

# GENERAL ASSEMBLY

FORTIETH SESSION

Official Records\*



SECOND COMMITTEE  
43rd meeting  
held on  
Monday, 25 November 1985  
at 3 p.m.  
New York

## SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 43rd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BIRIDO (Sudan)

later: Mr. BRODODININGRAT (Indonesia)

### CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 84: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued)

(b) REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CHARTER OF ECONOMIC RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF STATES: REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE TO REVIEW THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CHARTER OF ECONOMIC RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF STATES (continued)

(f) ENVIRONMENT (continued)

(g) HUMAN SETTLEMENTS (continued)

(h) INTERNATIONAL YEAR OF SHELTER FOR THE HOMELESS (continued)

(i) EFFECTIVE MOBILIZATION AND INTEGRATION OF WOMEN IN DEVELOPMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 87: SPECIAL ECONOMIC AND DISASTER RELIEF ASSISTANCE: SPECIAL PROGRAMMES OF ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE (continued)

\*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room IX 2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

The meeting was called to order at 3.40 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)  
(A/C.2/40/L.5, L.27, L.28/Rev.1, L.36 and L.47)

AGENDA ITEM 84: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued)  
(A/C.2/40/L.39 and L.65)

- (b) REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CHARTER OF ECONOMIC RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF STATES: REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE TO REVIEW THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CHARTER OF ECONOMIC RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF STATES (continued)  
(A/C.2/40/L.20/Rev.1)
- (f) ENVIRONMENT (continued) (A/C.2/40/L.35 and L.66)
- (g) HUMAN SETTLEMENTS (continued) (A/C.2/40/L.24, L.25 and L.43)
- (h) INTERNATIONAL YEAR OF SHELTER FOR THE HOMELESS (continued) (A/C.2/40/L.29 and L.34)
- (i) EFFECTIVE MOBILIZATION AND INTEGRATION OF WOMEN IN DEVELOPMENT (continued)  
(A/C.2/40/L.23/Rev.1, L.42 and L.71)

1. Mrs. ERIKSSON (Sweden), speaking as one of the Committee's Vice-Chairmen responsible for co-ordinating informal consultations, said that members of the Second Committee had reached consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.5 as well as on draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.27, which, in consequence, had been reissued under the symbol A/C.2/40/L.47. On the other hand, consensus had not been reached on draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.28/Rev.1 relating to international economic security. The informal consultations had led to a consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.36 and on draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.23/Rev.1, which, in consequence, had been reissued under the symbol A/C.2/40/L.71.

2. Mr. BRODODININGRAT (Indonesia), reporting on the results of the informal consultations which he had co-ordinated, said that a consensus had been reached on draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.39, which had been reissued in consequence under the symbol A/C.2/40/L.65. No consensus had been reached on draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.20/Rev.1, in spite of the amendments made. Draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.35 which had been reissued under the symbol A/C.2/40/L.66, on which a consensus had been reached. The same applied to draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.24 and L.25, reissued under the symbol A/C.2/40/L.43 and draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.29, reissued under the symbol A/C.2/40/L.34.

Draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.5

3. Draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.5 was adopted.

4. Mr. BROLSMA (Netherlands) expressed disappointment at the rather limited willingness to consider some amendments to the draft resolution which had been submitted at the Economic and Social Council's summer session. He intended to resubmit those amendments at the next session of the Committee on Natural Resources.

Draft resolutions A/C.2/40/L.27 and L.47

5. The CHAIRMAN announced that Morocco and Tunisia had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.27.

6. Draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.47 was adopted.

7. The CHAIRMAN said that, in view of the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.47 he would take it that draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.27 was withdrawn by its sponsors.

8. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.28/Rev.1

9. Mr. LAVROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that during the informal consultations which had taken place on the draft resolution under consideration, the Soviet delegation had explained in detail that the draft was aimed at creating favourable conditions for the economic development of all countries, particularly the developing ones. Many delegations of developing and Western countries had made specific proposals, almost all of which had been taken into consideration in the preparation of the text issued under the symbol A/C.2/40/L.28/Rev.1. Thus, at the developing countries' suggestion, a reference had been included to Economic and Social Council resolution 1911 (LVII) and, at the request of several Western countries, mention had been made of the role of multilateral organizations. The text of paragraph 3 had been amended, two preambular paragraphs had been deleted, and other changes had also been made. Thus the Soviet Union had done everything it could to prepare the way for a consensus and was willing to accept last-minute amendments submitted by several delegations which would replace the word "collective" by the word "common", delete the words "a system of" in the first line of paragraph 2 and replace the word "security" in the third line of that paragraph by the word "well-being". While recognizing that there were different ways of approaching economic problems his delegation hoped that all countries would show a spirit of co-operation and contribute towards the elaboration of a concept of international economic security which flowed directly from the Charter of the United Nations and whose importance had been emphasized many times.

10. Mr. ORLANDO (United States of America) said that he intended to vote against draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.28/Rev.1 because despite long discussions, it had proved impossible to define the concept of "international economic security" in a satisfactory manner. In order to trace its origins the sponsors of the draft had, in particular, referred the United States delegation to General Assembly resolution 38/188 H which, in fact, clearly showed that the subject was more a matter for the First Committee than for the Second. It should be noted, moreover, that the Final

(Mr. Orlando, United States)

Act of the Helsinki Conference, also referred to, was not binding upon all States Members of the United Nations and, in any case, did not define the concept of "international economic security" so that it could not be the source of the idea that efforts were still being made to define. The Economic and Social Council at its fifty-fourth, fifty-fifth and fifty-seventh sessions had examined a concept entitled "Collective economic security", which had also formed the subject of several reports of the Secretary-General (E/5263, E/5369 and E/5529), which, however, were not - as the sponsors themselves had confirmed - at the origin of the draft resolution now being considered. In 1973, the Soviet Union had opposed the concept of collective economic security as it had been defined, denouncing any attempt to bracket the developed capitalist countries, with the socialist countries which were historically in no way responsible for the economic backwardness of third-world countries (E/C.6/SR.621). The situation had not changed since then, and the only other possible source was document A/C.2/40/L.2, judged so unacceptable that members of the Economic and Social Council had refused to consider it and transmit it to the General Assembly at its fortieth session, agreeing only to recommend that the General Assembly should consider the questions appearing in it. That text was obviously the source of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.28/Rev.1, and that was the reason why the United States would vote against the draft resolution.

11. Mr. ELFORGANI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that the developing countries continued to bear the consequences of the unfair economic relations and restrictive measures and practices which had exacerbated their external debt problem and reduced their development level. Present-day economic problems could not be resolved without genuine co-operation based on the principle of mutual advantage, and the majority of peace-loving countries had officially expressed a desire to create an economic environment based on equity and justice.

12. Mr. SCHULLER (Luxembourg) said that the States members of the European Economic Community would be unable to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.28/Rev.1. They regretted the sponsors' failure to take into account the views of EEC, which would have preferred a resolution based on the concept of international economic co-operation that could have been adopted by consensus. Moreover, the EEC countries wished to stress that the concept of international economic security had never been clearly defined and that the practice of introducing vague and controversial concepts could jeopardize progress in the Committee's work. Lastly, the resources used for the work which the Secretary-General was requested to do in paragraph 3 could be employed more usefully, particularly for the benefit of developing countries.

