

1651st meeting

Monday, 9 December 1974, at 3.25 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Jihad KARAM (Iraq).

A/C.2/SR.1651

In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Hamid (Sudan) took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 48

Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States (concluded)

EXPLANATIONS OF VOTE (concluded)

1. Mr. MADDY (Guinea) said that he had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1386 and Corr.6 because the merits of the proposed Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States outweighed its defects. One of its shortcomings was article 32, on which his delegation had abstained. Recognizing the Charter's imperfections, its authors requested the General Assembly in article 34 to carry out systematic and comprehensive consideration of the implementation of the Charter, the progress achieved and any improvements and additions which might become necessary. His delegation was convinced that the seventh special session of the General Assembly would witness the culmination of the effort to establish a new international economic order, one means of achieving which would be the acceptance of the Charter by all States. In conclusion, his delegation expressed its gratitude to the President of Mexico, as the first proponent of the Charter.

2. Mr. SADEK (Egypt) said that the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States was an important measure which would enable the legal foundation to be laid for the new international economic order framed at the sixth special session of the General Assembly. His delegation had hoped that the Charter would be adopted unanimously, but to have postponed the item until the thirtieth session would have jeopardized the momentum for establishing the new international economic order and the desired unanimity would probably not have been achieved, in any event, in view of the attitude of some delegations.

3. His delegation was pleased that the Group of 77 had spared no effort to reach a unanimously approved text for the Charter. As a result of that and the co-operation of all the members of the other groups, with the exception of a very few, the text as it stood was adopted by an overwhelming majority.

4. Mr. MUYA TUMBA (Zaire) said that at its third session the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, seeking to rectify the existing imbalance between countries, had decided to draft a Charter of economic rights and duties of states. The Charter was undoubtedly the sign of a new era, and its approval by the Committee was an undeniable victory. It was to be hoped that the implementation of the Charter would reduce the disparity between developing and developed countries and the inequality in

their trade relations, and help to alleviate the world crisis. His delegation, wishing to restore equilibrium between countries, continents and races, had voted in favour of all the articles of the Charter and of the draft resolution as a whole, and, as a sponsor of the draft resolution, welcomed its adoption.

Mr. Karam (Iraq) resumed the Chair.

5. Mr. GONZALEZ GALVEZ (Mexico) expressed his gratitude for the references which had been made to the President of Mexico. The text of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States contained rules proposed not only by Mexico and the Group of 77, but by all other geographical groups represented in the United Nations. The Charter could have been adopted at the third session of UNCTAD, held at Santiago, Chile, but the Group of 77 had decided to continue working on the text in order to reconcile the interests of all States. It was to be hoped that that would be a lesson to those who spoke of the "tyranny of the majority". Those who were still referring to that question had been the real tyrants for 15 years.

6. Mr. BERLIS (Canada) said that the possibility that the explanations of vote might be repeated in the plenary meeting had been mentioned. A procedure might be established to avoid such repetition, and he pointed out that it had been proposed that the Committee's report should include an annex containing any statements which delegations deemed appropriate.

7. The CHAIRMAN said that consultations were under way concerning the financial implications of such a procedure.

8. Mr. FASLA (Algeria) endorsed the statement by the representative of Mexico concerning the "tyranny of the majority". With regard to the Canadian representative's proposal, he held that delegations desiring to make statements in the plenary meeting should have the right to do so.

9. Mr. HASHMI (India) said that the possibility that delegations wishing to explain their votes in the plenary meeting should be permitted to do so should not be ruled out.

10. The CHAIRMAN said that it was not a question of preventing delegations from speaking in the plenary meeting, but of devising a procedure whereby delegations which did not wish to speak need not do so.

11. Mr. BRITO (Brazil) said that there was no reason why delegations should not make statements in the plenary meeting. Statements of considerable importance, of which only a summary would remain, had been made in the

Committee. Only the fact of speaking at a plenary meeting ensured that the statement would be reproduced in its entirety; accordingly, delegations should not be denied the right to speak in the plenary meeting.

12. Mr. MWANGAGUHUNGA (Uganda) associated himself with the Mexican delegation with regard to the “tyranny of the majority”, and stated that he intended to speak in the plenary meeting.

13. Mr. HEMANS (United Kingdom) said that, in his view, the Canadian representative’s proposal had been misunderstood. It was a question of providing the secretariat with the statements which delegations wished to be reproduced in their entirety so that the Secretariat could circulate them. In effect, it was simply a way to save time for those who did not wish to speak in the plenary meeting.

