



Chairman: Mr. Bruce RANKIN (Canada).

AGENDA ITEM 43

United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
(continued) (A/8703/Add.1 (Part III), A/8819, A/8893,
A/C.2/L.1273, A/C.2/L.1274/Rev.1, A/C.2/L.1277,
A/C.2/L.1279, A/C.2/L.1284):

- (a) Report of the Conference on its third session
(TD/178 and Add.1, TD(III)/Misc.3 and Corr.1);
- (b) Report of the Trade and Development Board
(A/8715)

1. Mr. CHANG TSIEN-HUA (China), speaking in explanation of his vote on the draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1267/Rev.1) adopted at the preceding meeting, said that his delegation sympathized with the draft aim of alleviating the heavy debt-servicing burden of developing countries. However, since paragraph 2 referred to co-operation with the President of IBRD and with the Managing Director of IMF, both of which organizations had so far failed to implement General Assembly resolution 2758 (XXVI) on the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China, his delegation had not participated in the vote.

2. Mr. AL JABER (Jordan) said his delegation shared the general concern at the difficulties encountered by some developing countries in servicing their external debt, and believed that the subject should be studied. However, it had abstained in the vote because those problems were best dealt with on a case-by-case basis and the most effective remedy would be the provision of loans on soft terms to be utilized in productive projects.

3. Mr. RUGGIERO (Italy) said his delegation was deeply sympathetic towards those countries which were facing debt-servicing problems but had abstained in the vote, because it did not believe that the studies referred to in paragraphs 1 and 2 of the draft would add anything of value to those which were already being undertaken. Moreover, his delegation was unable to support the suggestion that a special fund should be established to finance the interest on external debts; in the majority of cases, special funds had not proved to be an effective tool, but had tended rather to disperse development assistance. His delegation would be glad to vote for a draft resolution which would effectively help the developing countries to solve their debt-servicing problem and hoped that, in the future, it would have the opportunity to do so.

4. Mr. SKOGLUND (Sweden) said that his delegation had abstained on the draft resolution. The problems occasioned by the rapid increase in the external debt of developing countries over the past decade were not likely to be completely eliminated during the current decade and might even be aggravated in some countries. The efforts being made to solve the problem were therefore fully understandable. There was a close relationship between the debt problem, the real volume of transfers and the terms and conditions of assistance. A greater flow of official development assistance on softer terms was required to solve the debt-servicing problem. His delegation seriously doubted the desirability of creating a special fund to service that debt, since as paragraph 11 of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade (General Assembly resolution 2626 (XXV)) stated, the primary responsibility for the development of developing countries rested upon themselves. Indeed, the establishment of the fund might disincline donor countries to soften the terms and conditions of aid. The problems of the mounting debt burden could not be viewed separately from the over-all problem of the flow of resources to developing countries and must be dealt with in the light of the specific situation in each country; it would not be equitable to apply the same criteria to all debt crises.

5. Mr. EKBLOM (Finland) said that his delegation seriously doubted whether the establishment of new special funds would further the cause of the developing countries. Each time a new fund was set up, the responsibility for choosing from the host of competing and well-founded needs fell increasingly upon the donor countries. That trend ran counter to the current joint efforts to bring about coherent multilateral development co-operation whereby the priorities of developing countries rather than the donors should guide the channelling of resources. Rather than create new institutions, the international community should try to strengthen those which already existed. It was unrealistic to think that setting up new funds would lead to a mobilization of more resources; in fact, such proposals led only to time-wasting debate. In the present case, moreover, the proposed fund seemed particularly unlikely to prove of real assistance to those encountering debt-servicing problems, since there was apparently little likelihood of contributions to it.

6. His delegation had welcomed the addition by the sponsors of the words "the desirability and possibility of" in paragraph 1, in relation to the special fund, which had enabled it to support the resolution as a whole.

AGENDA ITEM 12

Report of the Economic and Social Council [chapters III to XI, XII (sections A to G) and XVII to XIX] (continued) (A/8703)

THE PROBLEM OF MASS POVERTY AND UNEMPLOYMENT IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (concluded)* (A/C.2/L.1276/Rev.2)

7. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines) drew attention to a number of changes incorporated in the new revised text (A/C.2/L.1276/Rev.2) of the draft resolution. In the sixth preambular paragraph, the words "particularly" and "with the largest aggregate population" had been deleted. A new seventh preambular paragraph had been added for the purpose of including a specific reference to special measures in favour of the least developed among the developing countries, and in what was now the ninth preambular paragraph, the word "some" before "developing countries" had been deleted. The tenth preambular paragraph remained unchanged. In the eleventh preambular paragraph, the words "comprising a large proportion of the population in a number of developing countries" had been deleted.

8. Operative paragraph 2 had been revised by the deletion of the word "especially" at the beginning and the replacement of "to consider programmes designed" by "to continue their programmes and to take such further steps as may be necessary"; in addition, the words "within their national plans and priorities" had been added to take into account the point that the relief of mass poverty was a matter within the internal jurisdiction of States. Paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1276/Rev.1 had been removed, in response to the comment that there was a lack of balance in that text; in paragraph 4 of the new text, the words "aid" and "assist" replaced the original words "assistance" and "enable". At the beginning of paragraph 5, the word "Further" should be deleted.

9. The new text took into account many of the constructive comments made by a number of delegations. The question of identifying the countries, a large proportion of whose populations had extremely low *per capita* incomes, had been raised; in the view of the sponsors, the Secretary-General had at his disposal, through the Centre for Development Planning, Projections and Policies and the Statistical Office, the necessary data to enable him to identify those countries. Relevant statistics were also available to the World Bank Group and, in his delegation's view, there was no need for an identification exercise by the Committee for Development Planning, which would delay the implementation of urgently needed action by at least two years. The argument that the draft resolution would create a new category of countries was a negative approach; the Committee had in the past adopted many draft resolutions directed towards specific groups of countries, and the current draft was concerned with those developing countries in which mass poverty and unemployment existed.

