

known, and it was useless to try to give a distorted picture of them. The Secretary of CMEA had furnished precise information on the assistance given by socialist countries to developing countries, and the latter had repeatedly made known their feelings on that co-operation, as the representative of Egypt had just done. The socialist countries would refrain from responding to the provocations of the Chinese delegation, since that would only retard the consideration and adoption of the Charter.

74. Mr. CHANG Hsien-wu (China), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the slanderous charges made against China by the representative of the USSR helped people to see clearly the ugly features of Soviet social-imperialism. If the Soviet Union were truly willing to help the developing countries, it would quickly stop its deceptive babble and do something real. For example, the Soviet representative might declare publicly at the current meeting that the Soviet Union would cease to be a super-merchant of death, that it would supply free of charge to developing countries all the military aid they needed to resist foreign aggression, that it would not press for repayment of military debts and that all the filthy money gained through selling munitions at high prices would be returned to the owners. He might also say that the USSR would not extend loans at high interest any more, that all of its loans would be interest-free and that if the recipient countries had difficulties in repaying their loans, the repayment would be deferred or even cancelled. He might say that all the tainted money extorted by the USSR through so-called "economic co-operation" and "economic assistance" would be returned to the victims and that the Soviet Union would pledge not to carry out any more political control and economic plunder in the name of foreign aid.

75. Mr. HASHMI (India), speaking on a point of order, said, with all due respect to the representative of China, that if the latter was concerned with the interests of developing countries, he should not delay the work of the Committee. The accusations being made by the representative of China were out of place, and he asked that the exchange of charges should cease immediately.

76. Mr. CHANG Hsien-wu (China) said that his delegation was exercising its right of reply and that no one could prevent it from doing so. His delegation therefore wished to ask the representative of the Soviet Union to state whether he was prepared to take the practical steps which he (Mr. Chang) had just mentioned. He presumed that the representative of the Soviet Union had no such courage. In those circumstances, there seemed to be no sense to the shop-worn theme of "using funds saved from disarmament for assistance to developing countries".

77. The representative of the USSR had insinuated that China was trying to hinder the consideration of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States. On the contrary, it was the Soviet side alone that had triggered the debate. China had always supported the work of preparation of the Charter and would continue to do so. Its position was that the disarmament problem was highly controversial and should not be brought up in the context of consideration of the Charter.

78. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Committee) informed the Committee members, in accordance with the rules of procedure, that the reproduction *in extenso* of the statement made by the representative of Mexico would cost \$225 per page.

The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.

1640th meeting

Thursday, 28 November 1974, at 10.40 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Jihad KARAM (Iraq).

A/C.2/SR.1640

AGENDA ITEM 48

Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States (*continued*) (A/9615, TD/B/AC.12/3, TD/B/AC.12/4 and Corr.1, A/C.2/L.1386 and Corr.1 and 2)

1. Mr. WORKU (Ethiopia) said that his Government had followed the work of the UNCTAD Working Group with keen interest because it was convinced of the importance of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, which would make it possible to define and regulate international economic relations and to establish a new economic order ensuring maximum economic co-operation, security and progress for all nations.

2. With particular reference to chapter II, article 3, of the Charter contained in draft resolution A/C.2/L.1386, his

delegation believed that the need for effective international co-operation should not override the principle of the full sovereignty of States over their natural resources. In that connexion, the Declaration¹ adopted at Stockholm by the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment stipulated that international co-operation to protect the environment should be based on the principle that States had full sovereignty to utilize their natural resources when they deemed it necessary. General Assembly resolution 2995 (XXVII) also clearly recognized the need to maintain a balance between the rights of States over their natural resources and their commitment to international co-operation. The resolution stated that co-operation among States should be based on "good-neighbourliness, without

¹ A/CONF.48/14/Rev.1 and Corr.1 (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.73.II.A.14), chap. I,

this being construed as enabling each State to delay or impede the programmes and projects of exploration, exploitation and development of the natural resources of the States in whose territories such programmes and projects are carried out”.