14. Mr. BERLIS (Canada) confirmed what the representative of the United Kingdom had said; he had had no intention of preventing anyone who wished to do so from speaking in the plenary meeting.

15. Mr. AL-TAJIR (United Arab Emirates) said that his delegation reserved the right to make a statement in the plenary meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 46

United Nations Environment Programme (*concluded*)*
(A/9603, chap. VI, sect. C; A/C.2/292):

- (a) Report of the Governing Council (A/9625, A/C.2/L.1368/Rev.2);
- (b) United Nations Conference-Exposition on Human Settlements: report of the Secretary-General (A/9729);
- (c) Criteria governing multilateral financing of housing and human settlements: report of the Secretary-General (A/9575, A/9790)

16. Mr. OLIVERI LOPEZ (Argentina), introducing the revised draft resolution A/C.2/L.1368/Rev.2, pointed out that the first two preambular paragraphs had been combined to form the first preambular paragraph, and that the sixth preambular paragraph had been amended in order to reflect more accurately the wishes of the sponsors of the draft resolution. In the last preambular paragraph, the words “as well as its co-ordinating functions” had been added at the end of the text.

17. In operative paragraph 1 the words “*con satisfacción*” should be added after the words “*Toma nota*” in the Spanish text. The words “and of its adopted work programme” had been added at the end of that paragraph. In paragraph 2, subparagraphs (a) and (b) had been reworded. In paragraph 3 the words “and continuous consultations” had been inserted between the words “co-operation” and “with” to reflect the idea of continued co-operation. In the Spanish version of paragraph 3 (a), the words “a base” should be replaced by the words “sobre la base”. In paragraph 3 (b), the word “particularly” was inserted between the words “the needs” and “of developing”.

18. Paragraph 4 had been revised in order to give coherence to the activities of the Programme, enhance its effectiveness and direct it more strongly towards the needs of the developing countries. The purpose of the change in subparagraph (a) was to reflect the views of the sponsors more faithfully. In subparagraph (b) a reference had been added to the Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order; in the Spanish version of that subparagraph, the words “*en los sectores temáticos prioritarios del comercio . . .*” should read “*en el sector prioritario del comercio*”. The reference to consultations with WMO had been transferred to subparagraph (e), which was more comprehensive and detailed than subparagraph (d) of the earlier version. Subparagraph (g) referred to the environmental parameters different from pollutants to which the Global Environmental Monitoring System (GEMS) should give equal priority. Subparagraph (i) established a system of consultation with the Governments of developing countries. In paragraph 5, which dealt with co-ordination and co-operation between UNEP and other agencies and organizations of the United Nations system, the article “*las*” should be inserted between the words “*en materia de*” and “*necesidades*” in the fifth line of the Spanish text.

19. Mr. KLEIN (United States of America) proposed an oral amendment to paragraph 4 which called for the replacement of the beginning of that paragraph by the following text: “*Requests the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme to consider requesting the Executive Director in keeping with the goals and objectives of the Programme . . .*”. The object of the amendment was to remedy a grave deficiency in the proposed text. In accordance with General Assembly resolution 2997 (XXVII), the Executive Director was under the authority of the Governing Council, which assigned priorities and supervised the implementation of programmes. It was not a question of limiting the right and obligation of the General Assembly to evaluate the work of UNEP but of observing a hierarchical order, for reasons not only of principle but also of efficiency.

20. His delegation attached the utmost importance to the amendment and requested that it be put to the vote.

21. Mr. FLEMING (Argentina), in reply to the representative of the United States, observed that paragraph 10 of General Assembly resolution 3054 (XXVIII), which was addressed to the Governing Council of UNEP, had had little practical effect. Moreover, the issue which was worrying the representative of the United States was already taken care of by the phrase “in keeping with the goals and objectives of the Programme”; consequently, the United States amendment was unacceptable and his delegation would vote against it.

22. Mr. AL-KHUDHAIRY (Iraq) said that his delegation, which was a sponsor of the draft resolution, could not accept the United States amendment; he assured members of the Committee that the wording of the draft resolution was not designed to lessen the competence of the Governing Council; the latter was under the authority of the General Assembly in any event.

