



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 51st MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BIRIDO (Sudan)

CONTENTS

- AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 86: TRAINING AND RESEARCH: UNITED NATIONS INSTITUTE FOR TRAINING AND RESEARCH (continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 85: OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued)
- (e) UNITED NATIONS TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION ACTIVITIES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)
  - (f) LIQUIDATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS EMERGENCY OPERATION TRUST FUND AND ALLOCATION OF THE REMAINING BALANCE: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 84: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued)
- (c) TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT (continued)
  - (d) SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued)
  - (l) LONG-TERM TRENDS IN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (continued)
  - (j) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SUBSTANTIAL NEW PROGRAMME OF ACTION FOR THE 1980s FOR THE LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES (continued)

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

\* 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, rooms DC2-750, 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 on Saturday, 14 December at 12.30 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)  
(A/40/3/Add.1, A/40/329, A/40/409, A/40/420, A/40/633 and Add.1, A/40/735;  
A/C.2/40/L.4 and L.130)

Agreement between the United Nations and the United Nations Industrial Development Organization

1. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the addendum to the report of the Economic and Social Council (A/40/3/Add.1) concerning the Council's recommendation regarding the agreement between the United Nations and UNIDO. The Council had approved the agreement and recommended that the General Assembly should do likewise at the earliest opportunity (Council resolution 1985/81). The Committee might therefore wish to consider the following draft resolution:

"The General Assembly,

"Recalling paragraph 11 of its resolution 34/96 of 13 December 1979,

"Having considered Economic and Social Council resolution 1985/81 of 12 December 1985, and the draft agreement annexed thereto, intended to bring the United Nations Industrial Development Organization into relationship with the United Nations in accordance with Articles 57 and 63 of the Charter of the United Nations,

"Approves the Agreement between the United Nations and the United Nations Industrial Development Organization set forth in the annex to the present resolution."

If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution.

2. The draft resolution suggested by the Chairman was adopted.

Draft resolutions A/C.2/40/L.4 and L.130

3. Ms. ERIKSSON (Sweden), Vice-Chairman, introducing draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.130, said that the end of paragraph 9 should read:

"... efforts should continue in order to improve the effectiveness of appropriate export earning stabilization schemes and to seek agreement on more effective co-operation in international commodity policy, notably through the early entry into force of the Agreement establishing the Common Fund for Commodities".

4. Draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.130, as orally revised, was adopted.

5. Mr. LEE (Canada) said that his delegation had been pleased to support the consensus on the draft resolution just adopted. Export earning stabilization schemes based on balance-of-payments requirements, such as the IMF compensatory financing facility, were appropriate. Schemes that sought to compensate for shortfalls in export earnings from individual commodities were not appropriate. Canada continued to question the need for an additional financing facility. His delegation hoped that the draft resolution on food and agricultural problems adopted the following year would place greater emphasis on fundamental humanitarian issues relating to food, hunger and malnutrition, as well as on efforts to improve agricultural production and distribution. It hoped that the tendency to introduce relatively extraneous issues into the draft resolution on food and agricultural problems would not continue.

6. Mr. HANTKE (Federal Republic of Germany), speaking on behalf of the Belgian and United Kingdom delegations and his own delegation, said that Belgium, the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany had supported the consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.130 because they attached great importance to agriculture, food production and higher standards of nutrition in the developing countries. However, the wording of paragraph 9 gave rise to serious problems. The narrow interpretation of the words "international market prices" as meaning prices in United States dollars did not take due account of the fact that well over 75 per cent of key agricultural commodities were traded on European markets and that their prices were therefore denominated throughout the world in the national currency of a European country. Paragraph 9 could have provided a better description of what was admittedly a complex situation.

7. Mr. ORLANDO (United States of America), referring to paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.130, said that it was the responsibility of Governments to ensure that their own people were not denied food. Except in the case of total embargoes, United States grain was available to all purchasers. In emergencies people should receive food, regardless of the political system of their Government. However, the United States Government had the right to decide how its resources should be used.

8. Mr. ZOLLER (Australia) said that, although his delegation had supported the consensus on the draft resolution just adopted, it was sceptical about the appropriateness of new stabilization schemes, particularly commodity-specific schemes. Furthermore, it endorsed the views expressed by the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany on the interpretation of recent trends in international commodity prices, as well as the views expressed by the representative of Canada on the introduction of issues of marginal relevance.

