



SECOND COMMITTEE
44th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 23 November 1988
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 44th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. NAVAJAS-MOGRO (Bolivia)

CONTENTS

- AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 82: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued)
- (b) TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT (continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 84: OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 86: SPECIAL ECONOMIC AND DISASTER RELIEF ASSISTANCE (continued)
- (b) SPECIAL PROGRAMMES OF ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE (continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 148: CONSERVATION OF CLIMATE AS PART OF THE COMMON HERITAGE OF MANKIND (continued)

*The summary records of the meetings of the Committee are published in the Official Records of the United Nations, General Assembly, Forty-third Session, Supplement No. 1, Part II, and are available in the United Nations Library, New York, and in the United Nations Library, Geneva.

*Correction: A/43/59, paragraph 1, should read: "The Committee is composed of the following members: ..."

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.2/43/SR.44
2 December 1988
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)
(A/C.2/43/L.18* and L.21)

Draft resolution A/C.2/43/L.18* on the Transport and Communications Decade in Africa

1. Mr. FERNANDEZ (Philippines), Vice-Chairman of the Committee, recommended that, in view of the outcome of informal consultations, the Committee should adopt draft resolution A/C.2/43/L.18* by consensus, subject to one amendment. The penultimate line of paragraph 3 should read: "submit a progress report through the Economic and Social Council to the General Assembly ..."
2. Mr. RWAMBUYA (Programme Planning and Budget Division) pointed out that, in paragraph 1 (c) of resolution 1988/67, the Economic and Social Council had recommended that there should be a two-year preparatory period between the end of the first Decade and the launching of the second. Accordingly, 1989 and 1990 should be spent primarily to prepare the programmes for the Decade and to identify projects and project profiles. For that purpose, it was planned to establish a technical co-operation project, to be headed by a project co-ordinator, working with senior experts, consultants and administrative support staff, for a period of two years. The project, whose cost was estimated at approximately \$US 2.5 million, would be financed by UNDP and the African Development Bank (AfDB). There would, therefore, be no programme-budget implications.
3. Draft resolution A/C.2/43/L.18*, as orally amended, was adopted by consensus.
4. Mr. PAPADATOS (Greece), speaking on behalf of the member States of the European Community, pointed out, after the vote, that the Committee also had before it the proposals contained in document A/C.2/43/L.2 on guidelines for international decades. In paragraph 11(b), under the heading "procedures for the proclamation of international decades", it was recommended that steps should be taken to ensure that the expertise and experience acquired during the first Decade were retained and exploited in connection with the second. The Twelve attached particular importance to that recommendation. They hoped, therefore, that the Secretariat would henceforth ensure that the necessary analyses were made and that the conclusions reached were taken into account during planning of the Second Transport and Communications Decade in Africa.

Draft decision A/C.2/43/L.21 on revitalization of the Economic and Social Council

5. Mr. FERNANDEZ (Philippines), Vice-Chairman of the Committee, was pleased to announce that during informal consultations an agreement had been reached on draft decision A/C.2/43/L.21. He was submitting it to the Committee for adoption without a vote.
6. Mr. RWAMBUYA (Programme Planning and Budget Division) said that the cost of the work required to implement Economic and Social Council resolution 1988/77

/...

(Mr. Rwambuya)

should be met from within existing regular budget appropriations, supplemented by extrabudgetary resources. The Council would require three meetings to comply with subparagraphs (k) and (l) of resolution 1988/77, under the heading "Working methods and organization of work", in order to elect its President and Bureau and deal with the draft programme of work prior to the organizational session. The cost of those meetings had not yet been established. If they were held in January, the cost could be absorbed within existing resources and part of it might be offset by savings resulting from the shortening of the organizational session. If draft decision A/C.2/43/L.21 were adopted, no additional resources would be required under the regular budget.

7. Draft decision A/C.2/43/L.21 was adopted by consensus.

8. Mr. ELGHOUAYEL (Tunisia), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, welcomed the adoption by consensus of the draft decision. As far as the Group of 77 was concerned, implementation of the recommendations contained in the draft, and of the decisions to be taken by the Economic and Social Council at its 1989 summer session, would make it possible to lay the foundations for an effective process of reform in the economic and social sectors.