23. Mr. GONZALEZ GALVEZ (Mexico) said that his delegation would vote against the United States amend-

* Resumed from the 1644th meeting.

ment; he was disappointed to find that after a month of negotiations on the wording of paragraph 4 problems still arose.

24. Mr. HEMANS (United Kingdom) asked the sponsors if they could explain how exploitation of natural resources being carried out legally within the territory of a State could possibly constitute a threat to its exercise of permanent sovereignty. The way in which exploitation was conducted within its territories was the sovereign responsibility of a State and the carrying out of that exploitation was rather in exercise of its permanent sovereignty than a threat to it. The wording of the fourth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1368/Rev.2 was in his view either unclear or illogical.

25. Mr. FLEMING (Argentina) said that, as far as the exercise of sovereignty by the developing countries was concerned, a distinction had to be made between the legal aspect and the practical aspect; events in recent months had shown that the developing countries had been faced with the necessity of maintaining specific output rates in order to satisfy certain needs; that had caused some to affirm that the measures adopted by the developing countries to protect their resources were not legitimate. On that issue the sponsors had taken an essentially political approach; the General Assembly could not allow any group of countries to take measures that might be detrimental to the developing countries.

26. Mr. AL-KHUDHAIRY (Iraq) said that, in many cases, exploitation of the natural resources of the developing countries was carried out by transnational corporations on terms that were very disadvantageous to the country in which the resources were; besides, it was very common for those countries not to share in any way in the exploitation of those natural resources, and consequently they could not exercise their sovereignty in that connexion.

27. Mr. DIAW (Mali) said that his delegation would vote against the amendment and that the United States interpretation of paragraph 4 was incorrect.

28. Mr. FRAZÃO (Brazil) pointed out that his delegation supported draft resolution A/C.2/L.1368/Rev.2 and was gratified that particular attention was given to the environmental problems of developing countries. The draft resolution correctly situated the question of the environment within the context of recognition of State sovereignty in the exploitation of natural resources, and all the provisions of the draft resolution had to be interpreted in that context. The right to such exploitation remained unchanged in the case of resources which were not static and flowed through the territory of more than one State.

29. By introducing, in addition to the concept of optimization and with indisputable hierarchical pre-eminence, that of rationality, which presupposes that of economic profitability, the draft resolution opened up new horizons for the study and understanding of the subject and demonstrated that the criteria of optimization could not be construed in an absolute manner, imposing itself on national sovereignty. Besides, by replacing, with realism and objectivity, the idea of prior consultation by an exchange of information, the principles on which the draft resolution

was based were consistent with the system applied by the countries of the River Plate Basin with very satisfactory results.

30. In conclusion, he expressed the hope that the Governing Council would keep in mind Brazil's interest in collaborating fully with it so that future measures in relation to the environment would be consistent with the Charter of the United Nations and respect the interests of developing countries at all times.

31. The Chairman invited the members of the Committee to vote on the oral amendment submitted by the representative of the United States to paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1368/Rev.2, and then on the draft resolution as a whole.

The United States oral amendment was rejected by 65 votes to 6, with 36 abstentions.

The draft resolution was adopted by 111 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

32. Mr. VELLA (Malta) said that he had voted in favour of the draft resolution because his Government attached great importance to the preservation of the environment, particularly the marine environment. In that connexion, his delegation welcomed with particular interest the provisions of paragraph 4 (d), as the role of UNEP in co-ordinating the numerous activities in the marine environment should be encouraged.

33. His Government hoped that agreement would be reached at the intergovernmental meeting to be held in Barcelona in January 1975 on an action plan to fight pollution in the Mediterranean and, perhaps, on the establishment of an anti-pollution centre for the Mediterranean. His Government was prepared to co-operate fully with UNEP in that connexion and to help with the arrangements for the implementation of any decisions adopted in Barcelona; it was also prepared to offer the necessary facilities in Malta.

34. His Government was pursuing a development policy in accordance with sound environmental principles; for that reason, his delegation had noted with particular satisfaction paragraph 4 (i) in which the Executive Director of UNEP was requested to consult the Governments of developing countries about environmental problems on which they might wish to receive training and technical assistance. His Government was greatly interested in those consultations and hoped that the Executive Director of UNEP would send it any communication directed at implementing that provision of the draft resolution.

35. Mr. MORDEN (Canada) said that he regretted that it had not been possible to approve the draft resolution unanimously; however, there had been a sizeable majority. The Executive Director of UNEP had, in his opinion, faithfully performed the task entrusted to him by the General Assembly and the Governing Council.