3. The Declaration adopted at Algiers by the Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries² also stressed the need for co-operating States to retain their full sovereignty over their natural resources. Again, the inalienable right of States over their natural resources was reaffirmed in article 2, paragraph 1, of the draft Charter.

4. The concept of “prior consultations”, as formulated in chapter II, article 3, of the draft Charter, was far from reflecting the principles of the Stockholm and Algiers Declarations and of General Assembly resolution 2995 (XXVII). In the view of his delegation, article 3 of the draft Charter sought to impose certain rules of conduct which went much too far. A decision of the International Law Commission would be needed to solve that problem.

5. It was therefore premature to ask States to co-operate on the basis of a poorly defined system of “prior consultations” which might be construed as a legal obligation; the phrase could be taken to mean that a State could exploit and utilize its natural resources only with the prior consent of all interested parties, which was clearly a contravention of the basic principle of the sovereignty of States over their natural resources.

6. His delegation would therefore have liked article 3 to be replaced by a text taking into account both the principle of the sovereignty of States over their natural resources and the need for effective international co-operation. However, as the sponsors had not seemed willing to accept such an amendment, his delegation was obliged to ask for a separate vote on that article, and it would abstain when it was put to the vote.

7. Mr. BOTERO (Colombia) said that he wished to clarify his country's position on the draft Charter.

8. His Government had repeatedly indicated that it approved the idea of the preparation of a code of economic conduct applicable to all States, as proposed by the President of Mexico at the third session of UNCTAD in 1972. His delegation would therefore vote in favour of the draft resolution under consideration, of which it was in fact a sponsor.

9. Nevertheless, as was its right according to the foot-note on the first page of the draft resolution, his delegation wished to explain its position with regard to article 25 of the draft Charter. In 1971, his delegation had unsuccessfully attempted in the General Assembly to amend resolution 2768 (XXVI) concerning the identification of the least developed among the developing countries. At the third session of UNCTAD, his delegation had succeeded in including in resolution 62 (III)³ paragraph 2, which stressed

that any special measures taken in favour of the least developed among the developing countries should not injure or prejudice the interests of other developing countries.

10. In May 1974, at the sixth special session of the General Assembly, his delegation had again expressed its opposition to the proliferation of groups of developing countries. Since 1971, Colombia had constantly argued its point at meetings of UNCTAD, UNDP, the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly, because it considered that the United Nations should not discriminate in any way when dealing with the development process. His delegation felt that concern should be shown for the developing countries which were not at the lower end of the scale and that a country's level of under-development could not be correctly evaluated solely on the basis of the criteria of population and income. His delegation did support the efforts undertaken by the United Nations to assist countries stricken by natural disasters, but the special United Nations effort in favour of the least developed countries or those stricken by disasters must not prejudice other developing countries. It was in keeping with that consistent attitude that Colombia had sometimes unfortunately had to abstain from voting on certain draft resolutions.

11. His delegation would have more comments to make on other articles, but preferred to do so later in order not to hamper the adoption of the draft Charter, which it would vote in favour of.

12. Mr. NOLASCO (El Salvador) noted that, since the President of Mexico had called for the drafting, as a matter of urgency, of a Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States the gap between developed and developing countries had continued to widen. If that state of affairs persisted, a crisis of unforeseeable consequence was to be feared. He need only recall that, during the First United Nations Development Decade, the share of the increase in gross world product—\$1,100 thousand million—accruing to the group of developing countries, which had 60 per cent of the world's population, had been only 6 per cent, while the share of that increase accruing to the developed countries, with only 40 per cent of the world's population, had amounted to 94 per cent. Moreover, the world economy was now going through a serious crisis whose effects were being felt in many fields and which primarily affected the developing countries.

