

which had provided assistance for Ethiopia; the list would have been too long, since aid had come literally from the four points of the compass. It would have been quicker for his delegation to name those who had not sent assistance to his country. That was why he had elected to thank on a collective basis all the Governments and international and non-governmental organizations which had rendered assistance to Ethiopia in different degrees. Saudi Arabia was therefore likewise included in that category. He appealed to all countries which had not been specifically designated to understand that Ethiopia was deeply grateful to them too.

74. Mr. ORLANDO (United States of America), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, acknowledged

the thanks expressed by the Ethiopian delegation for the assistance rendered by the United States. The observer for Ethiopia had at the same time referred to a statement by his delegation at the previous meeting, dealing with certain well-known problems which had already been outstanding too long. Those problems had been raised by the United States delegation not with a view to politicizing the debate but merely to seek for solutions. He noted the statement made by the observer for Ethiopia, especially his comments on the subject of transport, and he looked forward to the day when those problems would no longer need to be addressed.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.

52nd meeting

From Thursday, 25 July, at 4.15 p.m.,
to Saturday, 27 July 1985, at 3.25 a.m.

Président: Mr. Tomohiko KOBAYASHI (Japan)

E/1985/SR.52

AGENDA ITEM 4

Review of the immediate and longer-term aspects of the critical economic situation in Africa and the follow-up of the response by the international community and the United Nations system (continued)
(E/1985/104 and Add.1 and 2, E/1985/122, E/1985/124, E/1985/129, E/1985/156; E/1985/NGO/2; E/1985/L.53)

1. Mr. Gervais CHARLES (Haiti) said that the terrible spectacle of millions of human beings reduced to misery had greatly moved world public opinion, which had mobilized its forces in an impressive manner with a view to providing immediate assistance to the destitute populations. There had been a genuine surge of sympathy and it had been a source of great comfort to see ordinary individuals doing their utmost to help their brothers in need. Such an important movement should not remain without any follow-up. Haiti, for its part, was particularly concerned about that problem, partly because its economic structure was similar to that of many African countries and primarily because the Haitian people belonged to the African diaspora which the slave trade had dispersed throughout the New World.

2. In general, the implementation of the first emergency phase had been satisfactory; Governments had responded generously to the appeals made, particularly on the occasion of the Conference on the Emergency Situation in Africa in March 1985. The United Nations system had demonstrated that it could be effective when Member States were agreed on the objective to be

achieved. The establishment of OEOA had made it possible to ensure proper co-ordination, while the participation of bodies such as FAO, WHO, WFP, UNDP, UNICEF, UNDR0 and UNHCR had been exemplary. Lastly, he welcomed the creation by the World Bank of a Special Facility for sub-Saharan Africa.

3. The terrible tragedy currently affecting the African countries was certainly exacerbated by unfavourable climatic conditions, but it demonstrated clearly the problems encountered in many developing countries, particularly the least developed among them, which remained exposed to the same dangers. The profound causes of the crisis were well known, since they were connected largely with the continued impoverishment of some countries, particularly the least developed among them, in which food production did not succeed in meeting the needs of a rapidly increasing population. Formerly exporters of foodstuffs, those countries had become food importers, and that used up their meagre foreign exchange reserves. The underlying international economic context was characterized by persistent crises, permanent and highly unfavourable balance-of-payments deficits, extremely high interest rates, unstable exchange rates, and stagnant or even declining growth rates; all that had had devastating effects on the already fragile economies of the poorest countries, particularly since ODA flows had decreased in recent years.

4. The Declaration on the Critical Economic Situation in Africa, adopted by the General Assembly in its resolution 39/29, provided the political framework for the action to be taken to resolve the crisis. It was for the

Council to preserve that political stimulus by ensuring the coherence and continuity of the efforts undertaken; in other words, it was the Council's task to lay the foundation for a genuine recovery on the African continent, for the urgency of the situation should not overshadow fundamental development needs. The participants at the Conference of the Ministers of ECA and at the recent Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU had reaffirmed the resolve of African leaders to assume primary responsibility for recovery. The priorities had been clearly established, and the international community had a duty, under the terms of the Declaration mentioned earlier, to provide concrete support for actions taken at the local level. The African leaders had recognized that the agricultural sector should be given special attention, since co-ordinated development of that sector remained the key to food self-sufficiency. At the same time, consideration should be given to restoring, maintaining and modernizing the transport and communications infrastructure, which required considerable investment. It was therefore essential that the financial resources of the African countries should first be reconstituted and then enlarged through an increase in ODA and the establishment of mechanisms ensuring more stable export earnings.

5. The debt problem should also receive the attention of the international community; financial institutions and creditor Governments should try to alleviate the burden of debtor countries through long-term rescheduling or, preferably, cancellation of debts. In that regard, he supported the suggestion for convening an international conference on Africa's external debt.

6. The resources earmarked for the solution of the current crisis and the short-term recovery of African economies should not be taken out of those allocated to development assistance and it would be desirable to implement immediately the Substantial New Programme of Action for the 1980s for the Least Developed Countries—of which 26 were in Africa; it would also be appropriate to convene, early in 1986, a special session of the General Assembly devoted to the economic situation in Africa.

7. As the Secretary-General had said, the quality of assistance was just as important as its volume. Indeed, what was needed to narrow the gap separating peoples was not a few million dollars but rather the establishment of the new international economic order, the essential aim of which was to enable the beneficiaries of assistance to stop considering themselves as perpetual recipients of aid and to achieve some degree of autonomy in their development programmes. The tragedy afflicting the African populations served as a cruel reminder that the most imperative challenge facing the conscience of mankind remained the fate of the poor, and the international community should endeavour to ensure that those millions of human beings had access, as was their right, to food, housing, medical care, hygiene and education.

8. Mr. SENE (Senegal) said that the Council had been right to await the end of the twenty-first regular session

the OAU summit Assembly before taking up agenda item 4. The discussion which had been held on the question testified to the effort of international cooperation and human solidarity exerted to assist a continent which, despite considerable potential wealth, contained nearly half of the poorest countries in the world and was confronted with a crisis that endangered its very survival. The stimulus given by the Declaration on the Critical Economic Situation in Africa adopted by the General Assembly at its thirty-ninth session and the appeal by the Conference on the Emergency Situation in Africa of March 1985 had had a profound impact on the international community, which had become aware of the nature, magnitude and origins of the social and economic crisis currently affecting Africa and which had responded promptly and generously to the most urgent problems. However, beyond the emergency, the time had come to support the recovery efforts of the countries affected, and to take the measures required for the short-term and long-term development of economies which were vulnerable and dependent on uncertain climatic conditions.

9. Thus, important as it might be, food aid was not the only action to be taken, and the question must be examined in the framework of a development strategy for the third world as a whole; it was precisely that framework which had been adopted at the recent summit Assembly of the Heads of State and Government of OAU at its last session and, while the participants had dealt more particularly with African economic questions, they had not ignored the major political problems facing them. It was of course well known that development could not be achieved without political will, without progress in cultural and social values, and without respect for human rights, which were the foundations of future societies. How was it possible to speak of the development of an entire continent without referring to the ties of co-operation and peaceful and friendly relations to be strengthened between the States concerned? In particular, how was it possible to forget the drama being played out every day in southern Africa, where *apartheid* prevailed and its supporters were in possession of nuclear technology? In that connection, he paid tribute to the position taken the previous day by the French Government in connection with the tragic events currently occurring in South Africa.

10. At the OAU summit Assembly, the African leaders had proposed specific measures to promote peace and security in Africa and Arab-African co-operation. The meeting had provided an opportunity to make an objective analysis of the implementation of the Lagos Plan of Action and the Final Act of Lagos, a fundamental element of the conceptual framework aimed at promoting and strengthening the unity of African States and peoples and their solidarity through economic co-operation and integration programmes. The achievement of those objectives had been hampered by various obstacles, the most disquieting of which was the alarming economic crisis which had brought hunger

and malnutrition to 21 countries with a total population of 200 million. Yet, one of the major objectives of the Lagos Plan was the implementation of a development strategy which, by developing immense natural and human resources, should make it possible to establish the bases for increased self-sufficiency.

11. It was time that considerable progress had been made in the establishment of regional economic groupings, but sectoral co-operation had not advanced, and little had been done in areas accorded priority in the Lagos Plan, such as food security, agronomic research, environment, drought and desertification control, industry, technology, natural resources, and new and renewable sources of energy. It was quite evident that one of the causes for the decline in agricultural production in Africa was the persistent drought which accelerated desertification and transformed arable land into vast arid stretches. That was why the Executive Secretary of ECA had organized a Scientific Round Table on the Climatic Situation and Drought in Africa at Addis Ababa in February 1984, under the auspices of ECA, UNEP, WMO and UNSO; the Round Table had brought together African and international experts specializing in climatology, earth sciences, water, soil and environment to study the causes, periodicity, trends and effects of drought on the African economy and populations. At the conclusion of the Round Table, a regional plan of action had been proposed, which ECA and OAU had adopted; the plan included short-term, medium-term and long-term measures to be taken at the national, regional and international levels.