36. The draft resolution just approved cited a number of resolutions and decisions; some of them his delegation had supported and some it had reservations about. In any case

reservations or interpretations which had been registered at the time of their adoption remained valid unless specifically withdrawn.

37. With regard to the sixth preambular paragraph, his delegation felt that the implementation of that paragraph should be strictly in conformity with the General Assembly and UNEP Governing Council resolutions relating to the obligation to hold consultations between or among the interested parties on the question of shared natural resources. The introductory words of paragraph 4 had been included in response to a suggestion made by his own delegation. The reasons behind the amendment put forward by the United States delegation were understandable; however, the existing text could be implemented with the same results. His delegation had accepted paragraph 4 (g) as a positive response to the sponsors' position that, with respect to the implementation of GEMS, environmental parameters other than pollutants were of particular importance to developing countries and despite the earlier decision to begin the implementation of GEMS with the more easily measurable pollutants. In any event, the question would have to be discussed more thoroughly in the Governing Council. Concerning paragraph 4 (i), his delegation interpreted its provisions to give emphasis to the technical assistance and training factors already contained in the adopted work programme priority areas. In conclusion he said that paragraph 5 reflected the views of his delegation which had been put forward during the general debate.

38. Mr. CHANG Hsien-wu (China) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution but wished to make some comments.

39. First, the draft resolution called for the implementation of the Declaration on the Establishment of a New Economic Order and the related Programme of Action. It should be stressed that the policies of aggression pursued by imperialism were the basic cause of the damage to the natural resources of some developing countries and the worsening environment of certain regions.

40. Secondly, the monitoring system should be put into effect first in the highly industrialized developed countries, which were responsible for the worsening environment. However, in the existing circumstances, in which the necessary monitoring technology was manipulated by the super-Powers, there was reason to doubt that the monitoring process would be carried out rationally. It should also be pointed out that any international agreement or action relating to environmental monitoring had to respect the sovereignty of all countries and should never be used as a pretext to interfere in a country's internal affairs.

41. Thirdly, his delegation could not agree with that part of the resolution concerning the monitoring of radio-nuclides resulting from nuclear tests. China had conducted limited nuclear tests solely for defensive purposes and in order to end the nuclear monopoly of the super-Powers. When those tests were conducted full consideration had been given to the climate, wind direction and other conditions, and effective measures had been taken to prevent contamination. China had always stood for complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear

weapons, and his Government had declared time and again that in no circumstances would China be the first to use such weapons. Nevertheless, indiscriminate opposition to nuclear tests simply benefited the super-Powers to the detriment of the people of all countries.

42. Mr. PETRONE (Italy) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it agreed with the resolution's main thrust, but it had agreed with the amendment proposed by the United States delegation in the belief that it was appropriate for the General Assembly, when issuing guidelines, to address the policy-making organs of its subsidiary bodies rather than the executive heads of those bodies. The contrary practice, if continued, would deprive the policy-making organs of their institutional functions, thus creating confusion without facilitating the rationalization of the methods of work of the United Nations system. In future his delegation might adopt a less favourable attitude towards resolutions phrased in such a manner. His delegation's acceptance of paragraphs 2 (a) and 4 (b) should not be interpreted as a change of position with regard to some parts of the documents adopted at the sixth special session of the General Assembly.

43. Mr. AMIRDZHANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had reservations on the seventh preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. He pointed out that the Russian text of paragraph 2 (a) contained an error.

44. Mr. EKBLOM (Finland) said that his delegation was in favour of the amendment proposed by the United States representative, but had abstained on it because it believed that the present wording of the draft resolution upheld the authority of the Governing Council.

45. Mr. AKSOY (Turkey) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, but had some reservations about its wording and thought that some concepts called for further discussion.

46. Mr. KLEIN (United States of America) said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution for the reasons he had already given when introducing his draft amendment; he reaffirmed his delegation's position on General Assembly resolutions 3201 (S-VI) and 3202 (S-VI).

47. Mr. RUCKTESCHELL (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1368/Rev.2 because it approved of the general targets of environmental policy set forth in that draft. With regard to the special emphasis laid on activities in respect of trade, technology and transfer of technology in paragraph 4 (b), his delegation understood that to refer only to the priorities as established by the Governing Council of UNEP at its second session, which did not include the section on trade in the Programme of Action. The resolution did not, in his delegation's view, authorize the Executive Director of UNEP to reformulate its work programme with regard to those parts of the Programme of Action in respect of which his delegation had reserved its position.

