of their own high level of improperly planned and inadequately co-ordinated industrial activities".

46. In the nineteenth preambular paragraph the word "particularly" in the English version, might be replaced by the words "such as".

47. In operative paragraph 8, he also proposed the deletion of the words from "to be calculated . . ." to the end.

48. He supported the draft resolution as a whole; he hoped, however, that the changes he had proposed would be accepted. He also supported the suggestions made by the representative of Spain concerning operative paragraph 4 (c). The draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.2/L.1185/Rev.2 and A/C.2/L.1195 were complementary. Draft resolution A/C.2/L.1195 was procedural, and his delegation was not prepared to accept any amendments to it. It therefore requested that the representative of Brazil withdraw the amendment he had proposed.

49. Mr. AYOUB (Tunisia) said that, in his view, the first draft resolution dealt with procedural matters and the



second with political principles. His delegation supported draft resolution A/C.2/L.1185/Rev.2 on the whole, because that resolution recognized that development and environment questions were two aspects of the same process, namely, economic and social development. He was pleased that the sponsors of the draft resolution had accepted the amendments proposed by Venezuela and regretted that they had not accepted the Spanish suggestion which, in his opinion, should be given full amendment status. He did not agree with the representative of Brazil that that amendment was out of place in the resolution. With regard to paragraph 4 (c), he did not see why the land-locked countries should have "particular" environment problems. Tunisia, like the other Mediterranean countries, was very familiar with environment questions, since it was continually confronted with problems of marine pollution. He supported the Ghanaian representative's suggestion that a paragraph of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1195 should be inserted in draft resolution A/C.2/L.1185/Rev.2.

50. Turning to the amendments proposed by the United Kingdom and Australia (A/C.2/L.1214), he supported the proposed amendment to the ninth preambular paragraph. He regretted that there had not been enough consultation on the eighteenth preambular paragraph; he would not support it. He supported the proposed change in operative paragraph 2. On the other hand, he found operative paragraph 3 satisfactory as it stood. He felt that there had not been enough consultation on operative paragraph 4 (c), but he supported the proposed change. He was opposed to the deletion of paragraph 5, but supported that of paragraph 7, since it was not within the Committee's competence to request a softening of the credit terms for projects relating to the environment. It was premature to establish a scheme of voluntary contributions, and he therefore supported the proposed amendment to paragraph 8. He also supported the amendment to paragraph 9, since it would not be advisable to tie the hands of UNCTAD by asking it to submit a comprehensive study at the third Conference.

51. Mr. HUTAGALUNG (Indonesia) said that he supported the amendments proposed by Venezuela (A/C.2/L.1213). With regard to the amendment proposed by Australia and the United Kingdom (A/C.2/L.1214), his delegation was prepared to support the changes in paragraphs 2 and 3 provided that the new text did not imply that the outcome of the Conference was being prejudged. He would abstain in the vote on the amendment to the ninth preambular paragraph and to paragraphs 8 and 9. Since the other proposals, in his view, did not improve the text, he would not support them. He was prepared to vote for the draft resolution as a whole if it was amended along the lines he had just indicated.

52. Mr. ORČIĆ (Yugoslavia) said he had not been persuaded by the United Kingdom representative's argument in support of her amendments. He was surprised that those amendments had not been submitted until the preceding Friday, since the text had been before the Committee for a month. Also, he did not understand how his own delegation could be accused of unwillingness to negotiate, when it was the United Kingdom which had not accepted any changes in its own amendments. Some of the wording in those amendments just denied that the requests made by the developing countries in the draft resolution were justified

It was totally untrue that the sponsors had tried to obstruct the third session of UNCTAD. In his delegation's view, the 1 per cent target established by the Strategy was much too low. After so much discussion, his delegation was even more convinced than it had originally been of the usefulness of the proposed resolution.

53. Mr. SANTA-CRUZ (Chile) said it was unfortunate that no real consultations had been held on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1185/Rev.2. It had been claimed that the sponsors were to blame for that but, in fact, the wording of the amendments proposed by the United Kingdom and Australia was not exactly conducive to agreement. He fully endorsed the Yugoslav representative's statement. A miracle would have been needed to induce the General Assembly to grant maximum authority to the third session of UNCTAD. The third session of UNCTAD must not be allowed to become a convenient screen for hiding responsibility. The text should not give the impression that there were ready-made solutions, as did draft resolution A/C.2/L.1195. His delegation would support any efforts at conciliation based on those considerations. If that proved fruitless, it would feel bound to support draft resolution A/C.2/L.1195 as modified by the amendments already adopted. It would abstain on operative paragraphs 7 and 8 of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1185/Rev.2, and would not request their deletion as the delegations of the United Kingdom and Australia had done. He wished to stress the pointlessness of the recommendation to the international financial institutions in paragraph 7. It was well known that the directors of IBRD found financing only for projects which interested them. He would abstain on paragraph 8, as he could not agree to the obligations of membership laid down in the Charter being replaced by a system of voluntary contributions.