13. Mr. KAWASHIMA (Japan) said that two important issues had been raised by many delegations, including his own, during the informal consultation, namely, on the one hand, the meaning of the notion of international economic security and the purpose served by using it and, on the other hand, the reason for requesting the Secretary-General to prepare a report on the subject. Despite the last-minute amendments proposed by the Soviet Union, no tangible outcome appeared possible. The reasons advanced in support of the need to adopt the draft resolution were not

(Mr. Kawashima, Japan)

convincing, particularly in view of its political implications. To take a vote on an issue with regard to which no consensus had been reached could in no way contribute towards strengthening the credibility or the role of the Second Committee and of the United Nations. For those reasons, should a vote be taken, Japan would vote against draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.28/Rev.1.

14. Mr. MALIK (India) said that the draft resolution under consideration contained some extremely praiseworthy elements. Consultations should nevertheless continue on the concept of "international economic security". His delegation had previously suggested that decisions on questions of such a nature and of such importance should not be taken by resorting to a vote. It appreciated the efforts made by the USSR and also understood the position of the United States. It considered, however, that it was difficult to accept the argument that the report requested in the draft resolution would constitute an additional burden on a Secretary-General who was already extremely busy. Given the great importance of the subject, in the interests of the concept of international economic security itself and with a view to promoting international economic co-operation, his delegation proposed that an attempt should be made, before putting the draft resolution to a vote, to remove the obstacles to the consensus that it considered desirable.

15. Mr. SHAABAN (Egypt) said that draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.28/Rev.1 referred to a number of basic principles that he supported. The term "international economic security", however, should be more precisely defined in order to make the text clearer and allow delegations to adopt fully informed positions. Egypt had always voted in favour of draft resolutions on questions of such importance but would prefer them to be adopted by consensus.

16. In paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly recognized the need to promote international economic security while, in paragraph 3, the Secretary-General was requested to prepare a report on that concept. It was difficult to see how something could be promoted that had yet to be clearly defined. It would therefore perhaps be preferable to include paragraph 1 in the preamble or to amend paragraph 3 so as to refer to a more precise concept. Given the importance of the question, his delegation would nevertheless vote in favour of the draft resolution if it was put to a vote.

17. Mr. LEE (Canada) said that, although the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.28/Rev.1 had made a number of amendments to their text in order to take account of the observations of other delegations, cogent arguments had been advanced that raised questions as to the substance and timeliness of the text. If the draft resolution was put to a vote, his delegation would vote against it inasmuch as its operative part left a number of unanswered questions and the obscurity of the concept it dealt with made any study virtually impossible.

18. Mr. FAREED (Pakistan) said that his delegation supported the concept of international economic security even though it remained vague. Clarification was necessary as to whether such security was synonymous with economic co-operation for development or was something other than that. If the draft resolution was put to a



(Mr. Fareed, Pakistan)

vote, his delegation would vote in favour but hoped that, in preparing his report, the Secretary-General would, in the first place, pay particular attention to defining the concept of international economic security. His delegation, like others, felt that it would perhaps be preferable for more extensive consultations to be held so that a text might be adopted by consensus.

19. Mr. LAVROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation welcomed the fact that the delegations of Egypt, India, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Pakistan had declared their readiness to support the draft resolution. It should be recalled that the text had been the subject of informal consultations for more than a month and that his delegation had established numerous bilateral contacts with almost all the delegations that now asserted that they could not support it or that they would vote against it. His delegation had frequently indicated that it was prepared to accept any constructive proposal likely to help allay the doubts of certain other delegations. It therefore accepted Egypt's proposal that paragraph 1 should become the last preambular paragraph, "Recognizes" being replaced by "Recognizing". It should be recalled that in preparing his report, the Secretary-General would take account of relevant earlier United Nations studies and of the views of all Governments.

20. His delegation had listened with interest to the proposal of the representative of India that consultations should continue in the hope of reaching consensus. It had, unfortunately, become apparent during the recent informal consultations that all delegations present considered a consensus unlikely. His delegation was not opposed to a consensus and had accepted all the amendments proposed - except for obvious reasons, those seeking to amend the title of the resolution - with the sole object of reaching the widest possible consensus. It seemed, however, that some delegations would still have great difficulty in adopting the draft resolution, regardless of the terms used, if the title remained unchanged. His delegation nevertheless hoped that those delegations that could not support the draft resolution or that would vote against it would still contribute to the preparation of the report requested and would also make known to the international community their contribution to the achievement of the economic security of States.