48. Paragraph 3 referred to the permanent sovereignty of States over their natural resources, which his delegation

understood to mean sovereignty within the existing rules of international law.

49. Mr. HEMANS (United Kingdom) said that his abstention on the draft resolution in no way affected his country's support for the activities of UNEP. That abstention had, instead, been motivated by the sponsors' firm rejection of the amendment proposed by the representative of the United States, which, in his (Mr. Hemans') opinion, indicated the correct procedure. His delegation, like many others, considered it necessary to abide by the hierarchical order and not to overlook, in resolutions, any of the competent organs to which the General Assembly should address itself. He hoped that it would be possible to iron out the differences of opinion and that a consensus on the draft resolution would be reached at the plenary meeting.

50. Mr. DIETZE (German Democratic Republic) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it believed that a system of ecological security was conceivable only as part of a general plan to strengthen international security.

51. Mr. CURTIN (Australia) said that he had abstained on the amendment proposed by the representative of the United States on the understanding that the concerns that had given rise to the amendment were in large measure covered by the last ten words of the introductory sentence. His delegation noted the sponsors' explanation that the subparagraphs of paragraph 4 were not intended as a sign of lack of confidence in the Governing Council.

52. Mr. GATES (New Zealand) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the amendment proposed by the United States, but that after the representative of Argentina had explained that the wording of paragraph 4 was in no way intended to belittle or undermine the competence of the Governing Council his delegation had been able to vote for the draft resolution as a whole, on the understanding that it was the Governing Council of UNEP that provided for the activities of the Executive Director and the Programme and that the draft resolution did not affect the separation of powers established by General Assembly resolution 2997 (XXVII).

53. He was, however, disappointed that informal negotiations had failed to produce a consensus on the draft resolution.

54. Mr. FLEMING (Argentina) emphasized the need to strengthen the Governing Council in order to make the Programme more effective. Neither the sixth preambular paragraph nor the operative paragraphs of the draft resolution just adopted would in any way affect decision 18 (II) of the Governing Council of UNEP and other General Assembly resolutions, which had established the system of information and prior consultation with full respect for the exercise of the sovereignty of the States concerned.

AGENDA ITEM 98

Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order (concluded)* (A/9603, chap. IV, sect. A; A/9603/Add.1 (part II), A/9784, A/9787,

* Resumed from the 1643rd meeting.

A/9828, A/C.2/294, A/C.2/L.1417, 1422, 1423 and 1425, E/5555, E/5590)

55. Mr. ÅLGÅRD (Norway) introduced the amendments contained in document A/C.2/L.1423, to draft resolution A/C.2/L.1417 which was before the Committee and in which the text of the draft resolution contained in paragraph 1 of the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Special Programme (E/5590) was reproduced. It was proposed, in the first place, that article III, paragraph 1, should be amended to conform to general United Nations practices; secondly, that a new article, VIII, on the financial regulations to be applied pending the approval of financial regulations to govern the Special Fund, should be added; and thirdly, that a final paragraph relating to the administrative arrangements for the Fund should be added at the end of the draft resolution.

56. He also proposed that the Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that States members of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Special Programme should be elected members of the Board of Governors of the Special Fund.

57. Mr. VELLA (Malta) said that the high priority given to low *per capita* income among the different criteria enumerated in section X(c) of General Assembly resolution 3202 (S-VI) in order to mitigate the difficulties of the countries most seriously affected by economic crisis was totally inadequate and unfair, and in the case of Malta it was a blatant fallacy. Conventional economic statistics tended to hide Malta's structural economic weaknesses. If the *per capita* income figure only was taken into consideration, various economic nuances, variables and unknown factors which profoundly affected the life of his country would be overlooked.

58. The main factor which had prompted the convening of the sixth special session of the General Assembly was undoubtedly that many countries, particularly developing countries, were experiencing difficulties as a result of the upheaval in the prices of raw materials. The Programme of Action adopted at the sixth special session spelled out clearly and unequivocally the havoc that the sharp increase in the prices of their essential imports had wrought in the economies of the developing countries. In the case of Malta, the sharp rise in commodity prices and in energy costs had affected its balance of payments very adversely. That was due to many factors, but the rise in fuel prices was hitting Malta harder than most countries. Malta's case was not unique, and his delegation was therefore most surprised that the Emergency Operation had completely set aside criterion (ii), which related to the "sharp increase in their import costs of essentials relative to export earnings".