12. At present, there was no reliable meteorological method that made it possible to forecast accurately when a period of drought would begin, end or recur. However, it was known that in the Sahelian area, drought was often the result of deforestation and overgrazing which caused soil deterioration and a lack of evaporation over vast stretches, and upset the thermal balance and equilibrium of the ecological heritage. The destruction of the biological potential and plant cover resulted in the emergence of the desert; today, it was known that desertification had a tendency to accelerate, especially where adequate means were not used to combat drought. That prolonged attack by drought and desertification in 36 African countries had had harmful effects on agricultural development, entailing a decline in cereal production and making 21 of them dependent on emergency food aid. Drought destroyed crops, reduced yields, decimated the livestock and caused the exodus of rural populations to urban areas or neighbouring countries, with all the difficulties that such migrations involved.

13. It was quite clear that any renewal of development in the affected regions required a merciless fight against drought and desertification by making use of scientific and meteorological research, regional projects for space-based remote-sensing and cartography activities, in particular for the exploitation of groundwater resources, the utilization of drought-resistant plant and cereal varieties and appropriate cultural techniques and

agrarian systems. In any event, the advance of the desert seemed inexorable and recent studies conducted by satellite showed that in 1983 the vegetation line at the southern edge of the Sahara was clearly 200 km farther south, which meant that the desert was advancing at an average of 8 to 10 km a year. The combined effects of drought and desertification on the fragile economies of African countries constituted a long-term threat to the survival of the African economic fabric and societies.

14. Senegal was among the 21 countries affected by the drought; it had long been waging a resolute fight against that scourge, and was among the founding members of the Permanent Inter-State Committee on Drought Control in the Sahel which was a model of subregional co-operation in that field. At the national level, a bold afforestation and reforestation policy had been undertaken to protect, up to the year 2000, nearly 3.5 million hectares. The longest-term objective was the afforestation of 14,000 hectares a year. At the same time, a programme to ensure water supply management by drilling wells, building dams and installing irrigated perimeters had been undertaken as part of an effort to integrate agricultural, pastoral and forestry activities.

15. However, the crisis in Africa had other causes; in particular, the reduction in the amount of capital and resources provided on concessional terms for the development of the continent; the collapse of commodity prices, which had led to a sharp decline in export earnings and, therefore, foreign exchange reserves; a deterioration in the terms of trade; increased interest rates and fluctuating exchange rates; the growth of protectionism; and, lastly, the shortcomings or errors inherent in any development policy. For example, in the field of agriculture, the growth target set out in the Lagos Plan had been 4 per cent a year, but the results obtained, according to the ECA index, amounted to 1.7 per cent, whereas the population growth rate was 2.8 per cent and would even reach 4 per cent in some countries. Similarly, in the secondary sector, energy production and the mining and manufacturing industries had also encountered difficulties. The first implementation programme of the Lagos Plan, formulated within the framework of the Industrial Development Decade for Africa (1980-1990), provided that the share of Africa in world industrial production should reach at least 1 per cent; however, despite the efforts made by the countries concerned and intergovernmental organizations, the aggravation of the crisis had diverted resources originally earmarked for new industrial projects to the restoration and rehabilitation of existing industries.

16. All those questions had been discussed at the twenty-first regular session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU, who had adopted a Declaration on the economic situation in Africa (E/1985/156, annex). Quoting paragraph 4 from the Declaration, he stressed that Africa had been the continent most vulnerable to recession and the world economic crisis, although it had immense potential and natural resources which, if exploited judiciously, would ensure its satisfactory development. He recalled that the

African Heads of State and Government had set, in paragraph 7 of the Declaration, the following priorities with a view to reorienting the management and long-term strategy of development: accelerated implementation of the Lagos Plan of Action and the Final Act of Lagos; special action for improvement of the food situation and the rehabilitation of agricultural development in Africa, providing in particular for the establishment of a warning system, incentives for the purpose of increasing agricultural output and productivity, better utilization of water resources, preservation of forestry, fish and animal resources, strengthening of research institutions, promotion of appropriate technologies, training of skilled manpower, and improvement of the standard of living in rural areas; formulation of a common platform of action at subregional, continental and international levels, defining the role and place of Africa in world economic negotiations; and lastly, measures for action against the effects of the destabilization policy of South Africa on the countries in southern Africa. In that way, together with the measures being taken currently, structural reforms were to be undertaken to rebuild the African economies through rehabilitation of the agricultural sector, which was accorded top priority. The discussions held and the decisions taken at the OAU summit Assembly testified to the maturity and credibility of the deliberations on the part of all the participants.

17. The qualitative and quantitative improvement of agricultural production and food security constituted a fundamental and priority element of the policy for the economic recovery and development of Africa; the process of agricultural rehabilitation would be accompanied by measures for relaunching industry, transport and trade. An effort would be made to ensure a balanced growth of food production intended for export and of that intended for consumption by local populations, so that Africa would cease to depend on emergency food aid. To restore agricultural production capacity, it would be necessary to obtain seeds and other inputs in good time, since, according to an FAO report, cereal production had fallen by 21 per cent in the 21 countries affected by the drought and 30 million persons were thus threatened with famine and malnutrition.

18. Efforts at restructuring would of course have to be made to relaunch development, but the fight against the crisis in Africa could not be summed up as merely a matter of structural adjustment. The African countries, within the framework of their adjustment policies, were endeavouring to mobilize national savings, to reduce their investment budgets and to decrease their public deficits, which entailed a decline in their economic activity; the measures thus taken, supported most frequently by financial assistance from IMF and the World Bank, had led to a decline in domestic demand by diminishing imports and reducing the propensity to consume. However, renewed economic growth also required the creation of the bases of development through the repair and maintenance of industrial equipment and the transport and communications infrastructure. Moreover, to ensure the success of adjustment policies,

it was necessary to achieve a sustained increase in financial flows to Africa. To that end, international financial institutions such as IMF, the World Bank or bodies such as IDA and IFAD should be provided with increased financial resources and, from that standpoint, the establishment of the Special Facility for sub-Saharan Africa under the auspices of the World Bank was a positive and promising development. Facilities should be offered through adjustment of the balance of payments, in order to promote the investment necessary to relaunch the productive sector. It was also urgent to increase the flow of ODA and to provide machinery to ensure stable export earnings for African countries at a remunerative level for producers. To that end, it was important to conclude international commodity agreements, and it would be a matter of urgency for countries which had not yet done so to ratify the Agreement Establishing the Common Fund for Commodities. In that context, reference could be made, as an encouraging example, to the agreements providing for the stabilization of commodities and for machinery to compensate for export income losses, established by the Stabex and Sysmin systems under the Third Lomé Convention.

19. According to recent estimates, Africa's external debt in 1985 would amount to a total of nearly \$172 billion. The World Bank had calculated that, considering only the guaranteed public debt in 1982 without taking account of new loans contracted since then or of private debts and payments made to IMF, the sub-Saharan African countries would have to pay \$11.6 billion a year from 1985 to 1987 to service the debt; thus, countries had to incur debt merely to service their debt. Moreover, inadequate export earnings, rising interest rates, and fluctuating exchange rates had substantially increased the external debt of African countries. In order to initiate co-ordination and fruitful dialogue on those questions, the Heads of State and Government of OAU had advocated the holding of an international conference on the foreign debt of African countries, which would enable international creditors and African borrowers to seek ways and means of attenuating the gravity of the debt problem. At a time of economic interdependence, the relaunching of African growth would be an earnest for the prosperity of all.

20. The international community had reacted in a highly commendable manner to relieve the sufferings of the afflicted populations of the countries stricken by drought and famine, but the measures advocated by the African Heads of State and Government at the OAU summit Assembly still had to be implemented. He welcomed the establishment of the Office of Emergency Operations in Africa since, given the magnitude of the task, co-ordination of the activities of United Nations bodies such as UNDP, UNDR0, WFP, FAO, UNICEF and UNHCR, as well as co-ordination between bilateral and multilateral bodies, non-governmental organizations and the recipient countries themselves, was essential. Moreover, institutions such as ILO, UNESCO, WHO or UNFPA could also make useful contributions

concerning particular social and cultural aspects of development. The desire for co-ordination should guide all partners, who would ensure such co-ordination through the selection of common priorities, dialogue, exchange of information, rationalization and integration of actions, in the interests of the suffering African populations.

21. The decisions taken at the OAU summit Assembly showed that Africa was aware that it bore the primary responsibility for its own recovery. Nevertheless, it required international solidarity, more than ever before. In that regard, the efforts to mobilize world public opinion, the favourable response of Governments to the appeals made and the active participation of international organizations all confirmed that the development actions defined by African countries would be favourably received in the Council. In their Declaration on the Economic Situation in Africa, the African leaders had proposed the holding of a special session of the General Assembly on the critical economic situation in Africa (E/1985/156, annex, para. 22) in order to continue action aimed at mobilizing world public opinion and to raise the problems by considering well-defined and attainable objectives as well as specific means of ensuring dynamic international co-operation and thus mobilizing the resources necessary for the rehabilitation of a continent in distress. Senegal sincerely hoped, therefore, that effect would be given to that proposal and to the proposal for the holding of a conference on Africa's external debt within appropriate periods of time, taking account of the urgency and gravity of the situation.