13. His delegation therefore hoped that the draft Charter would be adopted. It specifically enunciated principles which had already been established and recognized, although for different purposes, in other instruments and resolutions adopted by international bodies. As stated in the preamble, a fundamental purpose of the draft Charter was to codify and develop rules for the establishment of the new international economic order, based on equity, sovereign equality, interdependence, common interest and co-operation among all States, irrespective of their economic and social systems. Of course, the draft Charter did not purport to be a definitive document on that subject. As was also stated in the preamble, it was a first step in the codification and progressive development of the subject, but in his delegation's opinion it was in any event a specific,

² See A/9330 and Corr.1.

³ See *Proceedings of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, Third Session, vol. I, Report and Annexes* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.74.II.D.4), annex I.A.

coherent and harmonious instrument devoid of any generalities and imprecise wording which might reduce its value.

14. He believed that it would be very difficult to achieve a consensus on the draft Charter, and in fact he was not sure that that was desirable, since resolutions adopted by consensus were usually very vaguely worded, being intended precisely to reconcile often opposing points of view and to please everyone, which deprived them of any real value. The archives of the United Nations were full of such compromise documents.

15. He considered it essential for all countries to define their positions clearly so that it might be seen which of them were really willing to do something to eliminate the present inequalities in international economic relations and which were, on the contrary, taking an attitude that prevented the practical application of the principles on which the United Nations was based.

16. Mr. CASTAÑEDA (Mexico) speaking as Chairman of the Group of 40, said that it was extremely urgent to decide how consultations between the different groups would be arranged. As Mr. García Robles had said, the draft submitted was not a final and unalterable text; the sponsors were fully prepared to negotiate and to take into account any suggestions made to them.

17. He believed that the contact group of the Group of 77 might be authorized to approach other groups, if other delegations had no objection.

18. The sponsors of the draft resolution were more or less aware of the thinking of other groups; what they were now awaiting was suggestions on specific points, so that the discussions might offer prospects of a positive outcome. Consequently, the amendments proposed by other groups should relate solely to the text submitted by the Group of 77. One approach would be for the other groups to submit an informal working document indicating the changes they would like made in the text under consideration. In any event, what was important was that the amendments proposed should deal with essential points. Time was too short to cover every aspect of the draft.

19. As so little time remained, he asked the Chairman to do his best to arrange for the Second Committee to meet as often as possible during the following week, if necessary by holding night meetings.

20. Mr. AL-KHUDHAIRY (Iraq), supported by Mr. DOMINGUEZ (Venezuela), endorsed the proposal made by the representative of Mexico.

21. Mr. BENNANI (Morocco) also supported the proposal of the representative of Mexico and appealed to the members of the Group of 77 not to propose any amendments, since they had participated in the drafting. That would enable the Committee to expedite its work.

22. The CHAIRMAN said that he personally had no objection to night meetings, but that arrangement had not hitherto had much success with the members of the Committee. He set noon on Monday, 2 December, as the

deadline for the submission of formal amendments to the draft Charter.

23. Mr. MAES (European Economic Community) said that the Community's interest in questions of international co-operation was sufficiently well known to need no mention. In keeping with its customary spirit of co-operation, EEC had welcomed the idea of a Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, first advanced by the President of Mexico at the third session of UNCTAD, and it was in the same spirit that it had actively participated in the work of drafting the Charter.

24. However, there were many articles in draft resolution A/C.2/L.1386 on which a consensus had not yet been reached; a number of them were of direct concern to the Community, but he would merely cite one as an example. Article 12, paragraph 2, dealing with groupings to which States had transferred or might transfer certain competences with respect to matters that came within the scope of the Charter, specified that the States concerned should ensure, in regard to such matters, that the groupings in which they participated acted in a manner consistent with their responsibilities as members of such groupings and in accordance with the provisions of the Charter. Such a provision was not only contrary to the letter and spirit of the Treaty of Rome but was incompatible with the very existence of any regional grouping to which States might have transferred certain competences. In the case of EEC, there were certain fields in respect of which the Community as such, and not its member States, was competent; in other words, the Community itself was the subject of international rights and duties, and its competence derived directly from the treaties by which it had been set up.