AGENDA ITEM 82: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued)

(b) TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT (continued) (A/C.2/43/L.47, L.52, L.54 and L.66)

Draft resolution A/C.2/43/L.47 on reverse transfer of technology

9. Mr. OTOBO (Nigeria), Vice-Chairman of the Committee, said that an agreement on the draft resolution had been reached during informal consultations. He therefore recommended that the Committee should adopt it by consensus.

10. Draft resolution A/C.2/43/L.47 was adopted by consensus.

Draft resolution A/C.2/43/L.52 on the trade embargo against Nicaragua

11. Mr. OTOBO (Nigeria), Vice-Chairman of the Committee, said that, since it had proved impossible to reach an agreement on the draft resolution during informal consultations, he was submitting it to the Committee for a decision.

12. Mr. CAHILL (United States of America) said that it was unfortunate that the commendable results the Committee had achieved so far should be jeopardized by Nicaragua's insistence on bringing into an economic debate, a political - not to mention, partial and unilateral - draft resolution concerning its trade with the United States. Neither the Charter nor international law prohibited States from protecting their security when determining their bilateral trade relations. He pointed out that, during the current session the United States delegation had not linked other countries' votes on the trade embargo question with its own vote on any other resolution. It had asked in a spirit of conciliation. Because it favoured such a spirit - which was lacking certainly in the case of the draft

(Mr. Cahill, United States)

resolution in question - his delegation hoped that the Committee would not waste any more precious time that could be devoted to other more useful purposes.

13. Mr. BEN MOUSSA (Morocco) said that since he had not yet received instructions from his Government, his delegation would not participate in the vote. None the less, Morocco was opposed in principle to the adoption of any coercive measures against developing countries. His delegation trusted that the new American administration would find a lasting solution to the problem - one that was satisfactory to all - and that that would be the last time the Second Committee would have to consider such a draft resolution.

14. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/43/L.52.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Bahrain, Belgium, Brunei Darussalam, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, El Salvador, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Malta, Nepal, Netherlands, Oman, Portugal, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yemen, Zaire.

15. Draft resolution A/C.2/43/L.52 was adopted by 85 votes to 2, with 38 abstentions.

16. Mr. ASTAFIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking also on behalf of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist

(Mr. Astafiev, USSR)

Republic, said that they had voted for the draft resolution out of the conviction that resorting to economic measures in order to exert political pressure was inadmissible. For the countries in question, that position was a position of principle and it had not changed.

Draft resolutions A/C.2/43/L.54 and A/C.2/43/L.66 on the Second United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries

17. Mr. OTORO (Nigeria), Vice-Chairman of the Committee, said that agreement had been reached on draft resolution A/C.2/43/L.66 in informal consultations. He therefore recommended that the Committee should adopt it by consensus.

18. Draft resolution A/C.2/43/L.66 was adopted by consensus.

19. The CHAIRMAN said that as draft resolution A/C.2/43/L.66 had been adopted, he would take it that the sponsors wished to withdraw draft resolution A/C.2/43/L.54.

20. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 84: OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.2/43/L.43 on the third replenishment of the resources of the International Fund for Agricultural Development

21. Mr. BAGBENI (Zaire), speaking on behalf of the Group of African States, said that following consultations with the other regional groups, particularly the Group of 77, the main gist of draft resolution A/C.2/43/L.43 had been considered in another, much more comprehensive, draft resolution. The sponsors therefore wished to withdraw draft resolution A/C.2/43/L.43.

22. Draft resolution A/C.2/43/L.43 was withdrawn by its sponsors.

AGENDA ITEM 86: SPECIAL ECONOMIC AND DISASTER RELIEF ASSISTANCE (continued)
(A/C.2/43/L.37/Rev.1, L/41/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.2/43/L.37/Rev.1 on an International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction

23. Mr. FERNANDEZ (Philippines), Vice-Chairman of the Committee, said that an agreement had been reached in informal consultations on a revised text. He therefore recommended that the Committee should adopt the revised draft resolution by consensus.

24. The CHAIRMAN said that Czechoslovakia had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.2/43/L.37/Rev.1.

25. Draft resolution A/C.2/43/L.37/Rev.1 was adopted by consensus.

26. Mr. ELGHOUAYEL (Tunisia), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, stressed that the International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction, was an exceptional rallying point, as bore out by the record number of countries which had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/43/L.37/Rev.1. It was to be hoped that the same goodwill would be shown with regard to other resolutions that were still being discussed in informal consultations. He commended all those who had helped bring about the consensus and urged the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation to spare no effort in order to make the United Nations an international centre for the exchange of information and the co-ordination of international efforts in support of the objectives of the Decade.