54. He expressed the hope that a compromise solution could be found before the vote.

55. Mr. O'RIORDAN (Ireland) supported the amendments proposed by the United Kingdom and Australia and those proposed by Venezuela and Spain. He could not support paragraph 7 as it stood, since he could hardly be asked to accept a text that he did not understand.

56. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines) said he was dissatisfied with the draft resolution despite the amendments already adopted. That was unfortunate, since he recognized the link between the environment and development. Moreover, the draft resolution dealt with substantive matters which could better be examined at the Conference on the Human Environment. Certain ideas were out of place in the draft resolution and reflected positions which did not facilitate agreement. With regard to document A/C.2/L.1214, he supported the amendment to the ninth preambular paragraph. He had no preconceived ideas about the new text which should replace the eighteenth preambular paragraph. He supported the amendment to operative paragraphs 2 and 3; the new text replacing paragraph 4 (b), was acceptable also because the original text was ambiguous. He fully supported the Spanish proposal to add a new subparagraph 4 (d). He also supported the deletion of paragraph 5, since the question of nuclear tests and the other questions mentioned there—important as they were—were out of place in that draft resolution. A new wording should be found for paragraph 7; the paragraph did not necessarily

have to be deleted. The present wording of paragraph 8 seemed preferable to the amendment, provided that the words from "to be calculated" to the end were deleted, as proposed by the Ghanaian and other delegations. Like the representative of Ghana, he found the wording of the United Kingdom and Australian text satisfactory. He would like some of the other expressions in the resolution changed; for example, in the seventh preambular paragraph the words "sound ecology" should be replaced by "sound ecological standards". The ninth preambular paragraph should be replaced by the text proposed by the United Kingdom. He found the ending of the seventeenth preambular paragraph ambiguous.

57. Mr. NDUNG'U (Kenya) said that he fully appreciated the results of the efforts made by the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1185/Rev.2. He nevertheless felt that the preamble was too long and somewhat repetitious. The thirteenth paragraph, the fourteenth paragraph, which related to a subject covered more adequately in the fifteenth, and the twentieth paragraph which did nothing to explain or justify the operative part, could all, in his opinion, be deleted. Operative paragraph 2, the last provision of which was redundant, should also be simplified.

58. His delegation supported the amendment submitted orally by the Spanish representative at the preceding meeting, which would incorporate a clause on the risks of coastal pollution in operative paragraph 4. The sponsors should accept that amendment, which was of great significance to smaller countries such as Kenya, a country where tourism was a principal source of revenue and which was now facing the problem of the pollution of its coastal waters by shipping. His delegation would also support the amendments submitted by the United Kingdom and Australia in document A/C.2/L.1214 to the ninth preambular paragraph and to operative paragraphs 2 and 8, amendments which should ensure a consensus of opinion in favour of the draft resolution. He was, however, unable to accept the deletion of operative paragraph 7, as was proposed in document A/C.2/L.1214, because the text was perfectly relevant, although it could be further improved if it were amended in the way suggested by the Brazilian representative (A/C.2/L.1215) and if the word "exclusive" were deleted to give it wider scope, as had been proposed by the representative of France.

59. Mr. SWARTZ (Sweden) said that he was in sympathy with the motives that had prompted the sponsors to submit draft resolution A/C.2/L.1185/Rev.2, and was of the opinion that that text should facilitate agreement among participants in the Conference on the Human Environment. However, not all the provisions were acceptable to his delegation. For instance, the draft resolution did not give a balanced presentation of the relationship between environmental problems and development problems as they were described in the Founex report, which seemed to command general support. Nor was there sufficient emphasis on the need to take environmental considerations into account in development efforts in order to promote maximum economic growth. Again, it tended to place on the Conference's programme subjects, such as the one relating to the use of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons referred to in operative paragraph 5, which were already being studied in other forums.