25. The Community and its member States regarded that as a fundamental problem, and also as a matter of capital importance for those who did not want the provisions of the Charter to remain a dead letter. Consequently, the Community's response to the representative of Mexico's appeal to members of the Committee to continue the dialogue could only be positive, since it was clear that a charter not based on a genuine consensus could never be an effective instrument for strengthening international co-operation.

26. Mr. MANSOOR (Afghanistan) said that draft resolution A/C.2/L.1386 embodied a number of issues that were vital for the economic development of developing countries. Two points were of particular interest to his delegation. First, his delegation took note with appreciation of the inclusion of the right of free access to and from the sea by land-locked countries among the fundamentals of international economic relations under chapter I. Though the word "right" itself did not appear, the principle of that right was implicitly recognized.

27. His second remark related to chapter II, article 3, which dealt with the exploitation of natural resources shared by two or more countries. His delegation had stated its position on the subject at the twenty-seventh and twenty-eighth sessions of the General Assembly. It would like to reaffirm that nothing in article 3 could infringe upon the inalienable rights of States with regard to the full and effective utilization of the natural resources within their

national jurisdiction for the economic development and well-being of their own people. Only the external obligations of States could be defined by international conventions, treaties and agreements, within the framework of normal relations existing between them, with full respect for the sovereignty of the States concerned, and on the basis of friendly co-operation and good-neighbourliness. Consequently, nothing could limit the national jurisdiction of States over their natural resources, and nothing could give other States and organizations the right to exercise pressure, or the use of force or the threat of force, in order to interfere in the economic priorities and development or the exploitation, exploration or development of natural resources of other countries. His delegation would vote against article 3, if that article was put to a separate vote, and in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

AGENDA ITEM 12

Report of the Economic and Social Council [chapters II, III (sections A to D), IV, VI (sections A to D and G) and VII (sections 1 to 3)] (continued) (A/9588, A/9592, A/9599, A/9633, A/9648, A/9649, A/9656, A/9699, A/9716 and Corr.1, A/9761, A/9813, A/9855, A/C.2/289, A/C.2/291, A/C.2/L.1342, E/5425 and Corr.1 and Add.1, E/5467, E/5473, E/5499, E/5501, E/5519, E/5585 and Corr.1, E/5587 and Add.1-4, E/C.8/21)

ECONOMIC, FINANCIAL AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO THE GOVERNMENT OF GUINEA-BISSAU (concluded)* (A/C.2/L.1375/REV.1)

ECONOMIC, FINANCIAL AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO THE TERRITORIES STILL UNDER PORTUGUESE DOMINATION (concluded)* (A/C.2/L.1376/REV.1)

28. Mr. HAMID (Sudan), Vice-Chairman, introducing the revised draft resolutions A/C.2/L.1375/Rev.1 and A/C.2/L.1376/Rev.1, said that the questions of economic, financial and technical assistance to Guinea-Bissau and to the Territories still under Portuguese domination had been the subject of consultations, the length of which had been justified by the importance of the subject. The international community had a duty to assist independent Guinea-Bissau and the Territories still under Portuguese domination, to build their economic structures and to promote social progress. The participants in the consultations had agreed to recognize that that was the responsibility of the United Nations system as a whole and of the Member States individually. He noted the understanding and co-operation shown by the Portuguese delegation and said there could be no doubt that the change of régime in Portugal was one of the chief factors that now made it possible for the international community to take positive measures of co-operation with the Government of Guinea-Bissau and the national liberation movements of the other Territories. The new Portuguese Government had undertaken to provide material assistance to those African countries, and had in fact begun to do so. That had been particularly appreciated by the countries of Africa. In addition, the Portuguese delegation had stated its readiness to assume its special responsibilities and to provide various

forms of assistance to Guinea-Bissau and the Front for the Liberation of Mozambique (FRELIMO). In the view of the African countries, such evidence of goodwill was indispensable if old wounds were to heal. Lastly, the Portuguese delegation had given its assurance that it would discharge its obligations under draft resolutions A/C.2/L.1375/Rev.1 and A/C.2/L.1376/Rev.1, which were ready for adoption by consensus.