27. Future meetings of the international ad hoc group of experts for the purpose of ensuring the final preparations for the Decade would be closely watched by the Group of 77. Special attention should be paid to the locust threat. The Group of 77 would also pay attention to the desired composition of the national committees for natural disaster reduction in order to make them effective instruments. Lastly, the Group of 77 was pinning great hopes on the effective implementation of the Decade, the final decade of the century and of the millenium, in order to achieve the greatest good for mankind and for the developing world in particular.

28. Mr. TANIGUCHI (Japan) said that the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/43/L.37/Rev.1 by consensus was most encouraging, and who had made it possible to obtain a consensus should be commended. The very positive attitude of some of the developed countries was also welcome, for co-operation between developed and developing countries was essential in such a vital undertaking. His delegation was convinced that such concerted efforts within the Second Committee would create a favourable climate for revitalizing the Committee's work. His delegation, for its part, would continue to work with the other members of the Committee for the successful implementation of the Decade.

29. Mr. BIHAMIRIZA (Burundi) said that his delegation wished to become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.2/43/L.37/Rev.1.

Draft resolution A/C.2/43/L.41/Rev.1 on an international strategy for the fight against locust and grasshopper infestation, particularly in Africa

30. Mr. FERNANDEZ (Philippines), Vice-Chairman of the Committee, said he had organized informal consultations on the draft resolution and thanked those members who had devoted much time to drawing it up. He recommended that it should be adopted by consensus.

31. Mr. BEN MOUSSA (Morocco) announced that Malta and Thailand had become sponsors of the draft resolution and said that the names of the 12 member countries of the European Community should have been listed individually.

32. Draft resolution A/C.2/43/L.41/Rev.1 was adopted by consensus.

33. Mr. BAGBENI (Zaire), speaking on behalf of the African Group, expressed Africa's satisfaction that the draft resolution had been adopted by consensus. The fact that it had 122 sponsors demonstrated the massive support of the international community and attested to the solidarity of the members of the Group of 77 from whatever region they came. It was also worth noting that China, a traditional ally of the developing world and of Africa, a number of socialist countries and some developed countries had become sponsors. The presence among them of the States members of the European Community was a political message which had been well received by the African Group. Such a "sacred union" showed that the determination of the African countries to avert the locust and grasshopper peril was now well understood. Given the threats it posed to agricultural production and food self-sufficiency, one could understand the deep concern of the developing world, particularly Africa, which was currently the region worst affected. The spectre of widespread famine engendered the fear of cross-border movements of population with their customary aftermath of suffering. The locust and grasshopper peril threatened to wipe out the efforts made by the countries affected and also risked cancelling out the benefits of international assistance. The African Group wanted the resolution to be implemented fully and as a matter of urgency. The strategy just adopted for combating the infestation enhanced the Organization's credibility in a unique way.

(b) SPECIAL PROGRAMMES OF ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE (continued) (A/C.2/43/L.49)

Draft resolution A/C.2/43/L.49 on special assistance to front-line States

34. MR. FERNANDEZ (Philippines), Vice-Chairman of the Committee, said that it had not been possible to reach an agreement on the draft resolution during the informal consultations over which he had presided.

35. MR. KAZEMBE (Zambia) said that the following countries had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Afghanistan, Argentina, Austria, Canada, Cuba, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Mali, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway and Sweden.

36. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/43/L.49.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar,

Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, 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 Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: United States of America.

37. Draft resolution A/C.2/43/L.49 was adopted by 139 votes to none, with one abstention.

38. Mr. MacARTHUR (United States of America) explained that his country had abstained in the vote because it was convinced that no amount of external aid that could realistically be envisaged would be sufficient to protect the front-line States from the negative effects of economic measures taken by or against South Africa. To struggle against apartheid, realistic measures were required. The United States was the main supplier of aid to southern Africa, and in 1987 had paid the front-line States \$277 million, \$50 million of which was for the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference.

39. Mr. KAZEMBE (Zambia) thanked those representatives who had voted for the draft resolution on behalf of the front-line States.

