

AGENDA ITEM 50

Quantification of scientific and technological activities related to development, including the definition of the quantitative targets contemplated in paragraph 63 of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade (A/9603, chap. IV, sect. K; A/C.2/L.1397)

36. Mr. BRITO (Brazil), introducing draft resolution A/C.2/L.1397 on behalf of the sponsors, to which Colombia should be added, recalled that at its first session the Committee on Science and Technology for Development had recommended a revision of paragraphs 60, 61 and 63 of the International Development Strategy (General Assembly resolution 2626 (XXV)), concerning targets in the field of science, with particular reference to the targets mentioned in paragraph 63 for assistance to developing countries in science and technology and for a percentage share of

research in the developed countries which was of special interest to the developing countries. Since those targets had not been considered for quantification at the time of the first biennial review by the Committee on Review and Appraisal, the purpose of the draft resolution was to request that Committee, through the Economic and Social Council, to take whatever action it deemed appropriate. The operative paragraph should begin: "Requests the Economic and Social Council . . .", so that the text was in fact a draft resolution, and not a draft decision.

37. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Syrian Arab Republic had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1397; he suggested that the draft resolution should be adopted without a vote.

The draft resolution, as orally revised, was adopted.

The meeting rose at 12.05 p.m.

1646th meeting

Thursday, 5 December 1974, at 8.45 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Jihad KARAM (Iraq).

A/C.2/SR.1646

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.2/293, 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)

WORLD POPULATION CONFERENCE (*concluded*)*
(A/C.2/L.1388/REV.2 AND 1392/REV.1)

RESEARCH INTO THE INTERRELATIONSHIPS AMONG POPULATION, DEVELOPMENT, RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT (*concluded*)* (A/C.2/L.1389/REV.1, 1393 AND 1418/REV.1)

1. Mr. SINGH (Malaysia), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1388/Rev.2, said that the revised documents incorporated amendments proposed by a number of delegations. Referring to the amendments proposed in document A/C.2/L.1392/Rev.1 he explained that the sponsors of the amendments had not acted in good faith by including in the document amendments which were still being negotiated under the chairmanship of the Vice-Chairman. He also explained that the sponsors of the revised draft resolution had accepted a number of the amendments proposed in document A/C.2/L.1392, the first, the third, the sixth and the seventh. However, they were unable to accept the rest of the amendments because

they sought to alter the thrust of the draft resolution and also because they were incomplete quotations from the World Population Plan of Action. He pointed out that the representative of Brazil was taking upon himself the task of changing the delicate consensus reached during the World Population Conference at Bucharest, by attempting to tamper with the resolutions adopted there. This was not acceptable to the sponsors of the draft resolution.

2. He also questioned the motives of the representative of Brazil in submitting the fifth amendment, calling for a new paragraph after operative paragraph 3. He explained that on draft resolutions pertaining to UNITAR, technical co-operation among developing countries, IMF, the developing island countries and the World Food Conference and on a number of other draft resolutions, it had been possible to work out a consensus on the reference to the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order. However, the representative of Brazil was not prepared to accept a consensus on the formula of the draft resolution on the World Population Conference. He (Mr. Singh) wondered whether it was the intention of the representative of Brazil to cause a split among the sponsors of the draft resolution, as it was one of the few texts that had been co-sponsored by a large number of developed and developing countries.

3. Mr. BRITO (Brazil) said that it was not surprising that his delegation had presented amendments to the draft resolution, as it had not been invited to participate in its preparation. The mere fact that his delegation and that of Uruguay had revised their amendments showed clearly that they were not being intransigent. They were grateful to the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1388/Rev.2 for in-

* Resumed from the 1642nd meeting.

corporating some of their amendments in that document, but were not prepared to withdraw the remaining amendments contained in document A/C.2/L.1392/Rev.1.

4. He requested that prior to voting on those amendments separately, the Committee should take a vote on the fifth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1388/Rev.2, which was, in effect, one of the amendments proposed in paragraph 1 of document A/C.2/L.1392 with the addition of the words “taking into account universal solidarity in order to improve the quality of life of the peoples of the world”. His delegation accordingly proposed that those words should be deleted.