10. Mr. OZÓRIO DE ALMEIDA (Brazil) said his delegation greatly sympathized with the motives underlying the draft resolution. Its initial misgivings had to some extent been allayed by the revisions introduced by the sponsors, but it still had some difficulties. The sixth preambular paragraph still stated that there was no manifest improvement in the individual lives of the great masses of people in the developing countries, a sweeping generalization which was not true of a considerable number of developing countries, and certainly not of Brazil; it failed to distinguish between relative income distribution and absolute income growth; in some developing countries, the level of living of the masses had risen considerably without any income redistribution, and that important aspect of the matter should not be neglected. The eighth preambular paragraph seemed somewhat pointless, since it vaguely mentioned a problem without suggesting any solution. The urgent need referred to in the ninth preambular paragraph was felt not just in the developing countries, but in most countries. Moreover, his delegation had already made clear its view that the major reason for the unsatisfactory income distribution in developing countries was the type of development assistance which they received.

11. Operative paragraph 4 required clarification. Organizations were urged to consider the development and implementation of measures "including increased aid on concessionary terms"; that implied that other measures would also be taken. His delegation would like to know what type of measures were contemplated to enable developing countries to redistribute their income, which in its view would require changes in the nature of the technical assistance provided to them. Unless the draft resolution was amended to reflect the comments he had made, his delegation would be compelled to vote against it.

12. Mr. ARLÍA (Argentina) said that amendments were required in the fourth, sixth and seventh preambular paragraphs to make it clear that the problem of mass poverty and unemployment did not affect all developing countries; his delegation accordingly proposed the insertion in those paragraphs of the word "some" before "developing countries". In the ninth preambular paragraph, the words "past and current" added nothing and should be deleted.

13. His delegation did not understand how, in operative paragraph 4, international organizations could be required to consider the implementation of measures to assist developing countries, and accordingly requested deletion of the words "and implementation".

14. Mr. LEKONGA (Zaire), recalling his comments at the previous meeting, said his delegation still did not understand how increased concessionary assistance from developed countries would enable developing countries to eradicate mass poverty and unemployment, unless the aid provided was specifically earmarked for that purpose. Accordingly, his delegation maintained its reservations with regard to the draft resolution.

* Resumed from the 1509th meeting.

15. Mr. HEMANS (United Kingdom) said that his delegation attached the greatest importance to ensuring that any steps taken were integrated with the national plans and priorities of developing countries, but the phrase "within their national plans and priorities" had been added to the wrong paragraph. It was scarcely likely that developing countries would themselves take any steps which were not within their national plans and priorities. Accordingly, the words should be transferred from paragraph 2 to the end of paragraph 4, which dealt with measures to be developed by the international community.

16. Mrs. STRÖJE-WILKENS (Sweden) said that the two major criticisms of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1276/Rev.1 had been based on the fact that policies relating to income distribution came within the domestic jurisdiction of States and on the fear that the draft might establish a new category of developing countries. In some respects, the revised version was less satisfactory; for example, paragraph 2 expressed less clearly than before the responsibility of developing countries themselves for measures to improve the livelihood of the poorest sections of their populations. Paragraph 4 could still be interpreted as establishing a new criterion for special treatment of countries other than the least developed, namely, those in which there was a large difference in income between various groups of the population. In her delegation's view, the aim of the draft resolution should be to provide assistance to those countries which were taking action to remedy their income distribution. She accordingly suggested that the words from "a large proportion" at the end of paragraph 4 should be replaced by the phrase "to raise the level of living of their low-income groups". That would make it clear that there was no intention of introducing a new category of developing countries.

17. Mr. Cissé (Senegal) said that the revisions to the text introduced by the sponsors did not take into account his suggestion that the words "and to create new employment opportunities" should be transferred from paragraph 2 to paragraph 3. The essential point was that there was a close correlation between development, trade and employment problems, and the developing countries would be unable to increase employment opportunities unless the terms of trade were changed in their favour. Paragraph 4 should then contain a reference to assistance by international organizations to improve the terms of trade.

18. His delegation was concerned at the danger that a new category of the poorest of the poor might be established, alongside the groups consisting of the least developed among the developing countries and those which were relatively least developed within regions. If such a new category was established, it might not be long before yet another group was proposed, consisting perhaps of countries dependent on one export product which was dependent on climatic variations. His delegation would welcome an assurance that there was no intention of creating a new group to rival the group of the least developed among the developing countries.

19. Furthermore, the draft resolution gave the misleading impression that the developing countries already possessed sufficient income and that merely to redistribute it more equitably among the various segments of the population would solve their problems.

20. Mr. HAMID (Sudan) said he was fully satisfied by the changes introduced by the sponsors in paragraph 2. With regard to paragraph 4, he supported the suggestion of the representative of Sweden.

21. Mr. SEFIANI (Morocco) said that the view of his delegation as a sponsor of the draft resolution was that it merely echoed Economic and Social Council resolution 1727 (LIII) dealing with mass poverty and should in no way be interpreted as creating a new category of developing countries, a step to which his delegation would be strongly opposed.

22. Mr. VALDÉS (Bolivia) said that, since there appeared to be a desire to create an "aristocracy" among the poor countries, he wished to withdraw his sponsorship of the draft resolution.

23. Mr. CUBILLOS (Chile) said that there seemed to be something lacking in paragraph 2. Steps were, indeed, urgently needed to solve the problem of mass unemployment in developing countries referred to by the President of the World Bank at the third session of UNCTAD (85th meeting), but they must be taken by the developing countries themselves. He suggested that reference should be made to the structural reforms needed in such countries by adding the words "including the structural reforms that may be necessary" at the end of paragraph 2. If basic structural reforms did not take place, there would be no change in the economic and social conditions of the countries and their economies would continue to be controlled by the same groups as at present.

24. Mr. MORENO (Cuba) supported the Chilean amendment, adding that, if the distribution of income was to be improved and living levels raised, a change in the economic and social structure of developing countries was imperative. The Economic and Social Council had adopted a very explicit resolution on that subject at its fifty-third session (resolution 1727 (LIII)).

25. Mr. AL JABER (Jordan) suggested that the words "within their national plans and priorities" should be moved from the end of paragraph 2 and placed after the word "achieve" in the same paragraph.

26. Mr. DEBRAH (Ghana) pointed out that the main purpose of the draft resolution was to help the poor in all countries, developed as well as developing. In order to make it quite clear that the text was not designed to establish a new category of developing countries, his delegation would support the Swedish suggestion.