29. Mr. YAMADA (Japan) said that his delegation had joined the sponsors of draft resolutions A/C.2/L.1375/Rev.1 and A/C.2/L.1376/Rev.1 because the Japanese Government intended to give as soon as possible economic, financial and technical assistance to Guinea-Bissau and to the Territories still under Portuguese domination. His Government was extremely satisfied at the evolution of the Portuguese Government's policy with regard to Guinea-Bissau and the Territories still under its domination.

30. Mr. PATRICIO GOUVEIA (Portugal) thanked the representative of Sudan for his kind words concerning the Portuguese delegation and Government and requested that they should be included in the summary record of the meeting.

31. The CHAIRMAN said that, in the absence of any objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolutions A/C.2/L.1375/Rev.1 and A/C.2/L.1376/Rev.1 without a vote.

The draft resolutions were adopted.

32. Mr. FERNANDES (Guinea-Bissau) said that Guinea-Bissau's long war against Portugal had been succeeded by peace, harmony and friendship. It should be remembered that Guinea-Bissau had been fighting not against the Portuguese people but against their Government. Since Guinea-Bissau had attained independence, there had been close co-operation between the two countries. His delegation hoped moreover that the countries which had helped it during the war would also help it in peacetime to build up its economy, and that peace would now reign in Guinea-Bissau thanks to the vigilance of the international community.

33. Mr. KANDE (Senegal) said that, as a representative of a country which had recognized the new Government in Portugal, he wished to express his satisfaction at the courage and sincerity shown by the Portuguese delegation during the negotiations concerning draft resolutions A/C.2/L.1375/Rev.1 and A/C.2/L.1376/Rev.1. As long as the new Portuguese Government showed a sincere wish to maintain good relations with the African countries, the Senegalese Government would continue to support it.

34. Mr. PATRICIO GOUVEIA (Portugal) said that, in view of the aims of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1376/Rev.1, it was essential that it should be adopted by consensus. For obvious reasons, the subject matter of that draft resolution was of special interest to the Portuguese Government, and it was pleased to see that account had been taken of the political factors affecting decolonization.

35. Except perhaps for Angola, the other Territories still under Portuguese domination were confronted with serious

* Resumed from the 1630th meeting.

economic difficulties, so that when they were introducing the necessary reforms to establish new institutions, they would need a stable economic and financial sector.

36. Mozambique would become independent officially on 25 June 1975. Its economic situation was all the more difficult because, in order to apply sanctions against neighbouring countries, it would have to make sacrifices which it could ill afford at that stage in its history. The Portuguese Government had to face up to heavy current and future responsibilities, due to the commitments made by the previous régime, for example, the Cabora-Bassa dam. The large credits recently granted by the Portuguese Government to Mozambique were indispensable for the economic survival of that country on the eve of its independence.

37. In the other Territories, agreements were being prepared or had already been concluded with the representatives of the population and, in the meantime, their economy must be supported in order that democratic principles should be respected during the decolonization process and in order to avoid the racial instability often caused by economic problems. The efforts made by the Portuguese Government were all the greater because that country had not yet attained the level of a developed country. It was therefore necessary to give as much assistance as possible to the Territories still under Portuguese administration, always in full agreement with the local political movements and on a basis of shared responsibility, especially when the decolonization process had not been completed. Joint programmes could also be worked out with the participation of other countries, the United Nations and other interested bodies.

38. His delegation hoped that the operative part of the two draft resolutions which had been adopted would be fully implemented. It regretted, however, that the sponsors had not thought of mentioning either the need for Portugal to provide special assistance to Guinea-Bissau and the other Territories concerned or the efforts already made and the co-operation which existed between the parties concerned.