The proposal was rejected by 51 votes to 31, with 27 abstentions.

5. Mr. MOUSKY (United States of America) proposed that, in order to better reflect the spirit of Bucharest, which, via compromise, had finally enabled the conference to adopt the World Population Plan of Action by consensus, and in order to improve the chances of the Committee likewise being in a position to adopt the draft resolution in question by consensus, the last six words of the fifth amendment submitted by Brazil and Uruguay (A/C.2/L.1392/Rev.1) should be deleted.

6. Mr. BRITO (Brazil) said that the sponsors of the amendments could not accept the subamendment because they believe that the World Population Plan of Action should contribute to the establishment of the new international economic order; that was a point to which they attached great importance.

7. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the second amendment proposed in paragraph 2 of document A/C.2/L.1392/Rev.1.

The amendment was rejected by 58 votes to 25, with 26 abstentions.

8. The CHAIRMAN noted that the third amendment proposed in document A/C.2/L.1392/Rev.1 had been incorporated in the text of the revised draft resolution. He therefore invited the Committee to vote on the fourth amendment (A/C.2/L.1392/Rev.1, para. 4).

The amendment was rejected by 50 votes to 27, with 31 abstentions.

At the request of the representative of Brazil, a recorded vote was taken on the United States oral subamendment to the fifth amendment.

In favour: Belgium, Bolivia, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Israel, Italy, Sierra Leone, United States of America.

Against: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Hungary, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia,

Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Romania, Spain, Sri Lanka, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Burma, Congo, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Finland, Greece, Guinea, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Japan, Lebanon, Malaysia, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Oman, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Senegal, Singapore, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania.

The United States oral subamendment was rejected by 61 votes to 10, with 39 abstentions.

9. Mr. MACRAE (United Kingdom) explained that his delegation had intended to vote affirmatively but in point of fact had abstained; he wished the error to be corrected.

10. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the fifth Brazilian-Uruguayan amendment, which proposed the addition of a new operative paragraph after paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1388/Rev.2.

11. Mr. BREITENSTEIN (Finland) asked whether, in keeping with the wording of the fourth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, the amendment should not refer to “a New International Economic Order” instead of “the New International Economic Order”.

12. Mr. BRITO (Brazil) explained that the allusion in the preamble was to the titles of two resolutions, whereas his amendment referred to the new international economic order as it emerged from those resolutions.

The amendment was adopted by 72 votes to 17, with 21 abstentions.

13. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the eighth amendment proposed in document A/C.2/L.1392/Rev.1.

14. Mr. BRITO (Brazil) pointed out that, with the introduction of the new version of the draft resolution that amendment should read: “Replace in operative paragraph 8 the words ‘as well as . . .’ to the end of the paragraph by the words ‘in a manner to be determined by it’”.

The amendment was adopted by 48 votes to 32, with 29 abstentions.

15. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the ninth Brazilian-Uruguayan amendment calling for the deletion of operative paragraph 11.

The amendment was rejected by 54 votes to 22, with 33 abstentions.

16. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said that some of the sponsors of the draft resolution found some merit in the final Brazilian-Uruguayan amendment (A/C.2/L.1392/Rev.1, para. 10) and believed that, with a few changes, paragraph 12 of the draft resolution in A/C.2/L.1388/Rev.2 could be made generally acceptable. Accordingly, he proposed the following text:

"Urges that assistance to developing countries should be increased in accordance with the goals of the Second United Nations Development Decade and that international assistance in the population field should be expanded, particularly to the United Nations Fund for Population Activities, for the proper implementation of the World Population Plan of Action."

His delegation hoped that that wording was acceptable to all the sponsors and that it would preclude the need to take a vote on the Brazilian-Uruguayan amendment.

17. Mr. BRITO (Brazil) thanked the delegation of Pakistan for its proposal, which admirably covered the point the sponsors of the amendments had been making. They accordingly would withdraw their final amendment.

18. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1388/Rev.2, as a whole, as amended.