27. Mr. OKELO (Uganda) said that the question of the poorest 40 per cent of the population could be discussed by the Committee for Development Planning which could report to the Council and the matter could

subsequently be discussed in the General Assembly. His delegation still had reservations on the draft resolution.

28. Mr. KANKA (Czechoslovakia) supported the Chilean amendment.

29. Mr. ALI (Pakistan) said that, although all developing countries believed in self-reliance, the concept of external assistance was a well-established one. He agreed that it was the duty of Governments to redistribute income so that the poorest "40 per cent" of the population should have a greater share, but he appealed to delegations to remember that there were hundreds of millions of people living in substandard conditions. Those people should not be neglected.

30. Mr. KANÉ (Mauritania) said he agreed with what the representative of Senegal had said. His delegation had always voted on the side of the least developed among the developing countries. The draft resolution might jeopardize the solidarity of the developing countries and cause them to squabble over what each should receive. He therefore appealed to the sponsors to withdraw their draft resolution. If, however, it was put to the vote his delegation would vote for it in the interest of solidarity.

31. Mr. DE RIVERO (Peru) supported the Chilean amendment which was essential in order to make it quite clear that the better distribution of income referred to was designed to bring about a shift in economic power. The developing countries had accepted that concept in the Declaration of Lima¹ adopted by the Group of 77 and the International Development Strategy contained a clear reference to structural change. If the amendment was accepted his delegation would vote for the resolution; otherwise it would abstain.

32. Mr. GALLARDO MORENO (Mexico) said that, although he was in sympathy with the draft resolution, he was afraid that some of the concepts in it might be interpreted as interference in the internal affairs of developing countries. Every country was free to pursue development in its own way and nothing should be introduced into the draft resolution that might be interpreted as violating the principle of sovereignty.

33. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines), speaking for his own delegation and not for the sponsors as a whole, said he was prepared to replace the word "the" in line 3 of the sixth preambular paragraph by the phrase "a large number of". He could agree to moving the phrase "within their national plans and priorities" from its present position and placing it after the word "achieve" in paragraph 2. He appealed to the representative of Chile not to press his amendment since, if accepted, it would only create more controversy. He could not accept the Swedish suggestion because it would take all the force out of the resolution and, since the sponsors had clearly stated they were not trying to create a new category of developing countries, asked that the point should not be pressed; he could,

however, agree to replacing the word "large" in paragraph 4 by the word "considerable". Referring to the unity of the Group of 77, he pointed out that his delegation too, had always voted with the least developed among the developing countries and there was therefore no need for the draft resolution to create any disunity.

34. Mr. CUBILLOS (Chile) said that it was for the developing countries to take action to solve their problems instead of leaving it to international organizations. He maintained his amendment and, if it was defeated, he would abstain from voting on the resolution as a whole.

35. The CHAIRMAN requested the Committee to vote on the Chilean proposal to add the words "including the structural reforms that may be necessary" at the end of paragraph 2.

At the request of the representative of Cuba, a recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Bahrain, Belgium, Bhutan, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, Netherlands, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Malaysia, Morocco, New Zealand, Philippines, Thailand.

Abstaining: Austria, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Guinea, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Khmer Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Malta, Nigeria, Portugal, Singapore, South Africa, Spain, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey.

The amendment was adopted by 76 votes to 9, with 23 abstentions.

36. Mr. AL-EBRAHIM (Kuwait) requested a separate vote on the last part of paragraph 4 beginning with the words "a considerable proportion".

37. The CHAIRMAN requested the Committee to vote on the retention of the phrase "a considerable proportion of whose populations have extremely low per capita incomes to give special attention to their low-income groups."

¹ See A/C.2/L.270 and Corr.1.

The phrase was retained by 47 votes to 22, with 40 abstentions.

38. Mrs. STRÖJE-WILKENS (Sweden) proposed that the words "a considerable proportion of whose populations have extremely low *per capita* incomes" should be deleted from paragraph 4.

39. The CHAIRMAN said that the Swedish proposal was out of order since the Committee had already decided to retain the words in question as a result of the vote on the Kuwaiti proposal.

40. Mr. MANDERSON-JONES (Jamaica) said that the purport of the Swedish proposal was different from that of the Kuwaiti proposal and the results of the voting would also probably be different.

41. After a procedural discussion in which Mr. SIBAJENE (Zambia), Mr. VERCELES (Philippines), Mr. AL-EBRAHIM (Kuwait), Mrs. STRÖJE-WILKENS (Sweden), Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America) and Mr. GERLEIN (Colombia) took part, the CHAIRMAN ruled that the Committee could not vote on the Swedish proposal since it had already decided to retain the wording in question.

42. Mr. MANDERSON-JONES (Jamaica) challenged the Chairman's ruling and suggested that the Committee should be asked to decide whether it should stand.

43. The CHAIRMAN cited rule 115 of the rules of procedure and invited the Committee to vote on the challenge to his ruling.

The challenge to the Chairman's ruling was rejected by 66 votes to 12, with 20 abstentions.

At the request of the representative of Sudan, a separate vote was taken on paragraph 4.

Paragraph 4 was adopted by 52 votes to 18, with 34 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/C.2/L.1276/Rev.2 as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 75 votes to 1, with 28 abstentions.

Mr. Gobba (Egypt), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

44. Mr. UDOVENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution although, perhaps because of a mechanical failure, its affirmative vote had not been shown on the voting board.

45. Mr. MACAULEY (Sierra Leone) explained that his country had voted for the draft resolution on the clear understanding that it would not create a new category of developing nations.

46. Mr. CISSÉ (Senegal) said that his delegation had also supported the draft resolution in a spirit of solidarity and on the same understanding as the delegation of Sierra Leone.

47. Mr. EKBLOM (Finland) said that his country fully supported the aims of the draft resolution, namely, to eradicate mass poverty and unemployment, but he had abstained in the vote on the text as a whole because he was against pressing an important issue at that stage when many doubts were still being voiced.

48. Mr. AL-EBRAHIM (Kuwait) explained that the purpose of his delegation's amendment was to prevent the creation of a new category of developing countries. All developing countries required assistance if they were to overcome the evils of poverty and unemployment. Furthermore, the sponsors had failed to make clear what criteria would be used to determine the proportion of a country's population with extremely low *per capita* income.

49. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) said that he had voted against the draft resolution because it begged the very question it was intended to solve and suggested measures that were not measures, for example, the creation of employment, instead of tackling the root causes of the problem.