9. Mr. SHAABAN (Egypt) said that it was appropriate for the draft resolution to refer to the substantial decline in international market prices and the need for economic growth.

10. Certain delegations and groups of countries had set a regrettable precedent by submitting amendments to paragraphs 9, 10 and 11 of the draft, even though the matters in question had already been dealt with.

Reports considered by the Committee under item 12

11. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee might wish to consider the following draft decision in connection with reports before the Committee under agenda item 12:

"The General Assembly takes note of the following:

"(a) Report of the Secretary-General, entitled 'Critical situation of food and agriculture in Africa 1984-1985' (A/40/329);

"(b) Report of the Secretary-General on the Transport and Communications Decade in Africa (A/40/409);

"(c) Note by the Secretary-General on the implementation of the programme for the Industrial Development Decade for Africa (A/40/420);

"(d) Report of the Joint Inspection Unit on the Transport and Communications Decade in Africa and the comments of the Secretary-General thereon (A/40/633 and Add.1);

"(e) Report of the Secretary-General on the Transport and Communications Decade in Africa (A/40/735)."

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

13. The draft decision suggested by the Chairman was adopted.

AGENDA ITEM 86: TRAINING AND RESEARCH: UNITED NATIONS INSTITUTE FOR TRAINING AND RESEARCH (continued) (A/C.2/40/L.87, L.88, L.101, L.124 and L.125)

Draft resolutions L.87, L.88 and L.124

14. Draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.124 was adopted.

15. Mr. NKWELLE EKANEY (Cameroon) said that his delegation welcomed the consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.124. It had been agreed that the purpose of paragraph 4 was to ensure that in September 1986 the General Assembly would have before it a thorough analysis by the Secretary-General of the option to close down the Institute and the option to restructure it, together with outlines of all the possible scenarios and a plan for long-term financing. His delegation was confident that the Secretary-General would submit a study that would remove any obstacles to providing UNITAR with the means to fulfil its important mandate.

16. Ms. SMITHEY (United States of America) said that the United States had been an active contributor to the Institute's budget over the years. Recently, total voluntary contributions to UNITAR had consistently been insufficient to cover the Institute's programme of work, which might indicate a lack of confidence among donors in the efficacy of UNITAR programmes. The United States had become

(Ms. Smithey, United States)

increasingly concerned about the quality of the Institute's work, particularly in the area of research. It believed that the Institute's work should be funded through voluntary contributions and would therefore continue to oppose any attempts to fund UNITAR through the regular budget of the United Nations.

17. Mr. FAURE (France) said that the option to close down the Institute, including the possibility of reallocating the Institute's functions to other agencies and bodies, should not be considered until all other possible ways of remedying the situation had been explored. Moreover, that option should not be considered until formal consultations had been held on the matter and until delegations had been informed of the outcome of efforts undertaken in accordance with paragraph 4 (b) of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.124.

18. Mr. FAREED (Pakistan) said that he endorsed the view just expressed by the representative of France that the option to restructure the Institute should be explored fully before the option to close it down was considered. In the course of the informal consultations on UNITAR, many delegations had commented on the quality of the research carried out by the Institute. However, in the past three years the Committee had never considered the substantive aspects of the Institute's work. He was therefore surprised that any delegation should comment on the quality of the Institute's work at the current meeting. It was to be hoped that in the future delegations would have an opportunity to comment on substantive aspects of both the training and the research activities of UNITAR.

19. Mr. TUAN (Liberia) reaffirmed his delegation's commitment to UNITAR. The Institute depended on Member States for appropriate financial support so that it could carry out work of a high quality. In view of the current situation, UNITAR was performing well. The delegations that had reservations should reconsider their positions and give UNITAR full financial support.

20. Mr. PAYTON (New Zealand) said that he hoped that a final decision could be reached on the future of UNITAR in the course of the following year. The two options referred to in paragraph 4 of the draft resolution just adopted should be given equal priority.

21. Mr. HADID (Algeria) said that emphasis should be placed on the option to restructure the Institute and on long-term funding. The goal should be to ensure the future viability of UNITAR.