39. Mr. NEUFELDT (Federal Republic of Germany) emphasized the importance, from the standpoint of decolonization, of draft resolutions A/C.2/L.1375/Rev.1 and A/C.2/L.1376/Rev.1 which had just been adopted. His delegation was in favour of both draft resolutions but considered that it was unjustifiable to single out the developed countries, as was done in paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1375/Rev.1 and paragraphs 1 and 2 of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1376/Rev.1, and to attribute to them special responsibility with regard to assistance to the Government of Guinea-Bissau and the Territories still under Portuguese domination, especially since the preambular part of both draft resolutions stated that that assistance was the responsibility of the international community as a whole. Some developing countries were even better placed in that respect than the developed countries, and the Government of the Federal Republic did not recognize any special responsibility to former colonial countries. His delegation therefore regretted that the sponsors had not accepted the amendment it had proposed for the insertion of the words "and other countries with the potential to do so" after "in particular the developed countries" in the

paragraphs he had mentioned, in accordance with the wording of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1354/Rev.2.

40. His Government was co-operating with the Governments of Guinea-Bissau and with UNICEF in working out a programme for the refugees of Guinea-Bissau, thus showing its interest in meeting the needs of that country.

41. Mr. MWANGAGUHUNGA (Uganda) welcomed the adoption of the two draft resolutions without a vote. His Government's position on the problem before the Committee was well known and the proposals of the President of Uganda, Mr. Idi Amin, should be taken into account in dealing with such questions.

42. Mr. DIE (Ivory Coast) welcomed the consensus achieved on the two draft resolutions, especially because it was the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Ivory Coast who had proposed on 27 September 1974, at the 2246th plenary meeting of the General Assembly, the establishment of a fund for assistance to Guinea-Bissau. That was an example of the desire for mutual assistance and peace which characterized the President of the Ivory Coast, Mr. Houphouët Boigny. He hoped that the assistance provided to Guinea-Bissau and the Territories still under Portuguese domination would contribute to the peace and development of Africa.

43. Mr. PATTISON (United Kingdom) said that, although his delegation had abstained on General Assembly resolutions 1514 (XV) and had voted against resolutions 2621 (XXV) and 3118 (XXVIII) it had had no difficulty in accepting the two draft resolutions which had just been adopted and welcomed the consensus reached on them. His delegation had noted with satisfaction the statement made by the representative of Sudan who, when introducing the two draft resolutions, had recognized the constructive attitude adopted by the Portuguese delegation. The United Kingdom Government intended to work for the implementation of those draft resolutions in co-operation with the Government of Guinea-Bissau and the provisional Governments of the Territories still under Portuguese administration.

44. Mr. CROS (France) said that his delegation was glad that the two draft resolutions had been adopted without a vote. With regard to draft resolution A/C.2/L.1376/Rev.1, his delegation was glad to note that the State principally concerned had been able to agree to the text. However, his delegation would have preferred there to be no reference, especially in the first preambular paragraph to resolutions which his delegation had not supported. The attitude adopted by his Government was explained by the fact that it was anxious to see that the development of the populations concerned was promoted under the best possible conditions and in full agreement with the Portuguese authorities.

45. Mr. MADDY (Guinea) noted with satisfaction the adoption by consensus of the two draft resolutions. Such a consensus revealed the support the international community was giving to Guinea-Bissau and the Territories still under Portuguese domination. He was convinced that those resolutions would be implemented and that they would enable the peoples concerned to rebuild their countries and

overcome their difficulties. The Government and people of Guinea would continue to help the brother country of Guinea-Bissau in its struggle for development and national reconstruction.

46. Mr. SANDERS (United States of America) welcomed the adoption by consensus of the two draft resolutions and said that he approved of their aims. With regard to draft resolution A/C.2/L.1375/Rev.1, his delegation was looking forward to the day when the Government of Guinea-Bissau would become a member of the international financial institutions mentioned in the text. As to draft resolution A/C.2/L.1376/Rev.1, his delegation considered that its scope would have been increased if reference had been made in paragraphs 1 and 2 to existing governmental arrangements. He endorsed the remarks made by the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany on the role of the developed countries in the application of the resolutions.