60. Lastly, the draft resolution prejudged the conclusions of the Conference on such matters as the draft declaration on the human environment and the financing of assistance to the developing countries, which would no doubt make the problems more difficult to resolve.

61. Mr. ARNAUD (Argentina) said that, in response to the Greek representative's request, he would repeat his explanation of the meaning attached by the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1185/Rev.2 to operative paragraph 3 (d), to which the Greek delegation had suggested two amendments. As his delegation had already explained in its statement in the 1427th meeting, operative paragraph 3 (a) of the draft resolution stressed the need to respect fully the exercise of permanent sovereignty over natural resources, as well as the right of each country to exploit its own resources, in accordance with its own priorities and needs, with the express and moreover logical proviso that that be done "in such a manner as to avoid producing harmful effects on other countries"; the same proviso was spelt out again in the same paragraph (3 (d)). Indeed, a State's exercise of its sovereign right over its natural resources was subject to its obligation not to prejudice the interests of other States, i.e. its neighbours, in accordance with the basic principles of good-neighbourliness—and, in the socio-economic context of the Conference on the Human Environment, of economic good-neighbourliness—international solidarity, the rational utilization of natural resources, and international responsibility and co-operation, principles which were for the most part explicitly mentioned in the draft resolution A/C.2/L.1185/Rev.2. The express condition which States must respect had been referred to several times by other sponsors of the draft resolution, in particular Brazil; he hoped that his explanation would dispel any remaining doubts entertained by the Greek representative.

62. Miss DARLING (United Kingdom) thanked the Brazilian representative for his attempt to improve the wording of operative paragraph 7. Her delegation would nevertheless have to press its amendment to delete the paragraph, since it considered that the contents would tend to hamper the freedom of action of international financial institutions and it would in any case be premature at the present stage to increase the volume of economic assistance for the planning and implementation of projects to preserve the environment.

63. Mr. FERNANDEZ-VILLAVARDE (Spain) thanked all the delegations which had supported the Spanish amendment to operative paragraph 4. Following consultations with some of the sponsors of the draft resolution, he wished now to incorporate his amendment in the text as paragraph 4 (d). The present paragraph 4 (d) would become 4 (e), and the rest of the paragraph would remain unchanged. His delegation wished its amendment to be put to the vote.

64. The CHAIRMAN said that if he heard no objection, the Committee would proceed to the vote on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1185/Rev.2, beginning with the amendments and subamendments.

65. Mr. AHMED (Secretary of the Committee), read out the subamendments proposed orally by the Cuban represen-

tative to the Venezuelan amendments in document A/C.2/L.1213, the new text inserted by the sponsors on the suggestion of Ghana as paragraph 3, the revisions by the sponsors of paragraph 2 and their revised texts for the beginning of paragraph 7 and for paragraph 10.

#### *Ninth preambular paragraph*

66. The CHAIRMAN said that there were two amendments to the ninth preambular paragraph: one had been submitted by the representatives of Australia and the United Kingdom and appeared in paragraph 1 of document A/C.2/L.1214, and the other by Iran was to delete the words "as a consequence of their own high level of improperly planned and inadequately co-ordinated industrial activities". Pursuant to rule 131 of the rules of procedure, the Committee would vote first on the amendment submitted by Australia and the United Kingdom.

*The amendment contained in paragraph 1 of document A/C.2/L.1214 was rejected by 51 votes to 33, with 7 abstentions.*

*The Iranian amendment was rejected by 53 votes to 29, with 7 abstentions.*

67. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Kenyan representative had orally proposed the deletion of the thirteenth, fourteenth and twentieth preambular paragraphs.

*The Kenyan amendment to delete the thirteenth preambular paragraph was rejected by 65 votes to 5, with 22 abstentions.*

*The Kenyan amendment to delete the fourteenth preambular paragraph was rejected by 71 votes to 2, with 21 abstentions.*

*The Kenyan amendment to delete the twentieth preambular paragraph was rejected by 72 votes to 3, with 16 abstentions.*

#### *Eighteenth preambular paragraph*

*The amendment contained in paragraph 2 of document A/C.2/L.1214 was rejected by 53 votes to 25, with 13 abstentions.*

#### *Nineteenth preambular paragraph*

68. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the representative of Iran had proposed that the word "particularly" should be replaced by the words "such as".