19. Mr. MOUSKY (United States of America) announced that his delegation, in spite of its strong support for the results of the World Population Conference, most especially the World Population Plan of Action which had been adopted by consensus in Bucharest, with great reluctance desired to withdraw its sponsorship of the draft resolution because of the just completed affirmative vote by the Committee to add a new operative paragraph 5, the last six words of which his delegation could not accept for reasons well known to the Committee.

20. After a brief discussion in which Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan), Mr. MOUSKY (United States of America), Mr. MWANGAGUHUNGA (Uganda), Mr. MACRAE (United Kingdom) and Mr. HAMID (Sudan) participated, the CHAIRMAN stated that, under rule 128 of the rules of procedure, the representative of the United States was not entitled to interrupt the voting in order to withdraw his delegation's sponsorship of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1388/Rev.2.

The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, and orally revised, was adopted by 108 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

21. Mr. GRANQVIST (Sweden), introducing the revised draft resolution A/C.2/L.1389/Rev.1 on behalf of the sponsors, said that the extensive discussions between the sponsors of the draft resolution and the sponsors of the amendments in documents A/C.2/L.1393 and A/C.2/L.1418/Rev.1 had led to a consensus. The revised version of the draft resolution therefore contained only changes which were likely to be acceptable to all delegations. The sponsors had agreed to make some further changes in order to accommodate the wishes of delegations which had pro-

posed amendments. The title of the draft resolution had been revised to read "Research on the interrelationships between population, resources, environment and development". The fourth preambular paragraph should read: "Conscious of the need to take fully into account the objectives and priorities of the developing countries in order to create the necessary conditions for their development". The rest of paragraph 1 after the words "existing knowledge" should read: "on the relationships between population, resources, environment, and development in order to assist Member States, particularly the developing countries and the organizations of the United Nations system, in their efforts to cope with the complex and multi-dimensional problems related to this field in the context of social and economic development". The words "in the economic field" had been added at the end of paragraph 2. In paragraph 4, the word "already" should be deleted, and in paragraph 5 the words "including UNEP" should be deleted. Finally, in paragraph 7, the phrase "the General Assembly through the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme and" should be deleted.

22. Mr. FLEMING (Argentina) said that his delegation was withdrawing its amendments (A/C.2/L.1418/Rev.1) on the understanding that the draft resolution was to be adopted by consensus.

23. Mr. BRITO (Brazil) thanked the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1389/Rev.1 for taking account of his delegation's suggestions and withdrew the amendments in document A/C.2/L.1393.

The draft resolution, as orally revised, was adopted.

24. Mr. MOUSKY (United States of America) said that his delegation had originally intended to submit an amendment to paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1389/Rev.1 specifying that the programme of integrated studies on the future would be carried out and financed primarily by the UNITAR Commission on the Future; in view of the spirit of consensus, however, it had decided not to do so.

25. The United States, as a country well known to be vitally interested in and supportive of population matters and well pleased with the results of the World Population Conference, was saddened, in the first place, to see that the spirit of Bucharest and of consensus, needlessly, in his country's view, had not been allowed to prevail regarding an important omnibus draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1388/Rev.2); secondly, the United States had difficulty understanding why, if the implementation of a new international economic order was a "matter of principle" with Brazil, the sponsors of the amendments (A/C.2/L.1392/Rev.1) had insisted that language to that effect be incorporated into the operative part of one of the two draft resolutions on population (A/C.2/L.1388/Rev.2) and not into the other (A/C.2/L.1390/Rev.1); thirdly, the United States referred the Committee to the recent remarks made by Senator Percy before the Committee, which set forth in some detail the views of the United States delegation on the World Population Conference, its World Population Plan of Action, and the links between population and food, environment and natural resources.

26. In conclusion, he said his delegation had hoped that the spirit of Bucharest would prevail during the current proceedings and that the delegation of Brazil would not insist on the incorporation of its fifth amendment into the draft resolution on the World Population Conference (A/C.2/L.1388/Rev.2). As that had not been the case, and the Brazilian amendment had been added as a new operative paragraph, his delegation would have preferred to withdraw its sponsorship of the draft resolution.

27. Mr. FLEMING (Argentina) said that his delegation's abstentions on the first two amendments to draft resolution A/C.2/L.1388/Rev.2 had been based on a misunderstanding. It had voted in favour of the other amendments proposed by the delegations of Brazil and Uruguay.