22. Mr. LAURIJSSEN (International Confederation of Free Trade Unions) said that the critical social and economic situation in Africa, and the food crisis in particular, had been in the forefront of the unanimous concerns of the United Nations and relevant agencies since October 1983, when FAO's early warning system had sounded the first notes of alarm about a rapidly deteriorating food-deficit problem in many parts of Africa; of 50 African countries, 27 had been placed on a list of drought-affected, food-deficit countries in need of immediate assistance to avert famine and malnutrition on a wide scale. The international community had responded and continued to do so with food and other emergency relief assistance. However, that response had not been timely enough to prevent the loss of hundreds of thousands of lives.

23. At present, the number of countries on the list had been reduced to 21, but FAO reported that the crisis had worsened for some of those countries in terms of shortfalls in production, food insecurity and human suffering. Projections to the year 2000 indicated a continuous worsening of the food-deficit situation if current trends in food production, incomes and population growth were maintained. The interrelated causes of those phenomena were many, but could be summed up as unfavourable climatic conditions, stagnation in food production combined with high population growth rates, persistent world economic recession, deflationary

policies and low-growth momentum in industrialized countries, deteriorating terms of trade, inappropriate domestic policies and economic mismanagement.

24. Food production had been falling behind population growth since the 1970s, so that in 32 of the 39 sub-Saharan countries, per capita food output was lower in 1982 than in 1970. Industry, too, had stagnated and, in the worst cases, only 25 to 30 per cent of installed capacity was actually in use. Meanwhile, most countries faced a crippling debt burden. Expressed as a percentage of exports, Africa's debt-service payments had doubled to 27 per cent since 1977 and its foreign debt now stood at a total of 54 per cent of its GDP; in other words, the debt burden was proportionately heavier than in Latin America. The adjustment policies imposed by IMF had also had painful social and economic effects.

25. Workers in urban and rural areas bore the brunt of the severe economic crisis, through a loss in real wages, lower living standards, increased poverty, malnutrition and a deterioration in some much-needed social services. In 14 low-income African countries, real per capita income had declined to levels below those of 15 years ago. It had been estimated that half of Africa's labour force was underemployed or unemployed. The proportion of the population that was undernourished was higher in African countries than in other developing nations. Lastly, of the 7 million infant deaths in the world each year, 5 million occurred in Africa, which had less than one sixth of the population of developing countries.

26. In view of the enormity of the problems and their consequences, mankind was confronted with one of the most formidable challenges in recent history. The response of the international community had been encouraging. Efforts in the United Nations and the specialized agencies had concentrated both on short-term emergency relief and on longer-term rehabilitation of agriculture and the economies of the African countries as a whole. The international trade-union movement was contributing to the best of its ability to that world-wide emergency campaign. ICFTU had launched its own programme in that regard and had also requested its affiliated national trade-union centres to put pressure on their Governments with a view to enlisting maximum support for international relief assistance and aid efforts.

27. However, it was important also to take more vigorous measures to tackle the basic problems of the current severe crisis. The measures should be aimed at the eradication of the constantly spreading plagues of poverty and unemployment and of stopping the advance of desertification and the erosion of natural resources in Africa. In that regard, ICFTU had submitted to the Council at its second regular session in 1984, detailed proposals in the form of the final report of its Pan-African Conference, entitled "The African Worker and the World Economic Crisis" and, at its current session, its *1985 World Economic Review*.

28. It was of vital importance that African trade unions should become more involved in the planning and implementation of national development programmes. Workers were the ultimate beneficiaries of development. Without their active support and participation through trade unions and rural workers' organizations, policies would continue to be ineffective, with further disastrous consequences. Trade unions would be ever present to remind Governments of the need to reorient priorities towards self-sustaining growth and the satisfaction of basic needs. Their role as vital partners in development must be recognized. The survival of many workers and their families, indeed of African society as a whole, was at stake. Co-operation between, but also within, countries, involving all productive forces in society, was a key factor for progress and success.

29. The PRESIDENT welcomed the fruitful discussion which had been held in the Council on the question of the critical economic situation in Africa. The discussion had confirmed the consensus that had already emerged at the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly concerning the need to continue and strengthen international co-operation in order to support the untiring efforts of the Governments of the affected African countries themselves. Taking place immediately after the twenty-first session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU, which had recently been concluded, the discussion had enabled the Council to consider the most important aspects of the co-operation needed and to tackle the profound causes of the critical situation in Africa, i.e. questions of medium-term and long-term development, while seeking to alleviate the sufferings resulting from the critical situation. He hoped that the immense demonstration of goodwill and solidarity would be rapidly translated into specific measures and that the Council's work would result in a document in the form of a message and proposals for action reflecting the political will unanimously expressed during the discussion.

30. He announced that the Council had concluded the general debate on agenda item 4.

31. Mr. REDOUANE (Algeria) speaking on behalf of the members of the Group of African States and of the Syrian Arab Republic as sponsors, introduced draft resolution E/1985/L.53, the objective of which was to establish the link between the Declaration on the Critical Economic Situation in Africa, adopted by the General Assembly in its resolution 39/29 of 3 December 1984, and the Declaration and resolutions on the economic situation in Africa adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of OAU at its recently concluded twenty-first regular session. He drew the attention of members of the Council to operative paragraphs 9 and 10 of the draft resolution, which reproduced the appeal made by the Heads of State and Government of OAU at the conclusion of their Assembly.

AGENDA ITEM 11

Natural resources

REPORT OF THE FIRST (ECONOMIC) COMMITTEE (E/1985/148)

32. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to take action on the nine draft resolutions which the First Committee had recommended to the Council for adoption in paragraph 23 of its report (E/1985/148) as well as on the three draft decisions in paragraph 24 of the same document.

Draft resolution I: Small-scale mining

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 1985/47).

Draft resolution II: Mineral resources

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 1985/48).

Draft resolution III: Water resources development

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 1985/49).

Draft resolution IV: Application of microcomputer technology in the development of water, energy and mineral resources

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 1985/50).

Draft resolution V: United Nations Revolving Fund for Natural Resources Exploration

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 1985/51).

Draft resolution VI: Permanent sovereignty over natural resources

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 1985/52).

Draft resolution VII: Co-ordination of programmes within the United Nations system in the field of natural resources

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 1985/53).

Draft resolution VIII: Rationalization of the work of the Committee on Natural Resources

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 1985/54).

Draft resolution IX: Improvement of secretariat servicing and substantive support services for the Committee on Natural Resources

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 1985/55).

Draft decision I: Report of the Committee on Natural Resources on its ninth session and provisional agenda and documentation for the tenth session of the Committee

The draft decision was adopted (decision 1985/166).

Draft decision II: International Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation Decade

The draft decision was adopted (decision 1985/167).

33. Mr. GAJENTAAN (Netherlands), referring to paragraphs 17 and 18 of the report of the First Committee (E/1985/148), said that his delegation wished to place on record its regret that, although there had been many positive reactions—for which it was grateful—to the draft resolution entitled “International Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation Decade” (E/1985/C.1/L.6), which the Netherlands had sponsored, the Council had been unable to have a substantive discussion on the text during the session and that in examining the work of one of its subsidiary bodies it had confined itself to referring the questions raised to the General Assembly.

34. His delegation intended to take up the issues involved again at the forthcoming session of the General Assembly. It hoped that the discussion to be held there would make it possible to translate the expressions of support into a draft resolution that took those considerations fully into account. In its opinion, that would do justice to the efforts made to strengthen the implementation of the goals of the International Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation Decade at its mid-point. The time had come to benefit from the experience gained during the first five years of the Decade in order to continue the implementation of national and international action plans.

Draft decision III: Report of the Secretary-General on progress in the attainment of the goals of the International Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation Decade

Draft decision III was adopted (decision 1985/168).

35. The PRESIDENT announced that the Economic and Social Council had concluded its consideration of agenda item 11.

AGENDA ITEM 12

Industrial development co-operation

REPORT OF THE FIRST (ECONOMIC) COMMITTEE
(E/1985/149)

36. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to take action on the two draft decisions which the First Committee had recommended to the Council for adoption in paragraph 7 of its report (E/1985/149).

Draft decision I: Report of the Industrial Development Board

The draft decision was adopted (decision 1985/169).

Draft decision II: Report on the Industrial Development Decade for Africa

The draft decision was adopted (decision 1985/170).

37. The PRESIDENT drew the Council's attention to a letter, dated 24 July 1985 (E/1985/157), which he had addressed to the Secretary-General to inform him that, in accordance with Economic and Social Council decision 1983/105 of 4 February 1983, and in consultation with the regional groups concerned, he had appointed the following as members of the Committee on Negotiations with Intergovernmental Agencies: Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Colombia, Congo, Ecuador, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guinea, India, Japan, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Nigeria, Poland, Somalia, Thailand, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire and Zimbabwe.

38. He said that the Economic and Social Council had completed its consideration of agenda item 12.

AGENDA ITEM 13

Trade and development

REPORT OF THE FIRST (ECONOMIC) COMMITTEE
(E/1985/150)

39. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to take action on the draft decision which the First Committee had recommended to the Council for adoption in paragraph 6 of its report (E/1985/150).

Draft decision: Report of the Trade and Development Board

The draft decision was adopted (decision 1985/171).