21. Mr. DIETZE (German Democratic Republic) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution because it regarded it as a constructive element in developing mutually beneficial co-operation between Governments in the economic, trade, scientific, technological, monetary and financial fields. In view of the increased scope of international trade, the development of new forms of intergovernmental co-operation and the growing interdependence between world economic problems, on the one hand, and between States, on the other, questions of economic security acquired a new dimension. The overriding objective was to reduce mistrust and to prepare the ground for the establishment of a climate of mutual understanding favourable to co-operation. It was to be hoped that those delegations that still had difficulty in supporting the draft resolution would nevertheless contribute to the achievement of that goal. The challenge was, at one and the same time, to develop a comprehensive concept of international economic security and to safeguard peace through economic co-operation.

22. Mr. MAQUEIRA (Chile) said that the draft resolution under consideration contained elements that were extremely interesting and positive. It was not, however, by adopting such resolutions that international economic security could be ensured, but only by launching constructive negotiations on concrete points on the Committee's agenda so as to increase co-operation for development by re-establishing a consensus on development that was durable and that made it possible to reconcile the points of view of various regional groups. His delegation was therefore not in favour of the draft resolution.

23. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.28/Rev.1.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Comoros, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Greece, Grenada, Ivory Coast (Côte d'Ivoire), Jamaica, Liberia, Malawi, Papua New Guinea, Rwanda, Samoa, Senegal, Swaziland, Sweden, Turkey, Uganda, Zaire.

24. Draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.28/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted by 85 votes to 19, with 25 abstentions.

25. Mr. BROTDININGRAT (Indonesia) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution and wished that it could have been adopted by consensus. He wished to stress the provisions of the draft resolution that implicitly acknowledged that the promotion of just and mutually beneficial international economic relations and the establishment of a new international economic order

(Mr. Brotodiningrat, Indonesia)

would automatically contribute to international economic security. In preparing his report, the Secretary-General should take account of all the concepts defined in previous resolutions. It must be hoped that the concept of international economic security to be elaborated in implementation of the draft resolution would strengthen rather than complicate the North-South dialogue.

26. Mr. MAIIK (India) said he regretted that the draft resolution had had to be put to a vote. His delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it contained some extremely interesting elements but would have done so with greater enthusiasm had it considered it likely to promote economic co-operation. It regretted that it had not been possible to hold further consultations and that political considerations had been allowed to intrude into areas of crucial importance for the welfare of mankind. It nevertheless hoped that the report to be prepared by the Secretary-General would at least provide a better opportunity for consensus to be reached on the concept of international economic security.

27. Mr. DE LA TORRE (Argentina) said that his delegation would have preferred it if the draft resolution could have been adopted by consensus. It had nevertheless voted in favour of it since the report requested of the Secretary-General should provide an opportunity to clarify the scope of the concept of international economic security in such a way that the goal laid down in the last preambular paragraph could be attained. It hoped that the report would help create the required consensus.

28. Mr. NÁTHON (Hungary) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution and associated itself with its aims and contents. It was convinced of the urgent need to promote international stability and security aimed at promoting the economic and social development of all countries and particularly the developing countries which were most adversely affected by the inequities of international economic relations.

29. His delegation had often stressed that the subordination of economic relations to political and other purposes raised new obstacles to efforts for the implementation of the United Nations Charter and the international instruments mentioned in the first preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. Growing protectionism in international trade, discriminatory restrictions and measures of embargo for economic and political reasons posed serious problems in international economic relations and violated the generally accepted norms. His delegation was convinced that the implementation of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.28/Rev.1 would be a substantial step towards the establishment of the new international economic order on the basis of respect for national independence and sovereignty, non-interference in internal affairs, complete equality and mutual advantage, respect for national interests and the right to self-determination, non-discrimination and most-favoured-nation treatment.