22. Draft resolutions A/C.2/40/L.87 and L.88 were withdrawn by the sponsors.

Draft decision A/C.2/40/L.125

23. The CHAIRMAN said that the statement of programme budget implications set forth in document A/C.2/40/L.101 now applied to draft decision A/C.2/40/L.125.

24. At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on draft decision A/C.2/40/L.125.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Ivory Coast (Côte d'Ivoire), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Brazil, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Israel, Italy, Japan, Mongolia, Netherlands, Portugal, Romania, Spain.

25. Draft decision A/C.2/40/L.125 was adopted by 91 votes to 15, with 12 abstentions.

26. Mr. LEE (Canada) said that his delegation had supported the consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.124 and had voted in favour of the draft decision just adopted by the Committee, as part of a package. It would not normally be receptive to proposals such as the one in the draft decision. Canada would once again make a substantial contribution to UNITAR for 1986.

27. Mr. JØNCK (Denmark) said that his delegation appreciated the spirit of compromise that had been shown during the negotiations on draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.124. Denmark had voted in favour of the draft decision just adopted, in spite of its concern at the transfer of funds from the regular budget in order to cover the cost of activities that were supposed to be financed from voluntary contributions. However, draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.124 called for one more transitional year for UNITAR and the Institute required financing in that transitional year. For the same reason, Denmark would now give favourable consideration to the renewal of its contribution to UNITAR for 1986.

28. Mr. MULLER (Australia) said that his delegation had voted against the draft decision because organizations or institutions established on the basis of voluntary funding should not receive supplementary funds from the regular budget in order to enable them to implement their programmes of work. The programmes of work of bodies financed from voluntary funds should be formulated on the basis of the level of the voluntary contributions received. His delegation was also concerned that the General Assembly had been unable to adopt a decision on the future role of UNITAR. However, it had been pleased to join the consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.124.

29. Mr. BAHADIAN (Brazil) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft decision just adopted because it had abstained in the vote on the corresponding paragraph of General Assembly resolution 39/177. However, it welcomed the consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.124.

30. Mr. RAICHEV (Bulgaria) speaking on behalf of the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian SSR, the USSR and his own country, said that the delegations of those countries had not raised any objection to the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.124 without a vote, even although for a number of years UNITAR had not been taking the necessary steps to deal with its financial difficulties, which stemmed from its high level of expenditure, flaws in its programme of work and lack of strict financial controls. Research activities had suffered because the Institute's mandate was not entirely clear. Furthermore, in some cases the Institute's work duplicated that of other bodies. The delegations on whose behalf he was speaking objected to the granting to UNITAR of funds from the regular budget of the United Nations and to any suggestion that the existing voluntary system of financing its activities should be changed. They had therefore voted against draft decision A/C.2/40/L.125, except for Mongolia, which had abstained.

31. Mr. FIELD (United Kingdom) said that, although his delegation had welcomed the consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.124, it had been unable to support adoption of the draft decision. The Institute's activities should be funded voluntarily. UNITAR must therefore balance its budget and take account of its income in planning its activities. The United Kingdom welcomed the efforts made by the Executive Director to reduce the overall deficit forecast for 1985. However, the grant of \$1.5 million that had been authorized the previous year, which the United Kingdom had opposed, had been intended for use in 1985 only. It was not acceptable for the unspent balance to be carried over automatically into the following biennium. The United Kingdom had consistently argued against the use of funds from the regular budget for any form of non-voluntary funding for UNITAR. It was unacceptable that in cases where such bodies as UNITAR were unable to attract sufficient voluntary contributions Member States should be forced to contribute through the regular budget. It was to be hoped that the Secretary-General would bear that point in mind when considering the option to close down the Institute and reallocate its functions.

32. Mr. DE CATERINA (Italy) said that his Government had always supported the Institute's activities generously and believed that other Governments should contribute more generously to the Institute on a voluntary basis. It had therefore been unable to support adoption of the draft decision. On the other hand, it had been pleased to join the consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.124.

33. Mr. SCHNELLE (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation had been unable to support adoption of the draft decision because it was not in keeping with the Statute of UNITAR. It opposed the financing of operational activities through funds from the regular budget of the United Nations. However, it acknowledged that lack of funds might jeopardize the implementation of the draft resolution just adopted by consensus, and it had therefore abstained in the vote on the draft decision. It shared the view that the Secretary-General should be permitted to prepare an impartial report on all possible options. That abstention did not in any way prejudice his delegation's position on the basic question of the future role of UNITAR.