50. Mr. SINGER (Uruguay) said that his delegation, despite its sympathy with the aims of the sponsors, had doubts as to whether the text would produce effective results; it had therefore abstained on the draft resolution as a whole. It had voted in favour of the Chilean amendment to paragraph 2 because the purport was precise and clear.

51. Mr. CUBILLOS (Chile) explained that his delegation's affirmative vote for the text as a whole did not imply total support for every part of it. Indeed, it felt that the sponsors had gone too far by calling on international organizations, including IBRD, to provide increased aid in a field which had not yet been sufficiently explored.

52. Mr. MOLINA DUARTE (Venezuela) explained that he had abstained on the draft resolution as a whole for two reasons. First, there was no hope of eradicating mass poverty and unemployment until the developing countries obtained better terms of trade, which would generate the necessary resources for economic and social development. Hence, the text should have emphasized that aspect rather than increased aid. Secondly, it would be regrettable to establish a sliding scale of under-development by creating a second category within the developing countries, in addition to the hard core of the least developed.

53. Mr. FLEMING (Argentina) said that his delegation had not taken part in the vote because the text was weak and ambiguous and could even prove detrimental to United Nations activities.

54. Mr. GEBRU (Ethiopia) said that he had voted in favour on the understanding that the text in no way undermined the measures laid down in UNCTAD resolution 62 (III). He interpreted paragraph 4 as referring to any developing country, irrespective of the size of its population, in which the income of a proportion of the population fell below a certain level.

55. Mr. VALDÉS (Bolivia) said that his delegation had supported the draft resolution because it considered that the text was balanced, inspired by lofty aims and reflected his country's concern for the future of the masses. It had been unable to vote for the Chilean amendment because of the word "necessary" qualifying "structural reforms" which suggested interference in the internal affairs of States.

56. Mrs. STRÖJE-WILKENS (Sweden) said that she had voted for the draft resolution for the reasons given by the Finnish representative and because it endorsed Council resolution 1727 (LIII). She trusted that the sponsors' assurance that paragraph 4 did not imply the creation of any new category of developing countries would be borne in mind by the international secretariats concerned.

57. Mr. SELZ (France) said that, despite the urgency of the problem of mass poverty and unemployment, his delegation had felt obliged to abstain. There were certain improvements in the text but the fears expressed at the previous meeting had not been altogether dispelled. Paragraph 4, for example, left the way open for a new category of developing countries and that would diminish the effectiveness of the many measures decided at the third session of UNCTAD in favour of the least developed countries.

58. Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America) said that his delegation had understood the draft resolution in the same way as the sponsors, namely, that it was not intended to create a new category of developing countries and that it in no way prejudiced or weakened the special measures being taken for the least developed countries. In line with the proposals of the President of the World Bank, it introduced a new concept which was of concern to all countries, whether least developed, developing or developed, which had large pockets of poverty and unemployment. His delegation had therefore voted in favour of the draft resolution.

59. Mrs. COLMANT (Honduras) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the Chilean amendment because it regarded structural reforms as necessary for raising living levels. It had also voted for the text as a whole on the understanding that all developing countries needing assistance would receive it.

Mr. Rankin (Canada) resumed the Chair.

60. Mr. AL-KHUDHAIRY (Iraq) said that, although his country was in favour of giving increased attention to low-income groups, it could not support the implication that a subgroup of developing countries would be set up and had therefore abstained.

UNITED NATIONS FUND FOR POPULATION ACTIVITIES (*continued*)* (A/8899, A/C.2/L.1283/Rev.1)

61. The CHAIRMAN said that draft resolution A/C.2/L.1283/Rev.1 was a procedural one; it would

not be necessary to discuss the substantive aspects of the work of the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA).

62. Mr. ARVESEN (Norway), introducing the revised draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, drew attention to the enlarged list of sponsors and to the changes in paragraphs 2 and 4. He hoped that the text would meet with general support.

63. Mr. HUTAGALUNG (Indonesia) said that he was encouraged by the information in the Secretary-General's note (A/8899) that the Fund's resources were continuing to grow rapidly. That situation reflected a growing awareness and understanding of the seriousness and urgency of the population programmes and increasing confidence in the Organization. Indonesia had found the Fund's assistance particularly helpful. His delegation would continue its long-standing support for the Fund's population plan and hoped that its administrative and operational machinery would be improved with a view to speeding up the formulation of still larger programmes. The measures set out in paragraph 10 of the note by the Secretary-General would enable the Fund to discharge its increasing responsibilities. His delegation supported the view that the General Assembly would be in a position to approve the new measures, the procedural action for which was requested in the draft resolution before the Committee. He hoped that the draft resolution would enlist unanimous support.

64. Mr. Cissé (Senegal) said that his delegation supported the draft resolution because it would facilitate the activities of the Fund and enlarge the scope of its activities. Maximum flexibility was needed for its actions to be scheduled rationally. The idea of applying funding rules similar to those of UNDP would be very useful to the Fund in its work and facilitate its management.

65. Mr. ARLÍA (Argentina) considered the draft resolution to be very important. He disagreed with those delegations which felt that the draft resolution was merely procedural, because it implied the possibility of action that would have serious political repercussions.

66. He acknowledged the value of UNFPA's assistance activities, which had made it possible to complete population census projects. The idea of a population policy went beyond the traditional concept of a demographic policy. His delegation had every respect for the sovereign right of any country that wished to make use of aid from the Fund for family planning projects. It was important that all Member States, particularly the developing countries, should be able to make use of the resources available to deal with whatever matters they felt to be of greatest concern.

67. The text of the draft resolution caused his delegation some difficulties. It prejudged the decisions of the Governing Council—a danger that it was the Committee's duty to avoid. Before deciding to delegate to

* Resumed from the 1509th meeting.

the Governing Council the responsibility of acting as governing body for the Fund, the opinion of the Council should have been ascertained. Paragraph 2 seemed to have the effect of depriving the Economic and Social Council of the opportunity to state its opinion on policy matters that were its prerogative under the Charter. Since for most of the sponsors of the draft resolution the words "broad policies" referred to administrative and financial matters, there was no reason why that should not be stated specifically. He therefore suggested that the sponsors might consider amending the latter part of the paragraph to read: "to concern itself with the financial and administrative policies concerning the Work Programme, fund-raising methods and the annual budget of the Fund".