28. Draft resolution A/C.2/L.1389/Rev.1 rightly reflected the international community's concern for the economic development of the developing countries. It was vital that economic factors should be taken into account in any future multidisciplinary research if the international community was to avoid erroneous interpretations that might be detrimental to development. It would be highly regrettable if a failure to take into account the interrelationship between the many variables were to lead to a distortion of the priorities of the developing countries. His delegation also attached importance to the inclusion in the studies of accounts of the methods and assumptions used, so that Governments might see on what the research was based and what it was intended to achieve.

29. Mr. AL-JEEAN (Kuwait) said that his delegation had voted for draft resolution A/C.2/L.1388/Rev.2 as a whole although it did not fully grasp the significance of the words "the supplies and characteristics of natural resources" in the eighth preambular paragraph; however, it understood that there was no intent by the sponsors to violate the principle of a State's sovereignty over its natural resources.

30. Mr. GRANQVIST (Sweden) explained that he had had no difficulty of principle with the wording of the amendment in paragraph 5 of A/C.2/L.1392/Rev.1, but had been unable to vote in favour of it because of his delegation's sponsorship of the draft resolution itself.

31. Mr. YEH Yuan-ke (China) said that his delegation, whose views on the World Population Plan of Action and other subjects in the report of the Economic and Social Council had been stated at the resumed fifty-seventh session of the Council, had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1388/Rev.2.

32. Mr. BARCELO (Mexico) thanked the sponsors of the revised draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1388/Rev.2) for the pains they had taken with the drafting. His delegation's voting on the amendments in document A/C.2/L.1392/Rev.1, and particularly the fifth amendment, had been entirely consistent with his country's views on the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States.

33. Mr. O'RIORDAN (Ireland) said that he had voted in favour of draft resolutions A/C.2/L.1388/Rev.2, as amended, and A/C.2/L.1389/Rev.1 without prejudice to his delegation's reservations with regard to General Assembly

resolution 3202 (S-VI) and without prejudice also to any decision of his Government regarding a contribution to the United Nations Fund for Population Activities.

34. Mr. BRITO (Brazil) said that he had voted in favour of the resolution on the World Population Conference (A/C.2/L.1388/Rev.2) in view of his general satisfaction with the Conference's work. Despite the rejection of some of the amendments sponsored by his delegation, he was gratified that the Committee had adopted the new formulation for paragraph 5. It was evident that the spirit of Bucharest, which had produced the World Population Plan of Action, had served to reconcile the views of the developed and developing countries in the Committee in support of a resolution associating that Plan with implementation of the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order.

35. Mr. VALDES (Bolivia) said that he had voted in favour of all the amendments proposed with the exception of that contained in paragraph 5 of A/C.2/L.1392/Rev.1; he considered it unnecessary to call for the implementation of measures adopted at a world conference, and had thus been unable to support the amendment.

36. Mr. AL-KHUDHAIRY (Iraq) said that although he had voted for draft resolution A/C.2/L.1388/Rev.2, his delegation maintained that it was the sovereign right of every State to formulate and implement its own population policies in the light of its political, economic and social circumstances and in conformity with its development goals and national objectives. His delegation could not accept any form of external interference. The reference to "the supplies and characteristics of natural resources" needed further clarification.

37. He had voted for the Brazilian amendment to paragraph 4 of the draft resolution because he found the reference to national and international progress unclear; it would have been more realistic to refer to international co-operation for development.

38. He thanked the representative of Pakistan for his rephrasing of paragraph 12.

39. Mr. CAKPO (Dahomey) expressed appreciation to the Brazilian delegation for introducing a number of valuable amendments. He agreed in particular that the concept of demographic development should be a part of any development programme. Such programmes should receive international support but should be implemented nationally. It was for that reason that he had favoured the Brazilian proposal to delete the last two lines of the fifth preambular paragraph, since measures to improve the quality of life could take many forms and should be a matter for the State itself. He had also supported the Brazilian proposal to include the words "international co-operation for development" in paragraph 4.