34. Mr. KURLIN (Sweden) said that his delegation had supported the consensus on the draft resolution just adopted and had therefore voted in favour of the draft decision in order to ensure that UNITAR had adequate funds in 1986. For that same reason it would shortly be announcing a contribution to the Institute for 1986.

35. Mr. KAWASHIMA (Japan) said that his delegation believed that the Institute should function on the basis of voluntary contributions. However, although it had voted against paragraph 5 of General Assembly resolution 39/177, it had abstained in the vote on the draft decision because it welcomed the adoption by consensus of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.124.

36. Mr. DE LA TORRE (Argentina) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft decision in view of the exceptional circumstances described in draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.124.

AGENDA ITEM 85: OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued) (A/C.2/40/L.103 and L.132)

Draft resolutions A/C.2/40/L.103 and L.132

37. Ms. ERIKSSON (Sweden), Vice-Chairman, said that she wished to revise the third preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.132 so that it began with the word "Reaffirming".

38. Mr. MALIK (India) noted that the thirteenth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.132 referred merely to "increased contributions", which was not specific enough. Moreover, his Government did not recognize separate sectoral treatment such as that implied in paragraph 1 (f). It was therefore to be hoped that the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation would be able to explain the meaning of subparagraph (f) in his report for the 1986 comprehensive policy review. Clarification of the meaning of paragraph 1 (g) would also be appreciated. In connection with paragraph 1 (i), it should be recognized



(Mr. Malik, India)

that the developing countries were more in need of help than the under-utilized donor countries were. Lastly, paragraph 5 referred to "the eighth replenishment of the International Development Association at an adequate level". As far as his delegation was concerned, "an adequate level" meant that the replenishment would meet requirements at an enhanced or effective level.

39. Mr. FAREED (Pakistan) said that he endorsed the comments just made by the representative of India. Moreover, in paragraph 3 the words "and the decisions contained therein" were unnecessary.

40. Mr. BA (Senegal) said that his delegation was also of the view that the wording of the thirteenth preambular paragraph was in need of improvement.

41. Ms. ERIKSSON (Sweden), Vice-Chairman, responding to points raised by Mr. ULLERUP-PETERSEN (Denmark) and Mr. FAURE (France), confirmed that the thirteenth preambular paragraph contained wording proposed by the Group of 77 that had been agreed upon in the informal consultations. She appealed to delegations to take account of the fact that a consensus had been reached on the draft.

42. Mr. BA (Senegal) and Mr. FAREED (Pakistan), responding to comments made by Mr. LAZAREVIC (Yugoslavia), on behalf of the Group of 77, and Mr. PAYTON (New Zealand), said that they had no intention of standing in the way of a consensus.

43. Mr. MALIK (India) said that his delegation would not insist on changes being made in the draft before the Committee, even although the thirteenth preambular paragraph and paragraph 1 (f), (g) and (i) were not acceptable to it.

44. Draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.132, as orally revised, was adopted.

45. Draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.103 was withdrawn by the sponsors.

(e) UNITED NATIONS TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION ACTIVITIES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (DP/1985/43 and Add.1-3)

46. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee might wish to consider the following draft decision concerning a report on which no proposals had been submitted: "The General Assembly takes note of the report of the Secretary-General on United Nations technical co-operation activities (documents DP/1984/43 and Add.1-3)."

47. The draft decision suggested by the Chairman was adopted.

(f) LIQUIDATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS EMERGENCY OPERATION TRUST FUND AND ALLOCATION OF THE REMAINING BALANCE: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/40/740)

48. The CHAIRMAN said that he wished to suggest that the Committee should consider the following draft decision concerning another report on which no proposals had been submitted:

(The Chairman)

"The General Assembly takes note of the report of the Secretary-General on the liquidation of the United Nations Emergency Operation Trust Fund and allocation of the remaining balance (document A/40/740)."