AGENDA ITEM 148: CONSERVATION OF CLIMATE AS PART OF THE COMMON HERITAGE OF MANKIND
(continued) (A/C.2/43/L.17/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.2/43/L.17/Rev.1 on protection of global climate for present and future generations of mankind

40. Mr. FERNANDEZ (Philippines), Vice-Chairman of the Committee, said that the long informal consultations over which he had presided had enabled a consensus to be reached on the draft resolution which he was submitting to the Committee for adoption. He thanked the many representatives who had devoted so much energy to ensuring that the draft resolution should receive general approval.

41. Mr. BORG OLIVIER (Malta) said that by proposing the inclusion of item 148 in the agenda, his Government was inviting the United Nations to recognize the urgent need to protect the global climate against the effects of human activities. Global warming might threaten life on earth unless urgent action were taken. By the middle of the next century, on the basis of current scientific assumptions, the

(Mr. Borg Olivier, Malta)

rise in temperature could have a serious impact on agriculture, water resource management and certain climate-sensitive socio-economic activities. The depletion of the ozone layer was due principally to chlorofluorocarbons. The excessive ultraviolet radiation which resulted could increase the incidence of skin cancers and cataracts, as well as harming plant life and lowering the yield of certain crops. Global action would be in the interest of all mankind. Not enough was known of the phenomena leading to climatic change, and much more fundamental research was needed to increase knowledge of all the elements that affected the delicate ecological balance.

42. The text before the Committee was the product of careful drafting. It set out a cautiously realistic yet useful programme of action which would be elaborated with the assistance of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

43. Mr. BIRCH (United Kingdom) said that in adopting the draft resolution, the Committee would be taking a step of historic significance. The accelerating increase in the greenhouse gases posed a threat to life on the planet. The draft resolution provided a solid foundation for the detailed work which was now being undertaken by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change in association with UNEP and WMO.

44. He thanked the Government of Malta for its initiative, and reiterated his Government's concern about the damage caused to the environment by chlorofluorocarbons. That damage was not limited to the ozone layer, since recent evidence now suggested that chlorofluorocarbons might account for as much as 30 per cent of any greenhouse warming expected by the middle of the twenty-first century. Against that background, an announcement had been made in the British Parliament that the British Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for the Environment would be hosting a major international conference on chlorofluorocarbons and the ozone layer in London in March 1989. That conference, for which the Executive Director of UNEP, Mr. Tolba, had confirmed his full support, should take place at ministerial level.

45. Mr. ERI (Papua New Guinea), speaking on behalf of the seven States Members of the United Nations which were also members of the South Pacific Forum, i.e. Australia, Fiji, New Zealand, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu and his own country, announced that those countries had become sponsors of the draft resolution.

46. The issue of global climate change was of major concern to the countries of the South Pacific region. While much scientific research on many aspects of climate change was still necessary, the international community must give serious attention to that question. The draft resolution showed that that concern was shared by many other States. At the nineteenth meeting of the South Pacific forum, held at Tonga in September 1988, the 15 members of the Forum had expressed their concern about the serious social and economic disruptions that would result from a climatic change in the region. Many island countries were composed of coral atolls which would be submerged by even a modest rise in sea levels. The draft resolution was therefore extremely important to those countries.

47. Mrs. APPLEWHAITE (Jamaica) said her delegation wished to join in sponsoring draft resolution A/C.2/43/L.17/Rev.1.

48. Mr. UTHEIM (Norway) said that his delegation also wished to sponsor the draft text. Conservation of climate and the atmosphere was an extremely important issue for Norway. His delegation was pleased that the Maltese Government had requested its inclusion in the agenda of the forty-third session of the General Assembly and wished to express its appreciation to the Ambassador of Malta for his fruitful efforts. Norway's position had been set out before the General Assembly in plenary meeting. The draft resolution offered a satisfactory programme of work for international organizations for the drafting of a future convention on climate. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change would have a crucial role to play in that regard.

49. Mr. DASGUPTA (India) said that the draft resolution was largely the fruit of the efforts of the Permanent Representative of Malta. It reflected a delicate balance between the various concerns expressed by several delegations during informal consultations. His delegation supported the draft as a whole without reservation and thus wished to be included in the list of sponsors.

50. Mr. VALENILLA (Venezuela) said his delegation wished to express its gratitude to the Government of Malta and especially to that country's Ambassador for having taken the initiative in bringing the issue of protection of climate to the attention of the General Assembly. The draft resolution marked the beginning of an intensive effort aimed at conserving climate. His delegation had actively participated in the drafting process and would continue to co-operate fully in the search for solutions. It was convinced that all measures taken in the future would be consistent with the economic development of developing countries and the protection of their environment.