30. Ms. FANG Ping (China) said that her delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution. China supported all proposals aimed at ensuring fair and equitable economic relations, promoting the economic and social development of the



(Ms. Fang Ping, China)

developing countries and establishing a new international economic order. The draft resolution mentioned some of those goals, but its content was too vague and gave rise to political controversies among certain groups of States. The Committee should focus its efforts more on the consideration of solutions to urgent and important issues in the economic field, particularly those of special interest to the developing countries.

31. Mr. OLSSON (Sweden) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote since it questioned the need for a resolution of that kind. It also questioned the logic of a draft resolution in which the General Assembly would recognize the need for a concept that the Secretary-General would endeavour to define more precisely. The task entrusted to the Secretary-General was not easy, since the very vague concept mentioned in the draft resolution did not provide him with a clear framework.

32. Mr. HUHTANIEMI (Finland) said that the position of principal of his delegation was that draft resolutions on important aspects of international economic co-operation should be prepared and formulated in such a manner as to receive wide support and be susceptible of being adopted by consensus. In the particular case of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.28/Rev.1, consultations had not had that result and his delegation had therefore deemed it appropriate to abstain. It would continue to believe that the concept of international economic security should be more clearly defined before means of promoting its implementation were sought. It wished to stress that, in a draft resolution of the kind, greater attention should be paid to the existing multilateral framework and existing multilateral arrangements, which were of crucial importance for the stability of a significant proportion of trade and other international economic transactions.

33. Mr. DE ROJAS (Venezuela) said that his delegation supported the concept mentioned in the draft resolution but had not participated in the vote because it considered that more thorough consultations should have taken place with a view to making the text clearer and seeking to obtain the widest possible consensus. It nevertheless wished to state that it supported all initiatives for dialogue, international co-operation and the establishment of a new international economic order.

34. Mr. KOLEV (Bulgaria) said that he considered the draft resolution just adopted one of the most important documents before the Committee at the current session. His delegation had voted in favour of a draft resolution fully in keeping with the efforts of the international community for a democratic and equitable restructuring of international economic relations and with the goals laid down in the basic United Nations documents in the field. The question of international economic security had become particularly important given the complexity of the current international economic situation. International peace and security and co-operation between States were essential for a solution to current problems, particularly in the socio-economic field. For that reason, his delegation enthusiastically supported those provisions of the draft resolution that established a close link between international economic security and the economic and social progress of all countries, particularly developing countries.

35. Miss MBETTE MBONGUE (Cameroon) said that her delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.28/Rev.1, but would have preferred it to have been adopted by consensus. Believing in the triad "disarmament, security and development", it believed that the draft resolution would promote the economic development of the developing countries. The report requested in paragraph 3 should contribute to a better understanding of the concept of international economic security, which could and should play a significant role in the establishment of the new international economic order.

36. Mr. DOLJINTSEREN (Mongolia) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it involved a very important issue. The need to define the concept of international economic security had been stressed in a number of United Nations resolutions. A more thorough study of the concept would certainly be very useful for the developing countries, given their special economic vulnerability.

37. Mr. JURASZ (Poland) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution. Its timing, a few days after the Geneva summit meeting, had been most opportune, and it reflected an initiative that had Poland's full approval and that had already led it to advocate confidence-building in international economic relations. In a world of economic uncertainty and serious debt problems, the desire to base international economic relations on confidence and security had become almost universal. Lack of economic security was dangerous both for individuals and the entire international community. In general, the measures required should include: (a) acceptance of the universally recognized norm of international law that pacta sunt servanda, which should, in the case under consideration, be pacta economica sunt servanda; (b) improving mechanisms for consultation in order to avoid economic conflicts arising out of economic or political reasons; (c) promoting more advanced forms of economic co-operation in all fields; (d) agreement on more ambitious development projects within the framework of multilateral co-operation; and (e) limiting the application of restrictions and sanctions only to those cases envisaged in the United Nations Charter. His delegation hoped that the draft resolution would gradually be accepted by all States.