49. Mr. ORLANDO (United States of America), referring to the Secretary-General's report, said that the United States had encouraged the global system of trade preferences (GSTP) within the framework of the United Nations, in the expectation that it would be of benefit to all developing countries and that it would be designed and negotiated in a manner fully consistent with the principles of universality and transparency. However, his delegation noted an attempt to restrict GSTP negotiations to one political grouping of developing countries within the United Nations. That attempt had been most evident in the arrangements agreed upon by the Group of 77 and UNDP for the allocation of funds to the Group of 77 upon the liquidation of the Emergency Operation Trust Fund. The restriction of GSTP negotiations in that manner was a serious violation of the principle of universality. Steps must be taken to give access to the negotiations to all the developing countries that had expressed a desire to participate in the global system.

50. Mr. ELIASHIV (Israel) said that his delegation did not endorse the view that participation in the project on technical support for the negotiations on the proposed establishment of the global system should be limited to one group of developing countries. Economic co-operation among developing countries must be based on the principles of universality and self-election.

51. Mr. SHAABAN (Egypt), referring to the statements just made by the representatives of the United States and Israel, which he did not endorse, said that the matter in question had been decided upon under his country's chairmanship of the Group of 77. He therefore wished to explain that, when the remaining balance, which had originally amounted to \$5.8 million had been distributed, the Administrator of UNDP had indicated that a certain percentage should be allocated to the developing countries that were not members of the Group of 77. The Group had reluctantly agreed that part of the sum of \$5.8 million should be allocated to the so-called developing countries non-members of the Group of 77. The remaining amount had been allocated to the Group of 77, and a portion of that sum had been set aside for the GSTP project.

52. Mr. LAZAREVIC (Yugoslavia), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, said that he did not endorse the views expressed by the representatives of the United States and Israel. The Group of 77 stood by the arrangements that had been made for use of the unspent resources from the Fund and would continue to abide by the agreement that had been concluded.

53. The draft decision suggested by the Chairman was adopted.

AGENDA ITEM 84: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued)  
(A/C.2/40/L.129)

- (c) TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT (continued) (A/C.2/40/L.92, L.105, L.114, L.127 and L.128)

Draft resolutions A/C.2/40/L.92 and L.127

54. The CHAIRMAN said that the programme budget implications set forth in document A/C.2/40/L.105 no longer applied to draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.127.

55. Draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.127 was adopted.

Draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.114

56. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the amendments to draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.114 submitted by Yugoslavia on behalf of the Group of 77 (A/C.2/40/L.128).

57. Mr. LEE (Canada), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution, said that it was disappointing to note that delegations were having difficulty accepting that all countries should be urged to oppose protectionist measures, dismantle trade barriers and strengthen the open multilateral trading system. The sponsors were withdrawing the draft, since the amendments in document A/C.2/40/L.128 were not acceptable.

58. Mr. SEKULIC (Yugoslavia), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, said that there had been insufficient time to reach agreement on the draft resolution before the Committee. Since the sponsors of the draft resolution had withdrawn it, the members of the Group of 77 wished to withdraw the amendments they had submitted.

- (d) SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued) (A/C.2/40/L.126)

Draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.126

59. The draft resolution was adopted.

60. Mr. RAICHEV (Bulgaria), speaking on behalf of the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian SSR, the USSR and his own country, said that the position adopted by those countries, which had been stated on many occasions, remained unchanged.

61. Mr. SHAABAN (Egypt) said that his delegation welcomed the adoption by consensus of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.126. Further consultations were required on the report in document A/C.2/40/4 so that the Secretary-General could review his recommendations and transmit the resulting proposals to Governments well before the pledging conference that was to be convened by 30 April 1986. That conference might be a suitable occasion for Governments to pledge contributions to the United Nations Financing System for Science and Technology for Development. It was to be

(Mr. Shaaban, Egypt)

hoped that donors, particularly the potential donors that had originally requested certain administrative and other changes in the current procedures, would come forward at the conference and help to inject new life into the System. It was also to be hoped that the major potential donors that had so far not contributed to the financing of the System would participate actively in the informal consultations called for in the draft resolution just adopted.

- (1) LONG-TERM TRENDS IN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (continued) (A/C.2/40/L.10, L.22/Rev.1 and L.32)

Draft resolutions A/C.2/40/L.10 and L.22/Rev.1

62. The CHAIRMAN said that the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.22/Rev.1 were set forth in document A/C.2/40/L.32.