68. Paragraph 3, while recognizing the need for the Governing Council to have the necessary means to discharge its functions, nevertheless prejudged the manner in which it could assume its new functions. In common with all United Nations bodies, the Governing Council had a heavily overloaded agenda; it was important to preserve its order and methods of work. There was a danger that existing priorities would be changed in order to accommodate the new topics, thus defeating the purpose for which the Council, with its limited membership, had been set up. The matter of priorities required to be given attention.

69. His delegation was concerned lest the Governing Council might combine certain functions entailing the establishment of a link between the objectives and means of assistance, on the lines proposed by Mr. McNamara for the World Bank. Indicative planning figures might be reduced if the criteria for their establishment were reviewed in the light of a country's demographic policy. It might be worth while to consider the new administrative scheme for the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, which offered a number of interesting possibilities. The separate identity of the Fund, in paragraph 2, might be reaffirmed in order to avoid a situation in which an undesirable link was established between UNFPA's resources and indicative planning figures. The sponsors might consider amending the text to bring that out more explicitly.

70. Paragraph 4 was unacceptable as it stood. It was even more obscure than the original text; "the full implications thereof" sounded like an appeal to divine Providence. Paragraphs 5 and 6 could also be improved; he would be glad to discuss possible changes with the sponsors. It was important to avoid a situation in which UNFPA went in search of a governing body. While agreeing with the intention underlying the draft resolution, his delegation had misgivings about the proposed procedures and implementation.

71. Mr. ISAKSEN (Denmark) said that his delegation was satisfied with the text as it stood. The General Assembly should be asked to assign the Fund to a new authority in view of the large financial resources being made available to it. The Fund and UNDP should be linked as closely as possible; it was logical therefore that the Governing Council should be the governing

body of the Fund, although the latter should be a separate entity. Had the Committee been engaged in a substantive discussion, he would have expressed his delegation's doubts on the usefulness of integrating the Fund's programmes and UNDP country programmes, if such a course would result in any reduction in indicative planning figures. All countries must have access to the Fund's services, although the more affluent must pay for the assistance they received.

72. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) said that, like the representative of Argentina, he did not regard the draft resolution as a procedural one. In 1971 the Second Committee had recommended for approval a text aimed at improving the quality of the administrative arrangements of the United Nations Fund for Population Activities; the text had later become General Assembly resolution 2815 (XXVI). Subsequently the Economic and Social Council had discussed the question as to which body was to be responsible for UNFPA; the lack of intergovernmental control had been noted at the time. While his delegation would whole-heartedly support any measures that any country considered necessary for its population policy, pressure to qualify assistance in terms of a country's policies must be firmly rejected. While it was true that the Economic and Social Council had adopted a decision following its discussion enabling the Secretary-General to submit a report to the General Assembly, no transfer of authority had been implied thereby, nor had the Council recommended that the General Assembly should take any action without the Council's advice.

73. He was surprised that the Secretary-General's note (A/8899) and the original draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1283) had been submitted so late. He wondered what the purpose of the delay had been.

74. His delegation had urged strongly that the Fund should be placed under intergovernmental control, in order to ensure that it was generally known what decisions were being taken and what programmes were being approved and carried through. He wondered whether the proposals in draft resolution A/C.2/L.1283/Rev.1 were the right ones. Population problems, if properly presented, must be part of development policies. He wished to know what the role of the Economic and Social Council was to be under the new arrangements. Its views and those of the Governing Council on UNDP's new duties must be sought, and the repercussion of those new duties on normal tasks must be considered.

75. The representative of Argentina had remarked that there might be undesirable interaction between UNDP and UNFPA. The Brazilian delegation had serious reservations about delegating to the Governing Council functions that rightly belonged to the Economic and Social Council. The Governing Council was based on a donor-receiver country concept that made it undesirable for it to take decisions on population policies. If work programmes and policies were to be decided elsewhere, abstract discussion in the Economic and Social Council was useless. Although

certain functions of control over the Fund might conceivably be delegated to the Governing Council, over-all policy was strictly the prerogative of the Economic and Social Council and the words: "without prejudice to the over-all responsibilities and policy functions of the Economic and Social Council" in paragraph 2 were not sufficient. He formally proposed the inclusion of the amendment to paragraph 2 suggested by Argentina, which would make it quite clear which functions belonged to the Economic and Social Council and which might be delegated to the Governing Council.

76. In paragraph 3 it was not clear what was meant by "operate with maximum flexibility", which sounded like a blank cheque. The idea of involving non-governmental and other organizations required qualification; some of the organizations interested in population questions included pressure groups. He proposed that the latter part of paragraph 3 should be reworded to read: "... needs to operate under the guidance of the Economic and Social Council in close relationship with interested Governments and with appropriate international and national. . .".

77. The decision called for by the draft resolution was one that should be taken only after a decision by the Economic and Social Council and UNDP. The Committee was being urged to take action the need for which had been felt for many years, but the inter-governmental control to be established must be of the right kind. The Governing Council, by virtue of its composition and underlying receiver-donor philosophy, was politically the wrong body. The Fund's governing body must have a majority of developing countries in its membership. His delegation reserved the right to make further amendments if the draft resolution was pressed to a vote.

78. Mr. ALI (Pakistan) said that he did not wish to contest the statement that the draft resolution was a procedural one. The subject was, like that of the environment, vitally important.

79. His delegation fully agreed with the representative of Brazil that no country would welcome interference by an international organization in its domestic affairs. However, if a country, on its own initiative, requested assistance from an international organization in dealing with its population problems, that could not be interpreted as constituting interference. Where paragraph 2 was concerned, Pakistan fully agreed with the representative of Brazil that the Economic and Social Council should retain its over-all responsibilities and policy functions. However, the paragraph clearly stated that its provisions were without prejudice to those responsibilities and functions; dealing with the implementation of the policies laid down by the Economic and Social Council was the responsibility of the Governing Council of UNDP. His delegation would, however, be prepared to support any amendment which set forth that division of responsibilities more clearly.