38. Mr. LUDUNGE (Zaire) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote because it considered in principle that a decision of such importance should have been taken by consensus. Moreover, some parts of the text could have been included in other draft resolutions submitted in the Committee.

39. Mr. TUAN (Liberia) said that his delegation had reluctantly abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.28/Rev.1. A decision of that kind should have been adopted by consensus in order to avoid politicizing the issue of international economic co-operation in the interests of all countries, developed or developing. His delegation hoped that the draft resolution's sponsors would in future bear that imperative in mind, and was confident that the report of the Secretary-General would define an approach reflecting the concerns of all parties.

Draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.36

40. The CHAIRMAN announced that Benin, the Comoros and Rwanda had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution, entitled "Co-operation between the United Nations and the Agency for Cultural and Technical Co-operation".

41. Draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.36 was adopted.

Draft resolutions A/C.2/40/L.39 and L.65

42. Draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.65 was adopted.

43. The CHAIRMAN said that, in view of the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.65, he took it that draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.39 was withdrawn by the sponsor.

44. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.20/Rev.1

45. Mr. HACKETT (Department of International Economic and Social Affairs) said that if the draft resolution were adopted, the Secretary-General would entrust the Department of International Economic and Social Affairs with the preparation of the report requested in operative paragraph 3 and would provide the necessary resources in the draft programme budget for 1988-1989.

46. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.20/Rev.1.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast (Côte d'Ivoire), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, 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 Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Grenada, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

47. Draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.20/Rev.1 was adopted by 122 votes to 1, with 19 abstentions.

48. Mr. ORLANDO (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote after the vote, recalled his Government's position as set out in a note addressed to the Secretary-General (A/40/203). The United States had rejected several provisions of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States and had voted against the Charter as a whole. Accordingly, it did not envisage any steps towards the Charter's implementation. Moreover, the United States had voted against General Assembly resolution 39/163 establishing the Ad Hoc Committee of the Whole to Review the Implementation of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States and had not taken part in that Committee's work. His delegation's vote against draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.20/Rev.1 should be seen in that context.

49. Mr. MARTIN (Luxembourg), speaking on behalf of the European Economic Community, said that the EEC member countries had abstained in order to show the importance they attached to a compromise approach. The attitude which many countries, particularly those belonging to the Group of 77, had taken in the Committee, reflected the same concern. On the substance of the matter, the European Economic Community reaffirmed its previous position.

50. Mr. ZOLLER (Australia) said his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution in order to show its attachment to the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States. That being said, the reservations it had expressed on the occasion of the Charter's adoption still applied. Moreover, while the General Assembly was entitled to review the Charter's implementation, the use of a special procedure was not to be recommended, as it entailed very high costs and did not offer any obvious advantages. The Organization's resources could be used more judiciously.

51. Mr. STORFA (Austria) said his delegation had abstained because it maintained the reservations it had already expressed regarding connection with the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States and doubted the usefulness of a process of review of its implementation. The results of the work of the Ad Hoc Committee of the Whole would seem to confirm that view. It was therefore inappropriate to assign any further mandate to the Secretary-General in connection with that issue.