63. Mr. LAZAREVIC (Yugoslavia), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, said that he wished to revise paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.22/Rev.1. In the fourth line, the following words should be inserted after the word "problems": "including the net outflow of resources from developing to developed countries". In paragraph 4, the last two lines should read: "forms of international economic co-operation aimed at facilitating structural adjustment within the world economy towards the new international economic order".

64. He wished to request that the draft should be put to a recorded vote, if it was put to a vote.

65. Mr. JURASZ (Poland) said that his delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.22/Rev.1, as orally revised by the representative of Yugoslavia, and wished to join the sponsors of the draft.

66. Miss FRANKINET (Belgium), responding to points raised by the representative of Yugoslavia and Mr. DE LA TORRE (Argentina), said that her delegation was requesting that the draft resolution should be put to a vote.

67. Mr. LAZAREVIC (Yugoslavia), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, said, in response to a point raised by Mr. BA (Senegal), that he had revised the text of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.22/Rev.1 on the assumption that there would be a request for a vote. If the representative of Belgium did not insist on a vote, he would immediately withdraw the oral revisions he had made.

68. At the request of Belgium and Yugoslavia, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.22/Rev.1, as orally revised.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen,

Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Ivory Coast (Côte d'Ivoire), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, 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: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

69. Draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.22/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted by 105 votes to 1, with 11 abstentions.

70. Mr. LEE (Canada), speaking in explanation of vote after the vote, said that his delegation had been obliged to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution just adopted because the text had been revised. In any event, Canada would have considered it necessary to point out that the sixth preambular paragraph was inappropriate in such a resolution. However, his delegation attached great importance to the ideas set forth in paragraph 2.

71. Mrs. PRIEST (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of Belgium, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, Portugal, Spain and her own country, said that the delegations of those countries had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution just adopted by the Committee because the report in question would duplicate documentation already available from the Secretariat, UNCTAD, IMF and the World Bank. They questioned whether the Secretariat should devote its time to such a question, large parts of which must necessarily be highly speculative. It was regrettable that the amendments put forward by the European Community in the course of informal consultations had not been accepted. The Community had suggested that the Secretary-General should make use of generally-accepted data in a manner that facilitated analysis. One of the main shortcomings of the Secretary-General's report to the General Assembly at the current session was the lack of analysis of certain figures. The relevant amendments would have served to avoid in the following report some of the main deficiencies in the current report. She also wished to stress that the reference to disarmament in the sixth preambular paragraph was not appropriate in such a text.

72. Mr. SCOTT (United States of America) said that his delegation had been willing to accept the call for another report as early as the forty-second session of the General Assembly, despite its misgivings about frequent analyses of long-term trends. However, in view of the content of the sixth preambular paragraph and the oral revisions made, it had voted against the draft resolution just adopted.

73. Mr. KOLEV (Bulgaria) speaking on behalf of the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian SSR, the USSR and his own country, said that the socialist countries attached great importance to the studies carried out by the United Nations on long-term trends in economic development. In preparing the report referred to in the draft resolution just adopted, the Secretariat should concentrate on ways of solving current international economic problems, improving international economic relations, ensuring the economic security of all States and creating a climate of trust. It should take as a foundation for its work the relevant United Nations documents, which were referred to in the draft resolution. The report should show how much progress had been made in the area of economic relations. Moreover, it should contain an analysis of the causes of the developing countries' current economic problems. It was important not to underestimate the danger represented by the growing gap between the developed capitalist countries and the developing countries. Changes must take place in the developed capitalist countries, particularly where expenditure on the arms race was concerned. Any study of the socio-economic prospects for the world economy must take full account of the potential for implementing disarmament measures and using the resources thus made available for peaceful purposes, including the economic development of the developing countries.

74. The socialist countries were in favour of including in the agenda of the forty-second session of the General Assembly an item entitled "Long-term trends in social and economic development", for consideration on the basis of the report to be submitted by the Secretary-General through the Economic and Social Council in 1987.

75. Mr. ALPTUNA (Turkey) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.22/Rev.1 in view of the importance of the question of long-term trends in economic development. However, it did not support the sixth preambular paragraph, which dealt with disarmament and was therefore inappropriate in such a text.