47. Mr. CAVAGLIERI (Italy) said that the two draft resolutions which had just been adopted by consensus, to his great satisfaction, were in conformity with the principle of the freedom of peoples which his Government upheld, and he hoped that the assistance called for would prove useful to the peoples concerned.

48. Mr. HACHANI (Tunisia) said that the two draft resolutions which had just been adopted were of great importance not only for the countries directly concerned but also for the whole of Africa and for all countries which valued peace. He laid stress on the unofficial consultations which made it possible to reach a consensus and expressed the hope that some of the explanations of vote did not aim to limit the practical scope of the two draft resolutions, since Guinea-Bissau and the Territories which were still under Portuguese domination needed all possible assistance from the international community in order to overcome their initial difficulties.

49. Mr. FLEMING (Argentina) welcomed the adoption by consensus of draft resolutions A/C.2/L.1375/Rev.1 and A/C.2/L.1376/Rev.1 and said that the Argentine Government's position on the question of the independence of Guinea-Bissau and the Territories still under Portuguese domination was well known. He hoped that the measures envisaged would be implemented as soon as possible, as the situation required.

50. Mr. HALL (Jamaica) said that the adoption by consensus of the two draft resolutions was a further step towards the liberation of Africa and served as an encouragement to all those in that continent who were engaged in the struggle against colonialism and *apartheid*.

51. Mr. ABDENUR (Brazil) welcomed the adoption by consensus of the two draft resolutions, which his delegation had approved from the start without reservations. The Brazilian Government, as the Brazilian Minister for External Relations had stated at the General Assembly on 23 September 1974 (2238th plenary meeting), welcomed the accession to independence of the new Portuguese-speaking Territories. He hoped that the measures envisaged in the two draft resolutions would in fact be implemented.

WORLD POPULATION CONFERENCE (*continued*) (A/9603/Add.1 (part IV), A/C.2/L.1387 and 1388)

RESEARCH INTO THE INTERRELATIONSHIPS AMONG POPULATION, DEVELOPMENT, RE- SOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT (*continued*) (A/C.2/ L.1389)

52. Mrs. GROSSMAN (Dominican Republic) said that she wished firstly to stress how satisfied her delegation had been with the favourable results achieved by the United Nations Fund for Population Activities. It considered that the Fund should continue to work for better understanding of the mutual links between economic, social and demographic factors; such understanding was needed more than ever before. Her delegation also welcomed the World Population Conference held at Bucharest from 19 to 30 August 1974, and supported the World Population Plan of Action which the Conference had adopted and which she considered, as paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1388 affirmed, to be an instrument of the international community for the promotion of economic development, quality of life, human rights and fundamental freedoms. She wished to take the opportunity to thank the Romanian Government for having acted as host to the Conference and for its contribution to the preparations for the Conference, and also the Executive Director of the Fund and his staff for their hard work. The results achieved by the Conference would undoubtedly represent an important contribution to the preparations for the next special session of the General Assembly.

53. Her delegation was grateful to the Fund for the assistance it had provided to the Dominican Republic and wished to stress that it supported the activities of the Fund, and also the increase in the percentage of allocations made for family planning, which it considered to be a priority sector. She welcomed the Fund's contribution to the Dominican Republic's four-year plan and also the incalculable and disinterested assistance which had been offered to her country since 1968 by the New York Population Council in the sphere of family planning. She wished to take the opportunity to pay tribute to the understanding and spirit of co-operation of Mr. Charles Liniger of the New York Population Council.

54. In the Dominican Republic, the National Population and Family Council had been established not only to implement Government population plans but also to co-ordinate official and private efforts in that sphere. The Council collaborated with other bodies, including the Dominican Association for Family Welfare, the National Institute for Sexual Education and the Social Service Office of the Dominican Churches. The National Institute of Sexual Education was a private body where distinguished and devoted specialists worked together to try to promote the idea of sexual education.