*The Iranian amendment was rejected by 50 votes to 20, with 17 abstentions.*

#### *Operative paragraph 2*

*The amendment contained in paragraph 3 of document A/C.2/L.1214 was rejected by 45 votes to 38, with 9 abstentions.*

69. Miss DARLING (United Kingdom) said that the Australian and United Kingdom delegations agreed to the

Philippine representative's proposal that, in the English text of the amendment, the words "wherever possible" should be replaced by the words "as much as possible".

#### *Operative paragraph 3*

*The amendment contained in paragraph 4 of document A/C.2/L.1214, as revised, was rejected by 58 votes to 29, with 6 abstentions.*

#### *Operative paragraph 4 (b)*

*The amendment contained in paragraph 5 of document A/C.2/L.1214 was rejected by 55 votes to 26, with 12 abstentions.*

#### *New operative paragraph 4 (d)*

70. The CHAIRMAN said that the representative of Spain had proposed the inclusion of the following text as a new paragraph 4 (d): "Study with special attention the environmental problems and conditions of the countries with coastlines particularly exposed to the risks of marine pollution".

*The subparagraph was adopted by 84 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.*

#### *Operative paragraph 5*

*The amendment contained in paragraph 6 of document A/C.2/L.1214 was rejected by 69 votes to 14, with 12 abstentions.*

#### *Operative paragraph 7*

*The amendment contained in paragraph 7 of document A/C.2/L.1214 was rejected by 57 votes to 21, with 16 abstentions.*

#### *Operative paragraph 8*

71. The CHAIRMAN said that two amendments to paragraph 8 had been submitted: the amendment submitted by the United Kingdom and Australia, contained in paragraph 8 of document A/C.2/L.1214, and an amendment submitted orally by the delegations of Ghana, Iran and Tunisia which called for the deletion of the words "to be calculated on a percentage basis of expenditures incurred for environmental purposes by the developed countries". In accordance with rule 131 of the rules of procedure, he would put the United Kingdom-Australian amendment to the vote first.

*The amendment contained in paragraph 8 of document A/C.2/L.1214 was rejected by 46 votes to 34, with 13 abstentions.*

*The amendment submitted by the delegations of Ghana, Iran and Tunisia was adopted by 37 votes to 36, with 21 abstentions.*



*Operative paragraph 9*

*The amendment contained in paragraph 9 of document A/C.2/L.1214 was rejected by 51 votes to 32, with 10 abstentions.*

72. Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America) requested a separate vote on operative paragraph 2.

*Paragraph 2 was adopted by 59 votes to 11, with 25 abstentions.*

*New operative paragraph 3*

73. Miss DARLING (United Kingdom) requested a separate vote on the proposed new operative paragraph 3.

74. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the new paragraph was in fact operative paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1195, as amended by Brazil (A/C.2/L.1215). The proposed wording of the new paragraph was: "3. *Reaffirms* that it is important for the Conference to take fully into account the interests of the developing countries and, in this context, endorses the views expressed in section VII of the Declaration and Principles of the Action Programme adopted by the Second Ministerial Meeting of the Group of 77 of developing countries on 7 November 1971 at Lima;".

*New paragraph 3 was adopted by 63 votes to 7, with 24 abstentions.*

*Old operative paragraph 3*

75. The CHAIRMAN said that Greece had requested a separate vote on the words "to determine its own environmental standards and criteria" in subparagraph 3 (d).

*The words "to determine its own environmental standards and criteria" were retained by 75 votes to 1, with 18 abstentions.*

*Old operative paragraph 7*

76. The CHAIRMAN said that the representative of Greece had requested a separate vote on the words "in the exclusive judgement of those countries".

77. Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta), speaking on a point of order, pointed out that by rejecting the relevant amendment submitted by the United Kingdom and Australia, the members of the Committee had in fact decided to retain the words on which a separate vote had been requested.

*The words "in the exclusive judgement of those countries" were retained by 59 votes to 12, with 20 abstentions.*

*Operative paragraph 8*

78. Mr. SANTA-CRUZ (Chile) requested a separate vote on operative paragraph 8.

*Paragraph 8 was retained by 57 votes to 14, with 22 abstentions.*

*Draft resolution A/C.2/L.1185/Rev.2 as a whole, as amended*

*At the request of the representative of Yugoslavia, the vote was taken by roll-call.*

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

*In favour:* Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mexico.

*Against:* United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium.

*Abstaining:* Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Austria, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Malta, Mongolia.