40. The PRESIDENT announced that the Economic and Social Council had concluded its consideration of agenda item 13.

AGENDA ITEM 14

International co-operation on the environment

REPORT OF THE FIRST (ECONOMIC) COMMITTEE
(E/1985/151)

41. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to take action on the draft decision which the First Committee had recommended to the Council for adoption in paragraph 10 of its report (E/1985/151).

Draft decision: Report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme

42. Mr. DMITRIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that when the First Committee had considered agenda item 14 at its 16th meeting, the Soviet delegation had formally submitted a proposal for the inclusion in the report of the Economic and Social Council on its second regular session of 1985 of the statement by the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme on the financial implications of the decisions of the Governing Council of UNEP. Although no objection had been made to the statement by the delegation of the USSR, the information requested had not been included in the report of the First Committee which the Council was considering.

43. His delegation therefore proposed that the information submitted by the Executive Director of UNEP at the 16th meeting of the First Committee should be included in the Council's report and requested that the representative of UNEP should repeat the information for that purpose.

44. Mr. MERANI (United Nations Environment Programme) said that, at the 16th meeting of the First Committee, the Executive Director of UNEP had stated that the administrative and financial implications of the proposals he had submitted to the Governing Council for approval had been included in the draft programme budget considered and adopted by the Governing Council.

45. The administrative and financial implications of all other proposals had been submitted to the Governing Council in accordance with its rules of procedure.

46. The Executive Director of UNEP had gone on to say that none of the decisions referred to by the representative of the USSR taken by the Governing Council at its thirteenth session had financial implications beyond the programme budget already adopted, and that only one of the decisions in question had financial implications for the regular budget; those decisions had already been endorsed earlier by the General Assembly.

The draft decision was adopted (decision 1985/172).

47. The PRESIDENT said that the Economic and Social Council had completed its consideration of agenda item 14.

AGENDA ITEM 15

International co-operation in the field of human settlements

REPORT OF THE FIRST (ECONOMIC) COMMITTEE
(E/1985/142)

48. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to take action on the two draft decisions which the First Commit-

tee had recommended to the Council for adoption in paragraph 8 of its report (E/1985/142).

Draft decision I: Report of the Commission on Human Settlements

The draft decision was adopted (decision 1985/173).

Draft decision II: Report of the Secretary-General on the living conditions of the Palestinian people in the occupied Palestinian territories

The draft decision was adopted (decision 1985/174).

49. The PRESIDENT said that the Economic and Social Council had completed its consideration of agenda item 15.

AGENDA ITEM 16

Science and technology for development

REPORT OF THE FIRST (ECONOMIC) COMMITTEE
(E/1985/152)

50. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to take action on the draft decision which the First Committee had recommended to the Council for adoption in paragraph 6 of its report (E/1985/152).

Draft decision: Report of the Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development

The draft decision was adopted (decision 1985/175).

51. The PRESIDENT said that the Economic and Social Council had completed its consideration of agenda item 16.

AGENDA ITEM 22

Countries stricken by desertification and drought

REPORT OF THE FIRST (ECONOMIC) COMMITTEE
(E/1985/153)

52. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to take action on the draft decision which the First Committee had recommended to the Council for adoption in paragraph 9 of its report (E/1985/153).

Draft decision: Preliminary report of the Secretary-General on countries stricken by desertification and drought

The draft decision was adopted (decision 1985/176).

53. The PRESIDENT said that the Economic and Social Council had completed its consideration of agenda item 22.

AGENDA ITEM 6

Permanent sovereignty over national resources in the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories (continued*) (E/1985/L.50)

54. The PRESIDENT drew the attention of the Economic and Social Council to draft decision E/1985/L.50, entitled "Israeli economic practices in the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories" and said that the delegations of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, India and Pakistan had asked to be included as sponsors.

55. Mr. HARAN (Observer for Israel) urged the members of the Council not to adopt draft decision E/1985/L.50, which took note "with concern" of the report of the Secretary-General (E/1985/105) prepared in implementation of General Assembly decision 39/442. Since the report had been considered in detail at the 43rd plenary meeting, he would simply point out that paragraph 3 recalled that the legal expert, in his study of the same issue submitted to the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly the previous year (E/1983/85, annex), had concluded that the exact content and relation to other principles of international law of the right of peoples and nations to permanent sovereignty over their natural resources had "yet to be fully developed and defined". The only principle of international law recognized and binding in the circumstances was that set out in article 55 of the Hague Regulations annexed to the Hague Convention IV of 1907 respecting the Laws and Customs of War on Land; under that provision, the occupying State would be regarded as usufructuary of the properties situated in the occupied country. Israel was indeed limiting itself in the occupied Arab territories to the usufruct of the properties situated in the occupied country. In short, the legal expert was simply making a study *de lege ferenda*.

56. The Council also had before it at the current session four reports on the territories occupied by Israel; in the circumstances, he wondered whether it was useful to ask the Secretary-General to prepare a further report which would be as repetitive as the preceding ones. He asked what new information could be given by a report on the trade practices of the Israeli occupation authorities when the previous report on the living conditions of the Palestinian people in the occupied Palestinian territories had already indicated that "exports to Jordan ... are limited by the requirement that the raw material used in the manufacture should originate in the occupied territories" (see E/1983/77, para. 94).

57. Mr. ABU KOASH (Palestine Liberation Organization) said that the Observer for Israel was wrong in involving article 55 of the Hague Regulations, which expressly stated that "the occupying State" should be regarded only as the "administrator" of the occupied territories. Israel had actually annexed 65 per cent of the occupied territories and all of the Golan Heights,

violating not only article 55 of the Hague Regulations but also article 49 of the fourth Geneva Convention, of 1949, which prohibited the forcible transfer of persons from occupied territory, and article 53 of the same Convention, which prohibited the occupying Power from destroying real or personal property belonging to private persons in the occupied territories. International law prohibited occupation from becoming permanent and under no circumstances did it authorize the occupying Power to arrogate to itself the right to dispose as it pleased of the occupied territories. He urged all members of the Council to adopt draft decision E/1985/L.50 by consensus.

58. Mr. BARAKAT (Observer for Jordan) said that it was of the greatest importance that the Council should adopt the draft decision by consensus since the practices of the occupying Power in the occupied Arab territories did indeed call for the study requested in the draft decision. There were abundant instances of the manner in which the occupying Power sought to choke off all economic activity in the occupied territories.

59. Mr. AL-MIRDASS (Saudi Arabia) said that it was to be expected that the representative of the entity occupying the Arab territories should print a picture of the situation in those territories which was completely contrary to the facts. He unreservedly supported the comments of the Observer for the PLO and, on behalf of the sponsors of draft decision E/1985/L.50 which should also include Jordan, he proposed that the Council should adopt the draft by consensus.

60. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) requested that the draft decision should be put to the vote.

61. Mr. AL-MIRDASS (Saudi Arabia) said that he hoped that the representative of the United States could support the unanimous view of world public opinion and join the consensus on the draft decision.

At the request of the representative of Saudi Arabia, a vote was taken by roll-call.

Yugoslavia, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Colombia, Congo, Ecuador, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guinea, Haiti, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Japan, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

Draft decision E/1985/L.50 was adopted by 49 votes to one (decision 1985/177).

* Resumed from the 45th meeting.

62. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) said that he would have liked to have had a balanced and impartial report, submitted to the competent authority, on the financial and trade practices of the Israeli occupation authorities. Unfortunately, the mandate given to the Secretary-General in the decision just adopted would not allow him to prepare such a report. Every year, on the issue of the revitalization of the Council, delegations talked endlessly but did nothing concrete. The elimination of reports of the type requested in the text adopted would be a step in the right direction.

63. Mr. AL-MIRDASS (Saudi Arabia), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the draft decision E/1985/L.50, thanked all members of the Council for having supported it almost unanimously, thus giving the lie to Israel's allegations.

64. The PRESIDENT said that the delegations could take the floor in use of their right of reply when the Council's work had been completed.

AGENDA ITEM 3

General discussion of international economic and social policy, including regional and sectoral developments (concluded*) (E/1985/L.49, E/1985/L.51, E/1985/L.52, E/1985/L.55, E/1985/L.56)

65. Mr. HARLAND (New Zealand) noted that the Committee for Development Planning, in chapter III of the report on its twenty-first session (E/1985/29) on the identification of the least developed among the developing countries, had reached the conclusion that Vanuatu qualified for inclusion in the list of the least developed countries on the basis of the existing criteria and in the light of the available data. That conclusion was extremely satisfactory. New Zealand was, however, disappointed to learn that the Committee had decided to reserve its decision on Tuvalu and Kiribati until a new set of criteria had been established. Those two small island States were experiencing serious difficulties which would more than justify their inclusion in the list of the least developed countries. His delegation hoped that the Committee would keep their case under consideration and that the Secretariat would remain in contact with the two Governments in order to inform them of the action taken over that issue.