55. Her delegation wished to thank the representative of Sweden for her excellent introduction to draft resolution A/C.2/L.1389, of which the Dominican Republic had become a sponsor. She also wished to thank the representative of Malaysia for his presentation of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1388, of which her country was already a sponsor. Her delegation hoped that the two draft resolutions would be unanimously adopted.

56. Mr. FOMIN (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the recent World Population Conference which had been held in Bucharest had shown that the demographic processes in the world were determined by economic and social factors. He also noted that, as a result of the constructive participation of the majority of countries, the work of the Conference had been a success; it would be possible, on the basis of its discussions, to work out approaches which would bring to light the causes of current problems in the sphere of population and to find solutions to those problems, bearing in mind the diversity of demographic conditions in the world.

57. Serious differences of opinion had emerged during consideration of the World Population Plan of Action. The initial draft of the Plan had to some extent exaggerated the problems of population; it had not taken into account the experience acquired in the sphere of demographic processes, and had not clearly explained the factors which determined those processes. During consideration of the draft Plan of Action, his delegation, along with other delegations of socialist countries, had stressed that in order to modify demographic process, it was necessary to make qualitative changes in the standard of living of the population. The Plan of Action was very constructive,

particularly in that it stressed the decisive influence of economic and social factors on demographic processes, on the elaboration and application by States of demographic policies and on the need to improve the status of women. Quantitative aims had been omitted from the Plan. The World Population Conference had shown that deep-seated economic and social changes were the prerequisite for the solution of demographic problems, particularly in the countries where those problems were most serious.

58. He wished to stress the influence that the improvement of the international climate had had on the proceedings of the Conference. Détente was opening up new prospects of fruitful co-operation in all spheres, including the demographic sphere, but it was essential that that co-operation should be based on respect for the sovereignty and equality of States.

59. In conclusion, he stated that the fate of mankind did not depend on physical data on population growth or on reserves of natural resources but on peace and social progress.

The meeting rose at 12.40 p.m.

1641st meeting

Monday, 2 December 1974, at 10.45 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Jihad KARAM (Iraq).

A/C.2/SR.1641

Organization of work

1. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Committee) noted that under item 12 the Committee still had to consider two draft resolutions on the World Population Conference (A/C.2/L.1388 and A/C.2/L.1389), the report of the World Food Conference (E/5587), the draft resolution on the seventh special session of the General Assembly (A/C.2/L.1374), on which substantial and procedural action must be taken at the current session, the draft agreement with the World Intellectual Property Organization (A/C.2/L.1395), concerning which the Committee might wish the Secretariat to prepare a draft decision for adoption and transmission to the plenary Assembly during the current week, and the draft resolutions arising from Economic and Social Council resolution 1622 (LI). Also pending were two draft resolutions on item 46 (A/C.2/L.1368 and A/C.2/L.1382/Rev.1), as well as items 47, 48, 50 and 98.

2. He suggested that the Committee might wish to extend the deadline for the completion of its work until Tuesday, 10 December, which was the last date on which it could meet without disrupting the work of the General Assembly. He further suggested that the consideration of items 46 and 51 should be concluded by 3 December at the latest; that

the deadline for the submission of draft resolutions on quantification of scientific and technological activities related to development (item 50) and on the report of the World Food Conference should be 6 p.m. on 3 December; that the consideration of all draft resolutions under item 12, except those relating to the World Population Conference, and of items 47 and 50 should be concluded on 5 December; that action should be taken on the draft resolutions concerning the World Food Conference on 6 December so that they could be given priority consideration in the Fifth Committee; that consideration of item 12 generally should conclude on 10 December; that the Committee should devote 6 December to consideration of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, the deadline for submission of draft resolutions on that item being extended to 6 p.m. on 3 December; and that action should be taken on 9 December on the proposal submitted by the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Special Programme.

3. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee approved the programme of work suggested by the Secretary.

It was so decided.