51. Mr. LABERGE (Canada) said that his delegation was grateful to the Government and Permanent Representative of Malta for their efforts and wished to become a sponsor of the draft resolution. Two decades earlier, Malta had already proposed that the high seas should be declared part of the common heritage of mankind; that initiative had had a major impact on the international community's activities. The draft resolution on protection of global climate was in keeping with that tradition. Concerted political action was now entirely possible, as the main problems had become sufficiently familiar. Several initiatives had been taken in 1988, including the World Conference on the Changing Atmosphere, held at Toronto. The first meeting of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change had recently taken place at Geneva. Several activities were scheduled for 1989 at the global and regional levels. From 20 to 22 February 1989, legal and policy experts would meet at Ottawa to consider the provisions of a framework convention on the protection of the atmosphere, which would lend itself to the subsequent adoption of more specific agreements or protocols. That meeting should promote the further development of international law on the foundation established by case law. The codification of the law of the sea had shown how ideas could be translated into deeds. That precedent ought to be a source of inspiration for Member States.

52. Mr. PINZON (Colombia) associated himself with the remarks of previous speakers concerning the issue raised by Malta. He wished to draw attention to the important contribution made by the Ambassador of the Philippines and the central role played by the Permanent Representative of Malta. Draft resolution A/C.2/43/L.17/Rev.1 was the product of a constructive dialogue on a question of the utmost importance, and his delegation wished to join in sponsoring it.

53. Mr. ANDREEN (Sweden), Ms. WESTPHALEN (Finland), Mr. MELENDEZ (El Salvador) and Mr. FOLLY (Togo) commended the Maltese Government for its initiative and announced that their delegations wished to become sponsors of the draft resolution.

54. Mr. WORONIECKI (Poland) endorsed the remarks made by speakers who had commended the Ambassador of Malta and the Vice-Chairman of the Committee. It was well known that Poland attached great importance to international co-operation in the field of the environment. In 1987, it had been one of the sponsors of the draft resolution on that question. His delegation was therefore happy to join in sponsoring draft resolution A/C.2/43/L.17/Rev.1.

55. Mr. BEN MOUSSA (Morocco) reminded the Committee that his delegation had expressed its unconditional support for the Maltese proposal from the first day, when the debate had begun in the General Assembly. The Maltese Government had also been the originator of the concept of the "common heritage of mankind", which had proved extremely useful in the context of the law of the sea. His delegation was deeply concerned to note that, since the industrial revolution, some 140 billion tons of carbon dioxide had been spewed into the atmosphere, with potentially disastrous consequences for the Earth's temperature and the balance of ecosystems, specifically from global warming and a rise in sea levels. It was only recently that mankind had become aware of the link between man's activities and global warming. In that connection, his delegation wished to commend the United Kingdom for having proposed the convening of an international conference on that subject in 1989. It also took note with satisfaction of the appeal directed in the draft resolution to Member States to consider becoming parties to the international conventions and protocols which dealt with protection of climate or related issues. For all those reasons, his delegation was pleased to join in sponsoring the draft resolution.

56. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/43/L.17/Rev.1.

57. Draft resolution A/C.2/43/L.17/Rev.1 was adopted.

58. Mr. LICHTINGER (Mexico) drew attention to an omission in the Spanish version of the draft text. In paragraph 6, the phrase "de todas las fuentes y causas" should be inserted after the words "mejor comprensión".

59. Mr. CHARLES (United States of America) said his delegation was pleased to have participated in the consensus and wished to thank the Ambassador of Malta for his efforts. The question of climate change was important and would require further study. His country fully supported the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

(Mr. Charles, United States)

It did not believe that the use of the word "utilizing" in paragraph 10 of the draft resolution diminished the Panel's importance. In his delegation's view, the text meant that the Secretary-General of WMO and the Executive Director of UNEP would work together with the Intergovernmental Panel, which was an autonomous intergovernmental body capable of formulating policy.

60. Miss SAAD (Egypt) said that the Intergovernmental Panel had been established by a joint WMO and UNEP decision; it should therefore carry out its activities under the supervision of those two agencies.

The meeting rose at 5.10 p.m.