59. With regard to the work of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Special Programme at its second session (E/5590), he said that the function of the Special Fund, as provided for in article VI(c) of its proposed statute, which was set out in paragraph 1 of the report, to ensure an equitable distribution of its resources among the countries most seriously affected—a function that his delegation assumed would be vested in the Board of Governors—was extremely important. Taking into account the experience gained in the administration of the Emergency Operation and the

belief that the seven criteria listed in the Programme of Action were not in order of priority but were rather, a set of criteria leading to an optimal assessment of needs, the Governors of the Special Fund might decide not to consider the Programme of Action a simple mechanical formula based on *per capita* income to the exclusion of other important factors. In that connexion, his delegation was encouraged by the last sentence of paragraph 9 of the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, referring to the possibility of adding new countries to the list of the most seriously affected countries,¹ and hoped that the Board of Governors of the Special Fund would find a more equitable way of distributing the Fund's resources.

60. Mr. MANSOOR (Afghanistan) said it was unquestionable that the recent economic crisis had particularly affected the least developed and land-locked countries. Consequently, Afghanistan, a country with an annual *per capita* income of \$80 and a chronic balance-of-payments deficit, had had to resort to emergency measures in order to avoid the total collapse of its economy.

61. As his delegation understood it, according to section X of the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, the least developed and land-locked countries should be automatically included in the list of countries most seriously affected by the economic crisis, and it deplored the fact that Afghanistan, whose Government had already sent all the relevant information, had not yet been included in that list. In that connexion, the volume of imports and exports was not an adequate criterion for determining the economic situation of a country; the results obtained by a country over a specified number of years must also be taken into account.

62. He requested that due consideration should be given to the case of Afghanistan and said that his Government was ready to provide more information to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the United Nations Emergency Operation on receipt of the appropriate letter.

63. The Chairman said that if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee decided to adopt without a vote the amendments (A/C.2/L.1423) submitted by the representative of Norway.

The Norwegian amendments were adopted.

64. Mrs. DERRE (France) said that her delegation felt compelled to reiterate the reservations it had already expressed concerning the statute of the Special Fund; thus far, no one had been able to remove her delegation's doubts about the meaning of participation in investments or how investments would be defined for those purposes. Nor had her delegation been provided with any clarification concerning the problem of the automatic inclusion of land-locked countries in the list of countries most seriously affected by the economic crisis.

65. Lastly, she expressed surprise at the estimated financial implications of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1417, which were contained in the statement submitted by the Secretary-General (A/C.2/L.1422); in that connexion, she believed that the sum of \$565,000 indicated in that

statement was excessive and that, in any case, those costs should be met from the Special Fund, not from the regular budget of the United Nations.

66. Mr. MWANGAGUHUNGA (Uganda) asked why Uganda had not been included in the list of countries most seriously affected by the economic crisis; it should be automatically included, since it was one of the least developed land-locked countries.

67. Mr. ROSTOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had already indicated on other occasions his country's position with respect to the granting of assistance to the countries most seriously affected by the economic crisis; in that connexion, he pointed out that the USSR provided substantial amounts of assistance to developing countries and that it intended to maintain such assistance, taking into account the principles laid down by the General Assembly at its sixth special session.

68. With reference to draft resolution A/C.2/L.1417, his delegation considered it inappropriate to entrust to the Special Fund the task of supervising bilateral assistance, since that would be tantamount to investing it with supranational powers and to interference in the internal affairs of States. His delegation also could not accept a provision for the establishment of relations between the Special Fund and the World Bank, the activities of which had been criticized by the developing countries themselves. On the subject of article II, paragraph 4, of the draft resolution, his delegation wished to reiterate its position that each country was free to make contributions in its own currency.

69. Lastly, his delegation also had reservations about the possibility of the Special Fund's making use of contributions from private sources and about the composition of the Board of Governors.

70. Mr. CHANG Hsien-wu (China) said that his delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1417; it had already expressed on other occasions its views concerning the operation of the Special Fund and would confine itself to reiterating its serious reservations about the provisions of article V, paragraph 3, under which the Special Fund would be able to enter into management contracts with the World Bank.

71. Mr. DIETZE (German Democratic Republic) said that his delegation fully shared the views expressed by the representative of the USSR.