76. Mr. LAZAREVIC (Yugoslavia), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, said that the members of the Group welcomed the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.22/Rev.1, as orally revised, and regretted that it had not been possible to reach agreement on all the contentious issues. It was hard to understand why the reference to the promotion of disarmament had not been acceptable to some delegations. It was obvious that disarmament and development were closely linked and that the promotion of disarmament was in the interest of all countries. The Group of 77 had not suggested that the question of disarmament should be considered in the Committee in any other context than that of development. He also wished to stress that no report had as yet provided detailed information on the net outflow of resources from developing to developed countries and its implications for the development process of the developing countries.

77. The CHAIRMAN said that, in view of the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.22/Rev.1, as orally revised, it would not be necessary for the Committee to take any action on draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.10.

(j) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SUBSTANTIAL NEW PROGRAMME OF ACTION FOR THE 1980s FOR THE LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES (continued) (A/C.2/40/L.82 and L.131)

Draft resolutions A/C.2/40/L.82 and L.131

78. Ms. ERIKSSON (Sweden), Vice-Chairman, said that the conclusions and recommendations referred to in paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.131 would be annexed to the text in due course.

79. Draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.131 was adopted.

80. Mr. KOLEV (Bulgaria), speaking on behalf of the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian SSR, the USSR and his own country, said that the socialist countries attached great importance to the Substantial New Programme of Action and supported the just demands of the least developed countries. The wide-ranging economic co-operation that was taking place between the socialist countries and the least developed countries was based on progressive principles and took account of the goals and recommendations set forth in the Programme. That co-operation promoted integrated development of the developing countries' productive forces. In implementation of the relevant United Nations recommendations, the socialist countries had concluded many agreements with developing countries, mostly with the least developed countries.

81. They had participated actively in the review of progress towards the implementation of the Programme carried out by the Intergovernmental Group on the Least Developed Countries, as a result of which a number of important recommendations had been adopted. However, no recommendations had been made on such matters as the problem of the indebtedness of the least developed countries, halting the outflow of financial resources from those countries, reducing interest rates on loans from private banks, eliminating protectionism and compensation for damage to the economies of the least developed countries resulting from the economic crisis. Furthermore, the Intergovernmental Group had made no reference in its report (A/40/827, annex) to the interrelationship between disarmament and solving the developing countries' problems or to the need to establish a new international economic order. The socialist countries reaffirmed their position outlined at the sixth session of the Intergovernmental Group, as well as their position stated in the context of UNCTAD and various other United Nations bodies at the time of the adoption of the resolutions and decisions referred to in the draft resolution just adopted by the Committee.

82. Mr. FLEMING (United States of America), said that his delegation had been pleased to join the consensus on the draft resolution just adopted. However, it had expressed reservations on a number of points at the sixth session of the Intergovernmental Group and draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.131 gave rise to similar

(Mr. Fleming, United States)

difficulties. For example, the ninth preambular paragraph referred to a global review on the implementation of the Substantial New Programme of Action at the end of the Decade that might take the form of a United Nations conference on least developed countries. His delegation believed that the Committee should not prejudge the nature and scope of the global review or consider convening a conference until the purpose and objectives of the review had been carefully assessed. Paragraphs 12 and 13 were also a matter of concern to his delegation. Moreover, the United States rejected the call in paragraph 6 for the setting of targets for official development assistance.

83. Mrs. PRIEST (United Kingdom) said that, although her delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution just adopted, it wished to stress, in connection with the reference in paragraph 6 to official development assistance to least developed countries, that such assistance was subject to public-expenditure constraints and to the level of assistance provided by her Government to other developing countries.

84. Draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.82 was withdrawn by the sponsors.

Draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.129

85. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to grant permission to the members of the European Economic Community to submit a new draft resolution (A/C.2/40/L.129) under agenda item 84, even although the deadline for the submission of draft resolutions had already elapsed.

86. It was so decided.

87. Mr. SCHULLER (Luxembourg), introducing draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.129 on behalf of the European Economic Community, said that the draft set forth policies and measures designed to promote dialogue on the question of debt and related issues.

The meeting was suspended at 3.50 a.m. and resumed at 4.35 a.m.

#### ORGANIZATION OF WORK

88. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the current meeting should be adjourned and that the Committee should meet again at 5 p.m. that day.

89. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 5 a.m.