*The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 62 votes to 4 with 31 abstentions.*

79. Mr. MANI (India), explaining his vote, observed that he had voted for the draft resolution as a whole in spite of the fact that it did not refer to population pollution, a subject which his delegation felt should be among those to be discussed at the Conference; he had done so on the understanding that the problem would be studied under the terms of paragraph 9 of the resolution just adopted and that the Preparatory Committee for the Conference would deal with it at its next meeting.

80. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote because the amendments it had supported had all been rejected. He found it unacceptable that financial responsibility for protecting the environment should be thrust upon the developed countries and that they should be requested to supply assistance over and above that required for the objectives already set for the Second Development Decade, for that would jeopardize those very objectives. With regard to paragraph 8, he expressed surprise that Member States should be requested to consider voluntary contributions, for if such contributions were requested they were no longer voluntary.

81. Mr. JOSEPH (Australia) said that Australia had hoped to get at least some of the amendments it had co-sponsored with the United Kingdom accepted. That was particularly so since a number of the amendments seemed to receive considerable private support—indeed support at the private

level even from a number of the co-sponsors of the resolution. In the event, none of the amendments had been accepted, not even those which his delegation still regarded as having been highly conciliatory. His delegation therefore felt that it had little alternative but to record a vote against the draft resolution as a whole.

82. Mr. KOTOBALAVU (Fiji) said that his delegation had voted against the amendment calling for the deletion of paragraph 5 because his country, situated in a region directly threatened by the radio-activity from nuclear weapons tests, consistently opposed such tests.

83. Mr. HILLEL (Israel) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole because the latter contained provisions which prejudged the decisions of the Conference, which would in most cases be taken only after long exchanges of views and negotiations.

84. His delegation had voted for several of the amendments submitted by Australia and the United Kingdom because it had felt that they would make a constructive contribution to the search for solutions.

85. With regard to the second preambular paragraph, his delegation was hardly in a position to assess the efforts made and the results achieved by United Nations bodies in preparing a plan of action on the environment since his country was not permitted to take part in one of the seminars dealing with the matter.

86. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole because it was not compatible either with his delegation's position on the convening of the Stockholm Conference—a position set forth many times in the competent United Nations bodies—or with the joint statement of the socialist countries on the second decade of development and social progress, issued on 21 September 1970.<sup>1</sup>

87. Mr. CALENDI (Italy) said that he had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole because it had left his delegation somewhat perplexed.

88. Having unreservedly supported the United Kingdom amendments, his delegation could only regret that they had been rejected; had they been accepted, it would have been able to vote for the draft resolution.

89. However, the main difficulty for his delegation arose from the very conception of the draft resolution which both failed to come to grips with the main issue and went beyond it. On the one hand, it seemed to reduce the Conference to the problem of the relationship between the environment and development; on the other hand, it ended by implying that the Conference would merely duplicate, with regard to environmental problems, the sessions of UNCTAD.

90. He felt free to express that viewpoint because his delegation had, since the first session of the Preparatory Committee, stressed the importance of the environment-development problem. However, there were also other, more serious problems of a scientific, technical and institutional nature which formed a single whole and had to be solved before the environment-development problem could be studied in a concrete manner.

91. It was wrong to contend that environmental problems resulted solely from industrialization. A well-conceived industrialization project, undertaken with technical planning, did not lead to degradation of the environment, whereas soil deterioration was a legacy of the pre-industrial period common to all countries and quite possibly affected the non-industrialized countries more seriously than those which were industrialized. Improvement of soil conditions—reafforestation, action to prevent land from becoming desert, development of rivers and torrential streams—posed very serious financial problems. Moreover, it could not be denied that soil deterioration was chiefly the result of erroneous political and social concepts which were not characteristic of the highly industrialized countries.

92. Finally, his delegation felt obliged to state that the draft resolution gave the impression that its sponsors wished at all costs to introduce political factors into problems which would scarcely be discussed at Stockholm. The Conference would show what opportunities would be available to the countries of the world to solve the serious problems of the environment, including that of the relationship between the environment and development. When it took up those problems in a concrete manner, the Conference would encounter grave difficulties; it was therefore unwise to compete, before the event and in a vacuum, in creating additional difficulties. His delegation felt that before becoming divided over concrete problems—which could very well happen before pragmatic solutions could be found—the international community should unite its efforts in the solidarity of spirit required for action whose principal objective was to improve the human condition.

*The meeting rose at 9.05 p.m.*

<sup>1</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fifth Session, Annexes, agenda item 42, document A/8074.*