80. Mr. HOSNY (Egypt) said his delegation supported the draft resolution as a whole, in particular

its basic aim of changing the character of the Fund. It particularly welcomed paragraph 3 which stressed the separate identity of the Fund and its need to operate with maximum flexibility. Its continuing separate identity was necessary for the expeditious delivery of assistance and for maintaining the types of activity in which it engaged under existing programmes. Placing the Fund under the authority of the Governing Council should in no way impair its separate identity or its flexibility.

81. Paragraph 4 would expand the scope of the Fund's activities by enabling it to depart from the full-funding concept, as UNDP itself had done pursuant to the recommendations in the Capacity Study.² That departure would release resources which under the existing procedures were tied for the full term of approved projects. Finally, his delegation hoped that the invitation renewed in paragraph 6 would meet with a vigorous and continued response.

82. Mr. NDUNG'U (Kenya) said that his delegation had earlier proposed to the sponsors amendments which would prevent paragraph 4 from prejudging the action to be taken by the Governing Council; in general, the revised text covered the points his delegation had made, but he still wished to propose the replacement of the word "Authorizes" by the word "Recommends" and the addition of the words "in principle" after "apply". He supported the amendment submitted by the representative of Brazil and endorsed the arguments advanced by the representative of Argentina.

83. Mr. MORENO (Cuba) agreed that it would be desirable to obtain the views of the Governing Council of UNDP and the Economic and Social Council before a decision was taken on the draft resolution. He also reiterated his view that the application of any form of pressure to developing countries by international organizations was unacceptable; developing countries could not accept any kind of predetermined policy.

84. The role assigned to the Economic and Social Council in the draft resolution was not sufficiently broad. His delegation agreed with the amendment suggested by the representative of Brazil and would go further by proposing the addition, in paragraph 2 after the words "Population Activities", of the phrase "subject to conditions to be established by the Economic and Social Council". Even with that change, the draft resolution created great difficulties for his delegation, which could not agree to place the Fund under the Governing Council if the intent was to establish a tacit link between population control programmes and development programmes in general.

85. Mr. O'RIORDAN (Ireland) said he shared the doubts expressed with regard to the procedures proposed in paragraph 2. It was difficult to understand why the opinion of the Governing Council of UNDP had not been obtained. In paragraphs 2 and 3 it was not clear what the role of the Economic and Social Council would be. Was the intention to remove from

² *A Study of the Capacity of the United Nations Development System* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.70.I.10).

its jurisdiction matters which clearly involved questions of policy? Adoption of the amendments proposed by the representatives of Brazil and Cuba would greatly improve the text. The language of paragraph 3 was extremely imprecise. The Governing Council—which, incidentally, delegations had been led to believe was overburdened with work—was to be invited to take over responsibility for the Fund, which would nevertheless maintain its separate identity and maximum flexibility. In his delegation's view, some explanation of the meaning of that paragraph was necessary. He supported the amendment to paragraph 4 proposed by the representative of Kenya.

86. Mr. GEBRU (Ethiopia) noted, from the note by the Secretary-General (A/8899), that the resources available to the Fund had increased from \$15.3 million in 1970 to a probable \$36 million in 1972. While that increase was satisfactory, the draft resolution raised both procedural and substantive questions. His delegation was surprised to see a draft resolution dealing with a subject which the Committee had not discussed. In addition, it should be borne in mind that, while over-population was not a problem of interest to all developing countries, development was. His delegation would like to know the extent to which UNDP's activities relating to development would be affected if it were to give increased attention to population problems which affected only certain areas. In paragraph 10 (c) of the note by the Secretary-General, it was stated that the Fund should continue to be administered by the Administrator of UNDP, so that its inputs were integrated into the broader programme of economic and social development financed by UNDP. The extent to which that integration would affect the indicative planning figures of individual countries, especially the least developed among the developing countries, was not clear either from the document he had referred to or from the draft resolution.

87. Mr. ABHYANKAR (India) said that, although the representatives of Argentina and Brazil had disclaimed any intention of dealing with the substantive issues as to whether the United Nations should have a population policy and whether the Fund should exist, their views on those issues had tended to intrude on their specific comments on the draft resolution, with many of which his delegation sympathized. For example, his delegation, too, would have preferred to be guided in its consideration of the subject by the detailed views of the Governing Council and by something more than a brief section in the report of the Economic and Social Council (A/8703, chap. XI, sect. B). Nevertheless, the basis for the draft resolution was given in General Assembly resolution 2815 (XXVI), which requested the Secretary-General to inform the Economic and Social Council at its fifty-third session and the General Assembly at its twenty-seventh session of the steps he had taken to implement its provisions. The note by the Secretary-General (A/8899), prepared in response to that request, made it clear that nothing radically new was involved, since the Fund had always been administered through UNDP.

88. The note also outlined in more detail the substance of paragraph 4 of the draft resolution. The essential point was that the Fund's resources had reached a level where more detailed scrutiny of its activities and future growth had become necessary. The existing arrangements were unsatisfactory in that the Fund could not undertake long-range programming and a rational structuring of its activities over the course of time. The aim of the paragraph was to allow it to adopt funding and financial procedures which would enable it to do so, as had been done in the past by other organs.

89. The representative of Brazil had said he was in favour of intergovernmental scrutiny of the activities of the Fund, and that was precisely what was proposed—through the appointment of the Governing Council as its governing body. Although it would have been useful for the Committee to hear the views of the Governing Council before taking a decision, the fact that it had not done so would not prevent the Council from serving in that capacity.

90. In expressing a fear that the Governing Council, because of the parity in its membership of donor and recipient countries, was not a suitable organ to act as the Fund's governing body owing to the risk that developed countries might apply undue pressure on developing countries to initiate population programmes, the representative of Brazil had been influenced by his delegation's views on the substance of the matter. The Government of India, for its part, was sufficiently confident of its own national interests and the manner in which it expressed them to be fully confident that it had no need, in the last third of the twentieth century, to fear any pressure aimed at making it adopt policies which it did not wish to adopt. The new country programming system now applied by UNDP would ensure that country priorities remained sacrosanct in the distribution of UNDP resources. A similar comment applied to the remarks of the representative of Argentina concerning the link between the development activities undertaken by UNDP and the population activities in which the Fund engaged.

91. Paragraph 5 of the draft resolution referred to reorganization of the administrative machinery of the Fund. If such rearrangements would improve the Fund's operational efficiency and increase the net usable assistance which it delivered, they were to be commended. It would be better for delegations to refrain from commenting on administrative proposals at the present stage; if any of the suggested amendments could improve the text, his delegation was sure that the sponsors would accept them.