Draft decisions E/1985/L.51 and E/1985/L.52: Long-term trends in economic development

66. Mr. KUMLIN (Sweden) (Vice-President of the Council) introduced draft decision E/1985/L.51, prepared following informal consultations which he had had on draft decision E/1985/L.46, submitted by the delegation of Poland. The participants in those consultations had not had time to consider the Secretary-General's report on the overall socio-economic perspective of the world economy to the year 2000 (E/1985/102) in sufficient detail, and had considered

that it should be submitted to the General Assembly at its fortieth session for consideration and an appropriate decision. It was to that end that he was submitting draft decision E/1985/L.51 to the Council. Many participants in the consultations hoped that the Secretary-General could submit a full report on the overall socio-economic perspective of the world economy to the General Assembly at its fortieth session, and he had therefore decided to submit draft decision E/1985/L.52 to supplement draft decision E/1985/L.51.

Draft decision E/1985/L.51 was adopted (decision 1985/178).

Draft decision E/1985/L.52 was adopted (decision 1985/179).

Draft decision E/1985/L.55: International economic security: a major condition for accelerating the economic decolonization of developing countries

67. Mr. KUMLIN (Sweden) (Vice-President of the Council) submitted draft decision E/1985/L.55, prepared following informal consultations which he had held on draft decision E/1985/L.47, submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and containing a draft resolution which the General Assembly had been recommended to adopt. The participants in the consultations had not had time to consider the draft in detail but many of them had found the issues raised to be of interest. He had therefore decided to propose that the Council should refer the issues raised in the previously mentioned draft resolution to the General Assembly for consideration and decision, and he hoped that draft decision E/1985/L.55 could be adopted by consensus.

Draft decision E/1985/L.55 was adopted (decision 1985/180).

Draft decision E/1985/L.56: Conducting constructive and action-oriented international economic negotiations

68. Mr. KUMLIN (Sweden) (Vice-President of the Council) introduced draft decision E/1985/L.56, prepared following informal consultations which he had held on draft resolution E/1985/L.48, submitted by the German Democratic Republic. The consultations had taken up several meetings, and a large number of proposals had been considered. Once again, time had been too short, but an agreement seemed imminent. The participants in the consultations had therefore agreed to submit draft resolution E/1985/L.48 to the General Assembly at its fortieth session so that consideration of it could continue and an appropriate decision be taken.

69. The PRESIDENT said that he would wait until a new version of the text had been distributed before inviting the Council to take a decision on draft decision E/1985/L.56.

Draft resolution E/1985/L.49: Alternative formats of meetings of the Economic and Social Council

70. The PRESIDENT said that the delegations of

* Resumed from the 44th meeting.

Jamaica, Japan and New Zealand had joined the sponsors of draft resolution E/1985/L.49.

71. Mr. FAURE (France) said that the Council was already familiar with the substance of draft resolution E/1985/L.49, since it had had before it a similar document at the end of its second regular session for 1984. On the present occasion, the Council had been able to hold informal consultations on the text under consideration. Unfortunately, no argument put forward had expressed the doubts which the French delegation had already raised concerning the previous text. The authors of the draft had said that it was a matter of revitalizing the Council. The Council, however, could not meet at any time other than during the summer, in other words, following the meetings of its subsidiary bodies; it seemed logical that that meeting should be held at Geneva, since the Council was responsible for co-ordination within the system and nearly all the institutions were located in Europe. In those circumstances it was difficult to understand why the Council should ask the Secretary-General to prepare a report on formats of meetings which did not seem to be justified.

72. The draft resolution invoked questions of principle which were also political issues; for his part he would wish to maintain the geographical and linguistic balance of the regions where the main United Nations bodies met, and the Council was the only body set up under the Charter of the United Nations which met at Geneva. General Assembly resolution 31/140 on the pattern of conferences continued to be as valid as when it had been adopted in 1976. By asking the Secretary-General for the report mentioned in the draft resolution, the Council would call in question the decisions which had been taken at the beginning of the Organization's existence by the General Assembly itself and would upset the delicate balance established with regard to the venues for meetings.

73. Mr. FAREED (Observer for Pakistan) recalled that two years previously an oral report had been submitted on that issue. He had re-read what had been said during the discussions on that occasion in order to understand the motives for the submission of the draft resolution under consideration, and had been principally struck by a sentence contained in that document which conveyed an almost general feeling that a change of attitude was needed. What was important was to determine the extent to which member States were prepared to use the Economic and Social Council positively and constructively. After the adoption of draft decision E/1985/L.50, the representative of the United States had observed that the members of the Council paid little heed to the principles set out for its revitalization and continued to request reports; but he himself had done that very thing in draft resolution E/1985/L.49.

74. Behind it all there were manifest political problems which must be resolved before asking the Secretary-General to report on possible practical implications.

The Secretary-General could not take a political decision for the members of the Council; the only thing that he could do was to submit to them a report on the administrative and financial implications of a political decision which they themselves had taken. Over and above the issues of periodicity and the venue for Council meetings, which were only of incidental importance, the aim must be to reach agreement on how the Council should work. When the members of the Council had agreed on that point, his delegation would have no difficulty in asking the Secretary-General for a report on the practical implications. It would even be ready to propose an amendment to draft resolution E/1985/L.49 in order to add possibilities which did not appear in it, such as holding a session in a developing country or at Vienna. It should not be forgotten that the aim was to allow the Council better to perform the duties entrusted to it under Chapters IX and X of the Charter and, particularly, to make it capable of promoting the rapid establishment of a new international economic order. The Secretary-General should be asked to consider means of strengthening certain sectors of the secretariat as the President of the Economic and Social Council, Mr. da Costa, had proposed in his oral report in 1983. He therefore considered that the draft resolution under consideration was incomplete since it referred only to a limited aspect of the problem. In conclusion, he proposed that no decision should be taken on the draft resolution and asked for article 67, paragraph 2, of the rules of procedure to be applied.

75. Mr. PIRSON (Observer for Belgium) said that he shared the views expressed by the representative of France and the Observer for Pakistan. He recalled that 40 years previously the General Assembly had had a lengthy discussion on where the Headquarters of the Organization should be situated and when it had taken its decision it had at the same time decided that an important United Nations body, the Economic and Social Council, would hold its sessions in Europe. By that decision, the General Assembly had endeavoured to establish a balance between the United States of America and Europe, and it would not be appropriate for that political compromise reached by the General Assembly to be called in question by the Economic and Social Council. If certain member States thought that that decision no longer fitted the circumstances, they should inform the General Assembly, which would consider the issue. His delegation therefore considered that the Council should not take a decision on draft resolution E/1985/L.49.

76. Mr. TELLO (Mexico) said that the proposal before the Council had been submitted in good faith by its sponsors. They were merely asking the Secretary-General to give them some practical information which would help them to make a start on the process of revitalizing the Council. They were not prejudging the results of the report which they had requested, but merely wished to analyse the situation on the basis of that report. With regard to the various possibilities mentioned in the draft, he said they were taken from the oral

report made by Mr. da Costa, President of the Council. The reason why Pakistan's proposals did not appear in it was either that they had not yet been made at the time or that President da Costa had not considered them feasible. The arguments put forward by the delegations of France and Belgium would be taken into account by the Secretary-General. The sponsors of the draft resolution under consideration only intended the Council to take a decision on the request to the Secretary-General and for that reason he opposed the application of article 67, paragraph 2, of the rules of procedure.

77. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) said that the representative of Pakistan had—surprisingly—made a poor choice of comparison in endeavouring to draw a parallel between draft decision E/1985/L.50 and draft resolution E/1985/L.49, since the two texts were not of the same kind. While the former concerned questions which did not fall within the competence of the Council, the second dealt with improving that body's methods of work. His delegation still could not understand why certain member States opposed the latter draft.

78. Mr. CHOWDHURY (Bangladesh) observed that the Council was continuing to waste its time, instead of devoting itself to the task entrusted to it of improving its methods of work. Everything said showed that each speaker was maintaining his own point of view, and he therefore formally proposed the application of article 67, paragraph 2, of the rules of procedure.

79. Mr. HARLAND (New Zealand) agreed with those who considered that decisions taken in the past should be respected, but pointed out that many things had changed since then and that the Organization, which had been a sort of small private club of 51 Members when the decision had been taken in 1945, had become an almost universal body of 159 countries. It was also surprising that those decisions as a whole had never been called in question. In any event, the draft under consideration was not intended to prejudge the issue but merely to ask the Secretary-General to report on the practical consequences of the various possibilities set out in the text. His country considered that the Council would work more efficiently if it met only once a year in New York. No one could claim that the efficiency of the Council depended solely on the periodicity and the venue of its meetings. In order to make its activity more efficient, however, it was necessary to begin by making changes, even if they did not involve fundamental aspects.

80. Regarding the motion submitted by the representative of Bangladesh, his delegation recalled that it was the third year that the draft under consideration had been submitted and that so far its opponents had not allowed the Council to take any decision on it. His delegation therefore asked members of the Council to agree that there should be a vote on the draft, if only for reasons of fair play.

81. Mr. LEE (Canada) said that the Canadian delegation had no objection to the Secretary-General being

asked to prepare a report on the practical implications of the various possibilities set out in the text under consideration and did not consider that it was prejudging the issue. His delegation therefore supported draft resolution E/1985/L.49 and opposed any effort to postpone the decision on it.