40. He had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole despite those reservations.

41. Mr. NEUFELDT (Federal Republic of Germany) said that he had voted for the deletion of the words "and thus contribute to its implementation" in paragraph 5 of the

amendments proposed by Brazil (A/C.2/L.1392/Rev.1). At the sixth special session his delegation had agreed to the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, but the reservations which it had expressed at that session still stood.

42. Mr. TEMBOURY (Spain) said that he had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1388/Rev.2 as amended. With reference to paragraphs 6 and 12 of the draft resolution, he emphasized that his delegation's position with regard to the United Nations Fund for Population Activities was unchanged.

43. Mr. MUBARAK (Libyan Arab Republic) said that he had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1388/Rev.2 but had reservations with regard to the word "characteristics" in the penultimate preambular paragraph. He had voted in favour of the Brazilian amendments, since they favoured the sovereignty and national interests of the developing countries.

44. Mr. SINGH (Malaysia) said that he had abstained on paragraph 5 of the amendments (A/C.2/L.1392/Rev.1) which linked the World Population Plan of Action and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, not because his delegation had changed its position on the resolutions adopted at the sixth special session, but because it had felt that a consensus on the draft resolution might be achieved. That had not been possible, but it was nevertheless a healthy sign that the draft resolution had been sponsored by so many developed and developing countries. The interest which it had aroused in the Committee showed that population was still a sensitive issue in many countries.

45. It was for the same reason that the wording of the draft resolution differed from that of analogous draft resolutions such as those on UNITAR, monetary reform or the World Food Conference.

46. Mr. GORITZA (Romania) expressed satisfaction at the quasi-unanimous approval of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1388/Rev.2 of which his delegation had been a sponsor. His delegation had voted on the Brazilian amendments in accordance with its position of principle on the matter being voted upon.

47. Mr. KANDE (Senegal) said that he had abstained on paragraph 5 of the proposed amendments (A/C.2/L.1392/Rev.1) because it was difficult for his delegation to subscribe to any provision which might in some way affect the implementation of the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order. He had assumed, in voting on paragraph 8 of the draft resolution, that the intersessional meetings referred to would not be devoted specifically to population questions.

48. Mrs. GBUJAMA (Sierra Leone) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the United States subamendment to paragraph 5 of the amendments (A/C.2/L.1392/Rev.1); however, her delegation's position, as defined at the sixth special session, was unchanged. Her vote for the United States subamendment had been motivated by a desire to ensure the preservation of the paragraph as a

whole; she was nevertheless gratified that the paragraph had been adopted.

49. Mr. ATANGANA (United Republic of Cameroon) said that he had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1388/Rev.2; however, his delegation considered that policies set forth therein were not binding. He assumed that there would be no external interference in connexion with the implementation of the World Population Plan of Action.

MEASURES TO IMPROVE THE ORGANIZATION OF THE WORK OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (A/C.2/289)

50. The CHAIRMAN said, with reference to document A/C.2/289, that he had conducted informal consultations and that it had been agreed that he should propose to the Committee the following draft decision:

"The General Assembly decides that the substance of Economic and Social Council resolution 1622 (LI) and the amendments thereto has been resolved through the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1371."

If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft decision.

The draft decision was adopted.

AGREEMENT WITH THE WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION (A/C.2/L.1395)

51. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Committee) introduced a draft proposal (A/C.2/L.1395), in the form of a draft resolution, which the Secretariat had prepared in response to the Committee's request at its 1641st meeting. The text of the draft proposal followed in all essential respects the texts of similar resolutions adopted by the General Assembly in connexion with previous agreements concluded by the United Nations with specialized agencies.

52. In 1973 the Economic and Social Council had decided that it was desirable that the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) should be brought into relationship with the United Nations in accordance with Articles 57 and 63 of the Charter of the United Nations, and had instructed its Committee on Negotiations with Intergovernmental Agencies to enter into negotiations on an agreement to that end with the Negotiating Committee of WIPO. The text thus formulated had been considered by the Council at the first part of its fifty-seventh session, at which time it had recommended to the General Assembly that it should approve at its twenty-ninth session the text of the draft agreement set out in the annex to Economic and Social Council resolution 1890 (LVII). The draft agreement had thereafter been examined by the Fifth and Sixth Committees and formally transmitted to the Chairman of the Second Committee by the Chairman of the Sixth Committee through the President of the General Assembly.