92. Mr. KANÉ (Mauritania) said that, for the reasons given by the representative of Argentina, the administration of the Fund should not be entrusted to UNDP, which already had so much to do, but to the Economic and Social Council. He fully agreed with the amendments suggested by the representatives of Brazil and Cuba.

93. Mrs. THORSSON (Sweden) agreed with the Secretary-General that the time had come to establish

an intergovernmental body to govern UNFPA. Since the Administrator of UNDP was already responsible for UNFPA's administration, it would be appropriate for the Governing Council of UNDP to be the Governing Council of UNFPA as well. Naturally that would mean that the Economic and Social Council would receive a report on UNFPA and would have an opportunity to exercise its full responsibility and policy functions in the field of population. The Governing Council's resultant responsibilities should, however, in no way encroach upon its current responsibilities. That view was reflected in paragraph 3 of the draft resolution. Paragraph 4 proposed that the Governing Council should be authorized to apply to UNFPA funding principles similar to those of UNDP. The General Assembly could either decide on UNFPA's funding itself or delegate its authority to the Governing Council. Since the Assembly had neither the time nor the facts at its disposal, the latter alternative seemed preferable. It was essential that the Fund be given the right to abandon the full-funding principle which tied up resources for many years. However, the Council should consider the implications of such a step and examine what action would be needed to give a reasonable guarantee to recipients that their projects would not be left unfinished owing to lack of resources.

94. In reply to those delegations which were wondering why a decision must be taken at the current session, she said that unless UNFPA abandoned full funding as soon as possible, it might be forced to deny certain countries' projects for purely technical, financial reasons. Naturally further steps were necessary to improve the administrative machinery of the Fund and that need was recognized in paragraph 5. It was also natural that the Secretary-General should continue to consider any measures designed to strengthen United Nations population activities that might be suggested in the report of the Review Committee of the Advisory Board of UNFPA in relation to the preparatory work for the 1974 Population Conference and World Population Year. It might be appropriate to submit any suggestion to the Population Commission and the Economic and Social Council for discussion and possible action.

95. Mr. FIGUEROA (Chile) felt that it would have been better to consult the Governing Council before preparing the draft resolution. He suggested that there should be a separate report on UNFPA activities and therefore in paragraph 5 the words "annual reports" should be replaced by the words "annually a report". His delegation supported the amendments proposed by the representatives of Brazil and Cuba.

96. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) suggested that the word "interested" should be inserted before the word "Governments" in paragraph 6 and that the phrase "without prejudice to the agreed level of growth of contributions to UNDP and to developmental assistance in general" should be added at the end of the sentence. He supported the amendments proposed by the representatives of Chile and Cuba.

97. Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America) said that, even if the draft resolution was procedural, it

was nevertheless important. If the funding principles of UNFPA were changed so as to correspond to those of UNDP, it would mean that money already contributed could be used for other projects instead of being tied up for a long period of time, as was currently the case. The Kenyan proposal, if adopted, would harm the programme because it would delay changing the Fund's fiscal practice from full funding to annual funding. Finally, he asked the representative of Brazil not to press his amendment to operative paragraph 6, which would merely hamper efforts to support UNFPA and might have unfortunate results.

98. Mr. NDUNG'U (Kenya) said that by accepting paragraph 2 his delegation was concurring in the longer-term planning and advance commitment of funds referred to in paragraph 10 (f) of the note by the Secretary-General (A/8899). His amendment was merely intended to ensure that any action taken was in accordance with established principles. If action were taken forthwith those principles would be violated and he wondered whether the matter was so urgent as to warrant such a step.

99. Mr. FLEMING (Argentina) suggested that the word "interim" should be inserted in paragraph 2 before the words "governing body". He also suggested that a new paragraph 3 should be inserted to read:

"Requests the Economic and Social Council to consider, at its fifty-fourth session, establishing a Governing Council for the United Nations Fund for Population Activities independent from UNDP and with a membership similar to that of the current membership of the Economic and Social Council and in accordance with General Assembly resolution 2847 (XXVI)."

The following paragraphs would be renumbered accordingly.

100. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines) suggested that the semi-colon after the word "flexibility" in paragraph 3 should be changed to a comma. He felt that there was general agreement on the need for an intergovernmental body for UNFPA.

101. He could see no reason to amend paragraph 2 in the way suggested by Cuba since the draft resolution clearly stated that the Economic and Social Council would have over-all responsibility for the Fund. For the same reason, the Brazilian proposal to amend the same paragraph was unnecessary and unacceptable. The insertion of the words "on an interim basis" after the words "United Nations Fund for Population Activities" in paragraph 2, as proposed by Argentina, was also unacceptable.

102. Both of the Brazilian changes suggested to operative paragraph 3 were redundant. In any case, his delegation could not agree to the deletion of the words "with maximum flexibility" since that would undermine one of the main purposes of the text which was to permit the Fund to operate as expeditiously as possible. He had not yet studied thoroughly the

wording of the new paragraph 3 proposed by Argentina but his first reaction was that it would distort the entire thrust of the draft resolution.

103. Both the Kenyan amendments to paragraph 4 were unacceptable. In that connexion, he had nothing to add to the comments of the representative of Sweden who had given the reasons why authorization was necessary for the Governing Council to be able to apply funding principles similar to those of UNDP to the Fund.

104. The Chilean amendment to paragraph 5 also seemed redundant. The Governing Council reported on various activities besides its own in its annual report to the Economic and Social Council, including the activities of the Capital Development Fund and the United Nations Volunteers programme; the same procedure could be followed in the case of the Fund.

105. In paragraph 6, his delegation could agree to the insertion of the word "interested" before the word "Governments". However, the other Brazilian amendment to the same paragraph was unacceptable for the reasons already given by one of the other sponsors.

106. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the amendments to draft resolution A/C.2/L.1283/Rev.1. He announced that the representative of Guatemala had requested a recorded vote on all the amendments and on the revised draft resolution, including the parts newly revised by the sponsors.

A recorded vote was taken on the Brazilian amendment to operative paragraph 2.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, India, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Indonesia, Iran, Jamaica, Japan, Liberia, Malaysia, Netherlands, Norway, Philippines, Singapore, South Africa, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Burma, Cameroon, Chad, China, Congo, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guyana, Israel, Italy, Malta, Portugal, Togo, Tunisia, Upper Volta.