82. Mr. MALIK (India) said he had no objection to the Secretary-General being asked to prepare reports, provided that the requests were justified. In the case in question, he did not quite understand why the report had been requested; moreover, the text submitted seemed to him to prejudge the results of the study requested from the Secretary-General. The periodicity and venue of the sessions of the Council were not the basic problem to be settled in order to improve the efficiency of its work. His delegation would be prepared to support a text requesting the Secretary-General to prepare a report on ways of genuinely improving the Council's consideration of issues so that it could become the efficient body it was supposed to be under the Charter. His delegation considered that the draft in question was at best premature and that it might give rise to all kinds of problems. It therefore requested the Council to take a decision supporting the motion submitted by Pakistan and Bangladesh.

83. Mr. GAMBOA ALDER (Colombia) said that as his country was one of the sponsors of the draft resolution under consideration, and in view of the fact that the draft merely asked the Secretary-General to prepare a report, something which in no sense prejudged the substance of the issue, he hoped that the members of the Council would decide to vote on the text and support it.

84. Mr. FAURE (France) supported the motion submitted by Bangladesh and Pakistan, and endorsed by India. The French delegation considered that an answer had not yet been given to the questions raised by the draft submitted and it was still not sure whether the report requested would be on the revitalization of the Council. According to the statement by the representative of New Zealand, what was involved seemed, rather, to be the calling in question of a balance which had been established by the General Assembly long before.

85. Mr. BAHADIAN (Brazil), referring to the comment by the representative of France that an answer had not yet been given to the questions raised by the text under consideration, said that the only way of answering the questions was to discuss them. It was therefore regrettable that the application of article 67, paragraph 2, of the rules of procedure would end discussion before it had even begun.

86. Mr. ZOLLER (Observer for Australia) said that, like the representative of Brazil, he regretted the application of any procedure which would prevent a discussion on that issue. Having read the text under consideration, his delegation asked to be added to the list of sponsors.

87. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to take a decision on the motion submitted by Pakistan and Bangladesh.

The vote was taken by roll-call.

Lebanon, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called on to vote first.

In favour: Bangladesh, Botswana, Bulgaria, Congo, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guinea, India, Luxembourg, Poland, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Spain, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uganda, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Ecuador, Finland, Iceland, Japan, Lebanon, Mexico, New Zealand, United States of America, Venezuela.

Abstaining: Algeria, China, Haiti, Indonesia, Malaysia, Netherlands, Nigeria, Romania, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Thailand, Turkey.

The motion submitted by Pakistan and Bangladesh was adopted by 22 votes to 13, with 12 abstentions.

88. Mr. VAN SCHAİK (Netherlands) said that his delegation had abstained, as it had done the previous year, in the vote on the motion requesting the application of article 67, paragraph 2, of the rules of procedure, in connection with a text dealing with alternative formats of meetings of the Economic and Social Council. It wished once again to express its concern at the fact that the Council had not succeeded in resolving that question. It was absolutely essential, as the Netherlands had frequently stressed, that the Council should consider the problems affecting its operation in greater detail and that it should take appropriate steps. Draft resolution E/1985/L.49 raised a number of complex and delicate issues. His delegation considered that the periodicity and the venue of Council sessions was only a single aspect of the problem and that it was essential systematically to consider the operation of the Council as a whole. It did not believe that the type of report requested from the Secretary-General in the text under consideration would increase the efficiency of the Council's work. Furthermore, the General Assembly might also wish to give the Council guidelines in that regard, and it was therefore for that body initially to concern itself with the problem.

89. Mr. FAREED (Observer for Pakistan), replying to two points raised during the discussion, noted that some members of the Council seemed to consider that it had not had an opportunity to discuss the issue. That was not the case, since the issue had certainly been discussed under the chairmanship of the Vice-President of the Council, Mr. Kumlin. All delegations had at that time had an opportunity to express their points of view and if other consultations had been necessary they could have been organized. The divergences were so great, however, that Mr. Kumlin had obviously not considered it useful to do so. With reference to the question of fair play, he pointed out that in deciding not to vote

on the draft under consideration the Council had also taken a decision on the substance of the proposal.

90. Mr. LUNA (Colombia) said that he respected the wish of the majority of the Council expressed in the vote, but considered that delegations which sincerely sought to revitalize the work of the Council should continue their efforts to ensure that the question raised in draft resolution E/1985/L.49 was studied in a neutral and objective manner. He also invited delegations which had voted for the motion of Pakistan and Bangladesh to consider the basic meaning of the result of the vote and to ask themselves whether it did not indicate a loss of vitality on the part of the Council which should be corrected.

91. Mr. KOROMA (Sierra Leone) said that, if he had understood correctly, the object of draft resolution E/1985/L.49 was the revitalization of the Council. Unfortunately, no link between that revitalization and the periodicity and venue of Council meetings had been established and his delegation was not convinced that such a link actually did exist, even if the sponsors of the text submitted said that they had not had an opportunity to defend their standpoint. He shared the opinion of the delegation of the Netherlands that it was the broader issue of the efficiency of the Council which should be considered. He therefore thought that it might be preferable not to continue to consider the issue every year and that it would certainly be more worthwhile to submit it to another United Nations body such as the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization.

92. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should adopt the following draft decision concerning the reports considered under item 3:

“The Economic and Social Council takes note of:

“(a) *World Economic Survey 1985: Current trends and policies in the world economy* (E/1985/54);

“(b) *Economic and social survey of Asia and the Pacific, 1984* (summary) (E/1985/66);

“(c) *Survey of economic and social developments in the Economic Commission for Western Asia region, 1984* (summary) (E/1985/77);

“(d) *Survey of economic and social conditions in Africa, 1983-1984* (summary) (E/1985/81);

“(e) *Survey of economic and social conditions in Latin America and the Caribbean, 1984* (summary) (E/1985/98);

“(f) *Economic survey of Europe, 1984-1985* (summary) (E/1985/101);

“(g) *Report of the Committee for Development Planning on its twenty-first and resumed twenty-first sessions* (E/1985/29);

“(h) *Report of the Secretary-General on the overall socio-economic perspective of the world economy to the year 2000* (E/1985/102).”

The draft decision presented orally was adopted (decision 1985/182).

93. Mr. CHOWDHURY (Bangladesh), referring to the report of the Committee for Development Planning (E/1985/29), said that his delegation endorsed the New Zealand representative's statement and considered that CDP had failed to carry out the wishes of the Council and the Assembly in not recommending that Kiribati and Tuvalu should be eligible for inclusion in the list of least developed countries. It was a matter of serious concern, in view of the forthcoming global mid-term review of the Substantial New Programme of Action for the 1980s for the Least Developed Countries that CDP should have chosen to express scepticism about the existing criteria for determining the eligibility of countries for inclusion in the list of least developed countries. It would have been more helpful to have suggested ways of improving the conditions of the least developed countries through implementation of the new Programme.

94. Mr. FIELD (United Kingdom) agreed with the representatives of New Zealand and Bangladesh.

95. Mr. FAREED (Observer for Pakistan) also concurred with the previous speakers, but pointed out that the Assembly had not yet responded to CDP's request in its reports on recent sessions for directions concerning the review of existing criteria for eligibility.

96. Mr. ZOLLER (Observer of Australia) said that Australia was keenly aware of the desperate poverty of the two countries and hoped CDP's decision would be reconsidered at an early opportunity.

97. Mr. CHOWDHURY (Bangladesh) observed that, in every request by the Assembly or the Council to CDP to consider the eligibility of countries for inclusion in the list of least developed countries, it had been reiterated that the existing criteria were to be the basis of appraisal. In other words, CDP had been given directions.

98. The PRESIDENT remarked that the views expressed would be noted in the summary record.

99. He invited the Council to consider draft decision E/1985/L.56, by which the Council would decide to transmit the text of draft resolution E/1985/L.48 to the General Assembly at its fortieth session.

100. In response to the remark by Mr. ORLANDO (United States of America) regarding draft resolution E/1985/L.57, which the United States had sponsored, he said that, with the agreement of its sponsor, no action would be taken on this draft resolution, but that the proposals it contained would be reflected in the Council's report.

Draft decision E/1985/L.56 was adopted (decision 1985/181).

101. The PRESIDENT summarized the general discussion, under agenda item 3, in which special emphasis had been given to international co-operation in the interrelated areas of money, finance, debt and trade.

102. Although the fundamental positions of many member States might not have changed much since the

previous year, the debate had reflected some changes in attitudes in both developed and developing countries. There was full recognition of the crucial links of international trade with economic development and technical progress and of the need to reverse protectionist trends, as well as general agreement on the need for greater international monetary and financial stability. Greater stress had been placed on domestic policies, either because they had profound repercussions on other countries or because they were decisive to development performance. There was wide concern about the economic impact of the arms race and the political tensions it caused. The debt crisis had shown the need for greater coherence in monetary, trade and financial policies and many delegations seemed to think it had been useful to discuss those issues together. As some delegations had pointed out, the new elements had contributed to a measure of convergence. Although views about policy conclusions differed, he would like to suggest to the Assembly that the convergence should be fostered.

103. In 1984 the world economy had revived, led by vigorous recovery in the United States of America. World trade had made an impressive 9 per cent increase; but many developing countries continued to face serious development problems in a still difficult international economic environment. The Council had considered the policy challenges posed by the expected decline in the growth rate of developed market economies and world trade in the immediate future, as well as measures to further stability and development in the medium and long term. Some delegations had stressed the importance of enhancing economic security and confidence-building in international economic relations, which they would like to restructure to establish a new international economic order.