52. Mr. SADCHIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the delegations of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics had voted in favour of the draft resolution. The process of reviewing the implementation of the Charter of Economic

(Mr. Sadchikov, USSR)

Rights and Duties of States had demonstrated that instrument's continuing validity and had confirmed the need to democratize international economic relations and to promote mutually advantageous economic co-operation among all States, irrespective of their socio-economic system. There was increasingly wide recognition that the Charter constituted, as it were, a code of conduct in the economic field. Moreover, the negative attitude a number of capitalist countries had taken towards it gave rise to growing concern. Acting in compliance with General Assembly resolution 39/163, the socialist countries had chosen to take a constructive approach at the session of the Ad Hoc Committee of the Whole, and had supported the draft conclusions submitted by the Group of 77 (A/AC.226/L.1). In draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.20/Rev.1, the international community was urged to implement the Charter's provisions. A more explicit appeal might perhaps have been addressed to the States which were not doing so. The delegations of the socialist countries reiterated their general position regarding the implementation of the Charter, as stated, in particular, in document A/40/334.

53. Mr. Brotodiningrat (Indonesia) took the Chair.

54. Mr. LAZAREVIĆ (Yugoslavia), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, thanked the delegations which had voted in favour of resolution A/C.2/40/L.20/Rev.1. The resolution, like the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, was of undeniable importance to developing countries in their efforts to restructure international economic relations and establish a new economic order. The Group of 77 hoped that the General Assembly and the Second Committee would achieve more positive results on the occasion of the next review of the Charter's implementation.

Draft resolutions A/C.2/40/L.35 and L.66

55. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Comoros and the Netherlands had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.35.

56. Draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.66 was adopted.

57. The CHAIRMAN said that in view of the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.66, he took it that draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.35 was withdrawn by the sponsors.

58. It was so decided.

Draft resolutions A/C.2/40/L.24, L.25 and L.43

59. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Gambia and Panama had joined the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.24 and that the Gambia had also become a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.25.

60. Draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.43 was adopted.



61. Mr. DIMITRIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, in his opinion, the decision to declare a "World HABITAT Day" in paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.43 was unjustified. Practice had shown that such measures often turned into expensive official ceremonies which diverted limited resources away from the principal activities assigned to the organs of the United Nations. In that connection, he wished to reiterate the need to respect the criteria for the celebration of international days, years and anniversaries set forth in resolution 1980/67 of the Economic and Social Council, particularly those which stated that the preparation for and celebration of such occasions should not entail expenditures in excess of those available from existing resources in the regular budget of the United Nations and that the financing of those occasions should be based on voluntary contributions.

62. Mr. Birido (Sudan) resumed the Chair.

63. Mr. PAULSEN (Norway), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries, said that they had joined in the consensus on the draft resolution just adopted, but wished to express their concerns with regard to paragraph 6. Nearly 30 days in the year were already given over to celebrating a number of causes, all of them praiseworthy, and a dozen different international weeks, years and decades had been proclaimed. In the opinion of the Nordic countries, it would be advisable to avoid multiplying the number of such celebrations in the future, in view of the risk that such a practice might run counter to the desired goal.

64. Mr. WILLIS (United Kingdom) said that his delegation was concerned by the proliferation of special days to promote one aspect or another of United Nations activities, but had joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.43, on the understanding that participation in the celebration in question would be voluntary and that the Secretary-General would be responsible for all expenses connected with the celebration of World HABITAT Day.

65. Mr. MALIK (India), referring to the operative paragraph of part C of the draft resolution just adopted, stressed that he attached very great importance to the effective participation of the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat) in the work of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination and its subsidiary machinery in order to ensure the required co-ordination between the various organs and organizations of the United Nations system.

66. Mr. LEE (Canada) associated himself with the comments made by the representative of Norway on behalf of the Nordic countries.

67. Mr. ARIYARATNE (Sri Lanka) said that he shared the opinion expressed by the representative of India on the subject of the operative paragraph of part C of the draft resolution under consideration.

68. The CHAIRMAN said that, in view of the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.43, he took it that draft resolutions A/C.2/40/L.24 and L.25 were withdrawn by the sponsors.

69. It was so decided.

Draft resolutions A/C.2/40/L.29 and L.34

70. The CHAIRMAN announced that Rwanda and Uganda had joined the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.29.