53. Mr. HEMANS (United Kingdom) pointed out an anomaly in article 3 (b) of the draft agreement: there were in fact no rules of procedure which were "relevant" to the

subject of that paragraph. He therefore proposed that the word "relevant" should be deleted.

54. Mr. BOTERO (Colombia), supported by Mr. CAKPO (Dahomey), Miss GARCIA (Ecuador), Mr. MUBARAK (Libyan Arab Republic), Mr. GALLARDO MORENO (Mexico) and Mr. GARCIA BELAUNDE (Peru), said that delegations had only just received the document and required time to study it and consult their authorities. It would be advisable therefore to defer adoption of the text to a subsequent meeting.

55. Mr. FLEMING (Argentina) said that his delegation considered WIPO to be a matter of considerable importance. Moreover, the United Nations was about to embark on a review of its relationships with the specialized agencies and also on far-reaching reforms of the United Nations system. Other committees of the General Assembly had had an opportunity of considering the proposed agreement with WIPO, but the Second Committee had not. He therefore

suggested that the Committee might proceed to a vote on the draft resolution on the understanding that, any delegations interested in discussing it could do so in the plenary meeting.

56. Mr. HEMANS (United Kingdom) said that if the Committee decided on postponement, it should be made clear that it was the decision which was being postponed, the debate on agenda item 12 having been closed.

57. Mr. GARCIA BELAUNDE (Peru), supported by Mr. GALLARDO MORENO (Mexico) and Mr. KANDE (Senegal), proposed that the Committee's decision on the draft resolution should be postponed.

The proposal was adopted by 49 votes to 29, with 21 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 11.30 p.m.

1647th meeting

Friday, 6 December 1974, at 11 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Jihad KARAM (Iraq).

A/C.2/SR.1647

AGENDA ITEM 48

Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States (*continued*)* (A/9615, TD/B/AC.12/3, TD/BAC.12/4 and Corr.1, A/C.2/L.1386 and Corr.1-6, A/C.2/L.1398-1415 and 1419)

1. Mr. OLIVERI LOPEZ (Argentina) said that, in a world characterized on the one hand by increasing interdependence of States and on the other by continuing resistance to vital structural changes in international economic relations and therefore in domestic affairs, the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States represented a meaningful effort to satisfy the need for a codification of legal principles based on agreements reached and decisions taken in international forums dealing with economic and social problems. It constituted a significant step forward in promoting the new international economic order called for by the General Assembly in its resolution 3202 (S-VI), which would be progressively strengthened as all the members of the international community displayed a renewed political will to achieve the objectives laid down in the Programme of Action.

2. His delegation not only supported all the provisions of the draft Charter as set forth in draft resolution A/C.2/L.1386 and Corr.1-6, but would refrain from exercising its right, as a sponsor, to formulate interpretive declarations. It was particularly gratified by the inclusion in chapter I, among the principles which should govern economic rela-

tions, of the principle of free access to and from the sea by land-locked countries. It attached special importance to article 2 of the draft Charter, which represented a compromise by the developing countries but which contained the essential principles guaranteeing the exercise by States of permanent sovereignty over their natural resources and making foreign investments subject to the domestic law of the host State. For many years the capital-exporting countries had urged the host countries to define "the rules of the game", but now that most of the host countries had done so they were still not satisfied and were demanding that the host countries should accept the duties supposedly established by international law, some of which they themselves had refused to perform.

3. Article 3 stated a universally recognized principle, namely, that economic co-operation between States should be based on a system of information and prior consultations in order to prevent disputes. It should not be interpreted as implying that any State had a right of veto.

4. The right of primary commodity producers to associate and form organizations, stated in article 5, should be promoted as a valid instrument for strengthening their negotiating power. The time had come to establish a reasonable balance between control over natural resources by primary producers and the technological capacity of a small number of developed countries to process those resources. The need to promote the regular flow of goods essential to the balanced development of the world economy at remunerative and equitable prices, stated in article 6, was a concept borrowed from EEC. His delegation

* Resumed from the 1644th meeting.