The amendment was adopted by 64 votes to 24, with 16 abstentions.

A recorded vote was taken on the Cuban amendment to operative paragraph 2.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Spain, Sudan, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Indonesia, Iran, Jamaica, Japan, Khmer Republic, Malaysia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines, South Africa, Sweden, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Bahrain, Burma, Congo, Cyprus, Egypt, Fiji, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Israel, Lesotho, Liberia, Malta, Pakistan, Portugal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Uruguay.

The amendment was adopted by 55 votes to 26, with 22 abstentions.

A recorded vote was taken on the Argentine amendment to operative paragraph 2.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Honduras, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Libyan Arab Republic, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Peru, Poland, Romania, Spain, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, France, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Khmer Republic, Liberia, Malaysia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zambia.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Botswana, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Chad, China, Congo, Cyprus, Dahomey, El Salvador, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malta, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Portugal, Senegal, Singapore, Sudan, Swaziland, Togo,

Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen.

The amendment was rejected by 38 votes to 29, with 35 abstentions.

107. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the new operative paragraph 3 proposed by Argentina.

108. Mrs. THORSSON (Sweden) asked whether it made sense for the Committee to vote on a proposal which was inconsistent with the text of paragraph 2 of the draft resolution.

109. Mr. CABEZAS (Ecuador) pointed out that there was a contradiction in the new paragraph proposed by Argentina since the membership of the Economic and Social Council was currently 27 and had not yet been changed pursuant to General Assembly resolution 2847 (XXVI).

110. Mr. SIBAJENE (Zambia) said that, if paragraph 2 was adopted, the proposed new paragraph 3 would no longer be necessary.

111. The CHAIRMAN said that there did not appear to be any contradiction. Paragraph 2 would empower the Governing Council to take over for the time being, while the paragraph proposed by Argentina would allow the establishment of a separate body to be considered at a later juncture.

112. Mr. FLEMING (Argentina) said that the points raised by the representative of Ecuador could be settled by a request for a separate vote on the words or expressions in question.

113. Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America) requested that a separate vote be taken on paragraph 2 before the vote on the proposed new paragraph 3.

114. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the United States proposal to take a separate vote on paragraph 2 before voting on the Argentine amendment to add a new paragraph 3 in view of the potential conflict between the Argentine proposal and paragraph 2.

The proposal was adopted by 37 votes to 27, with 31 abstentions.

A recorded vote was taken on operative paragraph 2, as orally amended.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Cyprus, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar,

Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Guyana, Honduras, Ivory Coast, Malta, Peru, Philippines, Spain, Upper Volta, Venezuela.

Operative paragraph 2, as orally amended, was adopted by 88 votes to none, with 14 abstentions.

A recorded vote was taken on the Argentine proposal to insert a new paragraph 3.

In favour: Argentina, Botswana, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ethiopia, Guyana, Honduras, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Mali, Mauritania, Peru, Upper Volta.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Denmark, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mongolia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Bahrain, Burundi, Cameroon, Chad, Cuba, Cyprus, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Iraq, Kenya, Malta, Morocco, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sudan, Togo, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

The proposal was rejected by 58 votes to 14, with 28 abstentions.

A recorded vote was taken on the Brazilian amendments to operative paragraph 3.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, India, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru,

Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sudan, Togo, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, France, Indonesia, Iran, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Khmer Republic, Liberia, Malaysia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Philippines, South Africa, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Botswana, Cameroon, Chad, Cyprus, Ghana, Guyana, Israel, Lesotho, Malta, Morocco, Nepal, Turkey, Uganda, Upper Volta, Uruguay.

The amendments were adopted by 55 votes to 29, with 16 abstentions.

A recorded vote was taken on the Kenyan amendments to operative paragraph 4.

In favour: Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Peru, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Sudan, Togo, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Zaire.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Burma, Canada, Denmark, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Khmer Republic, Liberia, Malaysia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Bahrain, Botswana, Cameroon, Chad, Cyprus, Dahomey, France, Greece, Guyana, Iraq, Lesotho, Malta, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Portugal, Qatar, Spain, Swaziland, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

The amendments were rejected by 39 votes to 34, with 29 abstentions.

A recorded vote was taken on the Chilean amendment to operative paragraph 5.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Greece,

Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Spain, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Austria, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, Indonesia, Iran, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Khmer Republic, Malaysia, Netherlands, Norway, Philippines, South Africa, Sweden, Thailand, United States of America.

Abstaining: Belgium, Botswana, Burma, Cameroon, Canada, Cyprus, Ethiopia, France, Ghana, Guyana, India, Israel, Kenya, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malta, Morocco, New Zealand, Pakistan, Portugal, Sierra Leone, Swaziland, Tunisia, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The amendment was adopted by 60 votes to 19, with 25 abstentions.

A recorded vote was taken on the Brazilian amendments to operative paragraph 6.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, India, Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Nepal, Peru, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Burma, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, Khmer Republic, Malaysia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Sweden, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cyprus, El Salvador, France, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Liberia, Malta, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Singapore, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The amendments were adopted by 56 votes to 19, with 27 abstentions.

At the request of the representative of Guatemala, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1283/Rev.1, as a whole as orally revised and amended.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Botswana, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, China, Colombia, Cyprus, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Congo, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Ivory Coast, Mali, Malta, Mongolia, Peru, Poland, Romania, Spain, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist

Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela.

Draft resolution A/C.2/L.1283/Rev.1, as a whole, as orally revised and amended, was adopted by 81 votes to none, with 23 abstentions.

115. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) requested that a representative of the Office of Conference Services should be present at the Committee's next meeting to explain why, although it had met on time throughout the session, the Committee had been left in a position of having had no facilities by day for three full days and of having had to sit until the early hours of the morning. He also requested that a representative of the Office of the Controller and any other units of the Secretariat concerned should be present to answer questions.

116. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he wished to be associated with the protest against the discrimination to which the Committee was being submitted. He wondered whether the time was perhaps ripe to consider transferring the site for economic bodies, including the Second Committee, to Geneva, where normal facilities were always available.

The meeting rose on Thursday, 7 December, at 1.30 a.m.