71. Mr. LEE (Canada) said that his delegation was joining the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.34, as it had promised to do once the points of detail relating to "biennialization" it had raised in the course of the informal consultations had been settled.

72. Draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.34 was adopted.

73. Mr. DIMITRIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had not opposed the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.34 on condition that the criteria set forth in Economic and Social Council resolution 1980/67 were respected in its implementation. That meant that the programme of the International Year of Shelter for the Homeless should be financed from voluntary contributions, that the Commission on Human Settlements should consider questions relating to the celebration of the Year within the limits of the resources allocated to it and that the participation of the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat) in preparations for and celebration of the Year should not entail expenditures in excess of those available from existing resources in the regular budget of the United Nations.

74. Mr. MARCHICHE (Morocco) said that his country was joining the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.34.

75. The CHAIRMAN said that in view of the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.34, he took it that draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.29 was withdrawn by the sponsors.

76. It was so decided.

Draft resolutions A/C.2/40/L.23/Rev.1 and A/C.2/40/L.71

77. The CHAIRMAN announced that Morocco had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.23/Rev.1 and drew attention to the programme budget implications (A/C.2/40/L.42) of the draft resolution.

78. Mr. HACKETT (Department of International Economic and Social Affairs) recalled that paragraph 8 of document A/C.2/40/L.42 listed modifications required in the proposed programme of work for 1986-1987, which would consist of two additional outputs under programme element 4.2, namely a progress report to the General Assembly at its forty-second session and a similar report to the Commission on the Status of Women at its thirty-second session. However, since paragraph 8 of the new draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.71 requested that a progress report be submitted to the General Assembly and that the same report be submitted to the Commission on the Status of Women, together with the comments on the subject made by delegations in the General Assembly, it seemed that it would be useful to reword the text of

(Mr. Hackett)

paragraph 8 of document A/C.2/40/L.42 in the following manner: in the second line, the words "two additional outputs" would be omitted and replaced by "an additional output". Similarly, it was suggested that the end of paragraph 8 should be omitted, beginning from the phrase "and a similar report ...", and that it should be replaced by the following text: "together with the comments on the subject made by delegations in the General Assembly during its forty-second session, in 1987. The progress report to the General Assembly would constitute an interim report".

79. Draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.71 was adopted.

80. The CHAIRMAN announced that, in view of the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.71, draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.23/Rev.1 had been withdrawn by its sponsors. He also suggested that the Committee should consider the following draft decision: "The General Assembly takes note of the note by the Secretary-General on the implementation of General Assembly resolution 39/172 (A/40/703 and Corr.1)". If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft decision.

81. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 87: SPECIAL ECONOMIC AND DISASTER RELIEF ASSISTANCE: SPECIAL PROGRAMMES OF ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE (continued) (A/C.2/40/L.48)

Draft decision A/C.2/40/L.48

82. Draft decision A/C.2/40/L.48 was adopted.

83. Mr. GUMUCIO GRANIER (Bolivia) thanked the members of the Committee for the decision which they had just adopted and, more particularly, the Government of Venezuela for its generous contribution to alleviate the effects of the serious economic crisis which Bolivia was undergoing. The collapse of international prices for tin, which ranked second among Bolivia's export products, had had a negative effect on the economic recovery programmes adopted by his Government. Venezuela's decision to make available all remaining monies from the United Nations Special Fund, which consisted solely of contributions from Venezuela to the Bolivia account had been taken by the Venezuelan President himself, who had requested the international community to demonstrate its solidarity with the Government and people of Bolivia. The decision was an excellent example of South-South co-operation, and would help encourage members of the international community to work together in the search for solutions to the critical economic problems faced by developing countries.

84. His delegation also wished to express its appreciation to the Secretary-General, as well as to the Assistant Secretary-General and Deputy to the Under-Secretary-General, Miss Margaret Anstee, for the efforts they had made and the initiatives they had taken with a view to the provision of assistance to Bolivia.

The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.