72. Mr. MURANGO (Burundi) expressed his delegation's concern at the fact that Burundi had not been included in the list of countries most seriously affected by the economic crisis. In any case, it regarded as positive the statements made by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, who had reaffirmed the provisional nature of the list; it was therefore to be hoped that a fresh appraisal of the needs of the most seriously affected countries would be made and that the list of those countries would be completed.

73. In conclusion, he expressed the hope that account would in future be taken of all the criteria mentioned in

¹ See A/AC.168/6/Add.1.

resolution 3202 (S-VI) and that the least developed and land-locked countries would be automatically included among the beneficiaries of the Special Fund.

74. Mr. MURIN (Czechoslovakia) also endorsed the views expressed by the USSR and said that his delegation's support of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1417 in no way implied that Czechoslovakia would change its policy of assistance to developing countries. Nor did his country contemplate any change in the specific form in which such assistance was granted, namely, through bilateral agreements and contributions to UNDP.

75. Mr. CZARKOWSKI (Poland) said that his delegation had reservations about draft resolution A/C.2/L.1417, in connexion with both the nature of the voluntary contributions and the information relating to assistance.

76. The CHAIRMAN said that if there was no objection, he would take it that draft resolution A/C.2/L.1417, as amended, was adopted without a vote.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted.

77. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Norwegian delegation had proposed that the Committee should recommend that the General Assembly should, in the first election, appoint as members of the Board of Governors of the Special Fund those States which belonged to the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Special Programme; if there was no objection, he would take it that the proposal of the delegation of Norway was adopted.

It was so decided.

78. Mr. SMIDA (Tunisia) requested further information concerning the composition of the Board of Governors of the Special Fund.

79. The CHAIRMAN suggested that if any delegation wished to express reservations, it should do so in the General Assembly.

80. Mr. ÅLGÅRD (Norway) explained that it was the General Assembly which elected the Board of Governors and that the proposal in the Committee was that the General Assembly should appoint as members of the Board those States belonging to the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Special Programme.

81. Mr. SMIDA (Tunisia) said his understanding was that the election would be only for the current session.

82. Mr. TANK (United States of America) said that he had some misgivings despite the consensus in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1417. His Government's views concerning the Special Programme had not changed; it continued to believe that bilateral aid to the most seriously affected countries would be more desirable. Moreover, it seemed difficult to administer a fund for which no contributions

had been pledged. Lastly, his delegation had reservations about the Norwegian proposal.

83. Mr. WILDER (Canada) said that his delegation felt some concern about the financial implications of the draft resolution adopted and would comment further on that question in the Fifth Committee.

84. Mr. NEUFELDT (Federal Republic of Germany) said that the position of his Government with regard to the Special Fund had been made clear in the discussion on the Special Programme, on 14 October 1974 at the resumed fifty-seventh session of the Economic and Social Council (1923rd meeting). He expressed his delegation's reservations about the proposal made by the representative of Norway and endorsed the views expressed by the French delegation concerning participation in investments. He reserved the position of his delegation on the statement on administrative and financial implications submitted by the Secretary-General (A/C.2/L.1422).

85. Mr. JADEGHI (Iran) said that his delegation had supported the draft resolution but that its views, which were reflected in paragraph 3 of the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, had not changed.

86. Mr. ÅLGÅRD (Norway), in reply to the representative of Tunisia, read out article III (b) of the provisions relating to the operation of the Special Fund, which laid down the term for which the Governors of the Special Fund would be elected.

87. Mr. PETRONE (Italy) said that his delegation endorsed the observations made by the delegation of France concerning paragraphs 6 and 7 of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1417, since it had been determined that the Executive Director of the Special Fund would be assisted by the United Nations Secretariat and would not have to rely on non-Secretariat staff.

88. Mr. CAKPO (Dahomey) said that his delegation had supported the draft resolution and that it hoped that the situation of the least developed countries, including his own, would be taken into account.

89. Mr. MURIN (Czechoslovakia) said that he reserved the right to speak in the plenary meeting on the proposal that the Assembly should elect as members of the Board of Governors of the Special Fund those States which belonged to the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Special Programme.

90. Mr. SEYDOU (Niger) welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution, which he regarded as a fresh sign of the concern of all States at the plight of the developing countries most seriously affected by the crisis, and he hoped that few reservations would be expressed in the Fifth Committee concerning it.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.