104. Growth potential and capacity for structural adjustment were largely determined by national policies, although even the largest countries' prosperity depended on world trade and capital flow, making national policy a matter of concern to others, as the major economic Powers must recognize. Co-operation through the Bretton Woods institutions, as well as in GATT, UNCTAD and regional bodies, were of special importance for correcting unsustainable economic imbalances. Some successes in Asia showed that a developing country's domestic economic performance affected ability to attract external resources, private or official.

105. Many delegations had called for a new round of multilateral trade negotiations in GATT to complete the Tokyo Round and consider the implementation of commitments undertaken at the thirty-eighth session at Ministerial level of GATT in 1982 and discussed at the sixth session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. It was widely agreed that GATT rules should be strengthened and should incorporate sectoral arrangements negotiated outside the legal framework of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. A start should be made on careful preparation of a new round of multilateral trade negotiations

whose scope must reflect all countries' interests. Parallel efforts must be made to reduce exchange-rate instability which added to investment and trade uncertainties and accentuated protectionism and resource misallocation. Implementation of the Common Fund for Commodities and of commodity agreements had been urged, to assist developing countries. The genuine controversy surrounding the Compensatory Financing Facility and many other issues should be faced frankly in future discussions.

106. Greater monetary stability could be attained through mutually consistent economic policies in key countries, better multilateral surveillance, the removal of unjustifiable barriers and structural rigidities and central bank intervention where appropriate. International liquidity was largely acquired through credit arrangements, which introduced an element of flexibility, but the system depended on countries' creditworthiness. Some countries could "earn" creditworthiness through increased exports and sound domestic policies but others had no access to private credit and depended largely on other sources of finance. Moreover, the terms reflected not only the borrower's policies and performances but those of the major industrialized countries. In that field too, therefore, there was a case for enhanced economic policy co-ordination among key countries. A number of delegations had urged a new allocation of SDRs and a further increase of IMF resources.

107. While the need to improve the functioning of the international monetary and financial system was widely recognized, continuing discussion in the United Nations and other forums was required to narrow the differences between those who advocated an international conference and those who expected adequate results from efforts within IMF.

108. Although the primary importance of the developing countries' own efforts to increase domestic savings and apply resources to priority areas was unquestioned, the need was recognized for increased public and private foreign capital flows. There was less agreement about the enlargement of the resources of multilateral financial institutions, but many countries were ready to consider a general increase in World Bank capital and a further replenishment of IDA and IFAD. The need for better co-ordination of development assistance by donors and recipients had been underlined. However better resource utilization was not a substitute for an increased volume of aid. The value of United Nations operational activities, such as those of UNDP, UNICEF and UNFPA, was undisputed and more contributions were called for.

109. It was generally recognized that the low-income developing countries, particularly those of sub-Saharan Africa, required increased levels of highly concessional ODA. The consensus commitments of the Substantial New Programme of Action for the 1980s for the Least Developed Countries should be fully implemented. For low middle-income countries not qualifying for concessional financing but with limited access to commercial

credit, the opening of a World Bank "third window" should be considered. The potential contribution of foreign direct investment, under conditions dictated by national policies, in transferring capital as well as technology and skills to developing countries should not be overlooked. Short-term adjustment measures should, it was generally agreed, be compatible with long-term growth and the resumption of private and public investment. The recent net transfer of resources from developing to developed countries should be reversed and Governments and international organizations should make every effort to prevent adjustment from having adverse social effects such as rising unemployment, malnutrition and child mortality.

110. It was widely recognized that the debt problem had to be approached in the broader context of trade and monetary relations as well as development finance, in view of the impact of high real interest rates, exchange-rate instability, financial stringency, depressed commodity markets and creeping protectionism on the developing countries' debt-servicing capacity. Sustained and co-ordinated efforts by debtors, creditors, multilateral institutions and commercial banks were required. Positive developments such as a multi-year rescheduling with lower costs should be encouraged and further measures considered, such as longer repayment and grace periods, interest-rate capping, a compensatory interest-rate facility, the linking of service payments to export earnings, and easier conditions for the use of IMF and World Bank resources and their enlargement. The cancellation or readjustment of ODA debt of the least developed countries by some donor countries was encouraging. The difference between advocates of the current case-by-case approach and proponents of a more general intergovernmental dialogue between creditors and debtors was more apparent than real.

111. Many delegations had voiced concern about an "erosion of multilateralism". It had been stressed that the United Nations offered the only world forum for considering policy issues relating to ways of making national and international measures concerning inter-related economic problems more coherent. At the same time it had been emphasized that specific issues had to be discussed and negotiated in the appropriate specialized bodies. The topics of major concern to Member States, to which he had referred earlier, must continue to be tackled in the Council, the Assembly and other appropriate United Nations forums with a view to effective international economic co-operation.

112. The discussion had benefited from being relatively sharply focused on areas where there seemed to be a basis for pursuing efforts towards common solutions, so that constructive dialogue could be maintained and promoted.

113. Mr. MALIK (India) said that his delegation generally endorsed the President's observations, but felt the text should be regarded as a statement, not a summary.

114. Mr. SEKULIĆ (Yugoslavia) agreed. He proposed that the Council should forward the text as a statement to the General Assembly for consideration at its fortieth session.

115. Mr. CHOWDHURY (Bangladesh) supported that proposal.

116. Mr. WANG Baoliu (China), Mr. MALIK (India), Mr. FIELD (United Kingdom) and Mr. GAJENTAAN (Netherlands) concurred.

117. Mr. KOROMA (Sierra Leone) agreed, but suggested that a sentence should be added to the text referring to the attention given to the critical economic situation in Africa, although that topic had also been the subject of a separate item on the Council's agenda.

118. Mr. MAKEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation endorsed some of the President's observations but could not agree with all of them. In its view, the summary was a statement made by the President in his personal capacity. On that basis, it had no objection to the Yugoslav representative's proposal.

119. Mr. ORLANDO (United States of America) said that his delegation supported the President's statement.

120. The PRESIDENT said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council agreed to forward the text as a statement to the General Assembly for consideration at its fortieth session.

It was so decided (decision 1985/183).

121. The PRESIDENT announced that the Council had concluded its consideration of agenda item 3.

AGENDA ITEM 17

Special economic, humanitarian and disaster relief assistance

REPORT OF THE THIRD (PROGRAMME AND CO-ORDINATION) COMMITTEE (E/1985/139)

122. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to take action on the draft resolution and on the two draft decisions which the Third Committee had recommended to the Council for adoption in paragraphs 13 and 14 of its report (E/1985/139).

Draft resolution: Assistance for the reconstruction and development of Lebanon

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 1985/56).

Draft decision I: Reports of the Secretary-General relating to special economic, humanitarian and disaster relief assistance

The draft decision was adopted (decision 1985/184).

Draft decision II: Oral reports relating to special economic, humanitarian and disaster relief assistance

The draft decision was adopted (decision 1985/185).

123. The PRESIDENT announced that the Council had concluded its examination of agenda item 17.

AGENDA ITEM 18

Operational activities for development

REPORT OF THE THIRD (PROGRAMME AND CO-ORDINATION) COMMITTEE (E/1985/140)

124. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to take action on the draft decision which the Third Committee had recommended to the Council for adoption in paragraph 10 of its report (E/1985/140).

Draft decision: Reports considered by the Economic and Social Council in connection with the question of operational activities for development

The draft decision was adopted (decision E/1985/186).

125. The PRESIDENT announced that the Council had concluded its examination of agenda item 18.

AGENDA ITEM 21

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations

REPORT OF THE THIRD (PROGRAMME AND CO-ORDINATION) COMMITTEE (E/1985/138)

126. The PRESIDENT drew attention to the three draft resolutions in paragraph 32 of the Third Committee's report (E/1985/138). He invited the Council to consider draft resolution I, which had been approved by the Committee by 43 votes to 1 in a roll-call vote.

Draft resolution I: Assistance to the Palestinian People

127. Mr. HARAN (Observer for Israel) remarked that draft resolution I drew attention to the need for assistance to the Palestinian people only. It should be noted that in a report issued in June 1985 on assistance to the Palestinian people, UNDP had stated that mobilization of additional funds was a matter of urgency, since the project pipeline approved by all parties concerned contained some \$50 million worth of potential activities.

128. Mr. BARAKAT (Observer for Jordan) said that draft resolution I was extremely important in that it would provide an occasion for assistance to the Palestinian people, particularly those in the territories oc-

cupied by Israel, whose authorities would not otherwise allow the channelling of any aid to that people.

At the request of the representative of Saudi Arabia, a vote was taken by roll-call on draft resolution I.

Lebanon, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Congo, Ecuador, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Japan, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

The draft resolution was adopted by 44 votes to 1 (resolution 1985/57).

129. Mr. MARTIN (Luxembourg), speaking on behalf of the member countries of EEC, said that they had supported draft resolution I as a whole, since they attached great importance to humanitarian assistance to the Palestinian people through tried and tested complementary instruments. Such aid comprised food and emergency supplies as well as co-financing in collaboration with relevant non-governmental organizations. The resolution should have the effect of benefiting the Palestinian people in the occupied territories and elsewhere. The EEC countries would continue their efforts, both directly and through the United Nations system, to provide the best possible response to the Palestinian people's emergency needs.

130. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft resolution II, the text of which had been approved by roll-call vote by the Committee by 40 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

Draft resolution II: Economic development projects in the occupied Palestinian territories

131. In response to an observation by Mr. DE ROJAS (Venezuela), he requested delegations to reserve their statements, including explanations of vote, relating to the draft resolutions and decisions submitted for consideration under agenda item 21 until action had been taken on the texts.

132. Mr. HARAN (Observer for Israel) said that draft resolution II was based on false premises, particularly in regard to the call for a seaport in the occupied Gaza Strip. Trade in the occupied territories was being restricted not by Israel but by its Arab neighbours. In annex III, paragraph 30, of his report to the International Labour Conference at its seventy-first session, dealing with his mission to the occupied territories, the Director-General of the International Labour Office

had stated that the situation in the Gaza Strip, where 40 per cent of agricultural production consisted of citrus fruits, faced permanent difficulties because of the closure of the Egyptian markets and intermittent closures of Jordanian markets. Israel had already pointed out to the Secretary-General, in its letter dated 24 May 1985 annexed to document E/1985/116, that General Assembly resolution 39/223 was biased and politically motivated, the sponsors having falsely accused Israel of imposing arbitrary economic restrictions in the administered territories, in deliberate disregard of the inhabitants' improved welfare and Israel's action to foster economic growth there. The ports of Ashdod and Haifa were fully open to the inhabitants of Judea, Samaria and the Gaza District, and all development projects were considered solely on their economic merit. The experts who had reported on living conditions of the Palestinian people in the occupied Palestinian territories had seemingly ignored such circumstances when proposing possible remedies and measures (E/1985/99, paras. 46 and 47). Establishment of a citrus plant in the occupied Gaza Strip had in fact been approved and the establishment of a cement plant in the occupied West Bank was bound to depend on fuel-supply security, which would be no problem if the Arab States lifted the oil boycott imposed on the administered territory.

133. Mr. BARAKAT (Observer for Jordan) said that although he would have preferred to comply with the President's request, a reply must be made to the previous speaker in regard to a text of such great importance for the Palestinian people in the occupied territories.

134. Mr. ABU-KOASH (Palestine Liberation Organization) said that the Israeli authorities had stated that a citrus plant could be established in the Gaza Strip on condition that the plant was obtained from Israel, the produce was not marketed in Israel and Israel's produce should have access to Arab markets. With regard to the establishment of a cement plant in the West Bank, Israel had permitted Federal German consultants to undertake a feasibility study, presumably in order to demonstrate that the project was not viable, and must have been taken aback to be informed that it was. With regard to port outlets, Israel controlled 90 per cent of the occupied Palestinian territory's foreign trade. World public opinion had reiterated that Palestinian trade should be completely free of Israeli restrictions, and indeed that the territory should be free of Israeli occupation.

135. He was in a position to refute the Israeli delegation's contentions, having personally studied the situation in conjunction with the UNDP Resident Representative. But for Israel's restrictions on project implementation the Palestinians would not, in fact, require help from UNDP, which in any case could provide only what Israel allowed. Since 1979 UNDP had spent less than \$4 million in the occupied territories, compared to a single donation by an Arab prince, in 1985, of \$1 million for a sewage project in the occupied territories. It was time for UNDP to refute the false claims about Israel's ef-

forts to promote development in the occupied territories.

136. Israel's claim to be a prosperous nation able to foster growth in the occupied territories compared ill with its excuse that economic problems prevented it from helping the African countries beset by crisis. Israel's economy was suffering from galloping inflation and a huge budget deficit, as well as foreign debts amounting to over \$20 billion. Its United States paymasters, however, seemed willing to go on funding it to the extent of \$4.5 billion or more a year. Israel's plight was reflected in a recent doubling of air fares, the purpose being not to generate revenue, as claimed, but to hinder emigration to the United States of America and Europe. The authorities, far from being apt to foster growth in the occupied territories, were striving to prevent development which might be a source of competition. The Observer for Israel should give straightforward answers to the questions raised during the Council's deliberations instead of seeking to divert attention by reference to other United Nations forums.

A vote was taken by roll-call on draft resolution II.

Indonesia, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, China, Congo, Ecuador, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Japan, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Suriname, Thailand, Turkey, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Canada, Finland, Iceland, Sweden.

The draft resolution was adopted by 41 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions (resolution 1985/58).

137. After a procedural discussion in which Mr. ORLANDO (United States of America), Mr. KOROMA (Sierra Leone), Mr. HARAN (Observer for Israel) and Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Council) took part, the PRESIDENT suggested that the meeting should be suspended and resumed the following day to conclude consideration of agenda item 21.

It was so decided.

The meeting was suspended at 9.30 p.m. and resumed on Friday, 26 July 1985, at 3.20 p.m.

138. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider draft resolution III, which the Third Committee had recommended for adoption to the Council in paragraph 32 of its report (E/1985/138).

Draft resolution III: Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the

international institutions associated with the United Nations

At the request of the representative of the United Kingdom, a separate vote was taken on the seventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution III.

The seventh preambular paragraph was adopted by 31 votes to 2, with 8 abstentions.

At the request of the representative of the United Kingdom, a separate vote was taken on the thirteenth preambular paragraph.

At the request of the representative of Zimbabwe, the vote on the thirteenth preambular paragraph was taken by roll-call.

Turkey, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Lebanon, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Suriname, Thailand, Turkey, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Botswana, Canada, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Spain, Sweden.

The thirteenth preambular paragraph was adopted by 31 votes to 2, with 12 abstentions.

At the request of the representative of the United Kingdom, separate votes were taken on operative paragraphs 3, 6, 7 and 9.

Operative paragraph 3 was adopted by 31 votes to 2, with 8 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 6 was adopted by 33 votes to 2, with 9 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 7 was adopted by 36 votes to 2, with 8 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 9 was adopted by 35 votes to 3, with 11 abstentions.

At the request of the representative of Zimbabwe, a vote was taken by roll-call on draft resolution III as a whole.

Luxembourg, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Lebanon, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The draft resolution, as a whole, was adopted by 39 votes to 1, with 9 abstentions (resolution 1985/59).

139. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to take action on the draft decision which the Third Committee had recommended to the Council for adoption in paragraph 33 of its report (E/1985/138).

Draft decision: Report of the Secretary-General on economic development projects in the occupied Palestinian territories

The draft decision was adopted (decision 1985/187).

140. Mr. CHOWDHURY (Bangladesh) said that if the delegation of Bangladesh had been present during the voting on the seventh and thirteenth preambular paragraphs and operative paragraphs 3, 6 and 7, it would have voted in favour of them, as it had done for paragraph 9 and for draft resolution III as a whole.

141. Mr. Gervais CHARLES (Haiti) said that if the delegation of Haiti had been present at the time of the voting on draft resolution III, it would have voted for the various preambular paragraphs and operative paragraphs, and for draft resolution III as a whole.

142. Mr. BAKALOV (Bulgaria), speaking on behalf of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, said that they had all voted for draft resolution III because they supported the exercise by the people of Namibia of its right to self-determination on the basis of the maintenance of territorial unity and integrity, the immediate and total withdrawal from Namibia of the South African occupation forces, the transfer of all powers to SWAPO, the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people. The socialist countries had provided and would continue to provide support for the just struggle of African peoples against *apartheid* and for liberty and social progress. In their opinion, South Africa would not dare to defy world public opinion if it was not supported by its Western protectors and, in particular, by the Government of the United States, which prevented by all possible means the adoption of sanctions by the Security Council and continued to develop its relations with South Africa in the most diverse areas. In the view of the socialist countries, draft resolution III would have had much greater impact if it had condemned the fact that the Western countries were continuing to help South Africa and had called for an end to such assistance. It was necessary to exclude from economic relations any form of exploitation, inequality, colonialism and neo-colonialism, as well as of interference in the internal affairs of other States. Those were essential conditions to accelerate the

process of economic decolonization of the developing countries.

143. Mr. GUAN (Malaysia) said that if the delegation of Malaysia had been present at the time of the voting on draft resolution III, it would have voted in favour of the seventh and thirteenth preambular paragraphs and of the text as a whole.

144. Mr. MARTIN (Luxembourg), speaking on behalf of the delegations of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, recalled, in connection with the vote on draft resolution III, the terms of the Declaration made by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the EEC, at the close of the meeting of 22 July 1984 at Brussels, in which those States totally rejected the policy of *apartheid* of South Africa. They considered, nevertheless, that as the situation in South Africa was not a problem of colonization it should not be dealt with under the agenda item in question. The goal which continued to be the basis of their commitment was to act in such a way as to replace the tragic and fruitless course chosen by the South African Government by a project of hope. The same was true with regard to the implementation of the objectives of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) concerning the independence of Namibia. To that end, they would spare no effort to bring about an urgent change in the policy of the Government of South Africa with a view, not only to eradicating the system of *apartheid*, but also to building a genuinely non-racial society in that country. In that context, an authentic and durable solution could be initiated only through a reconciliation of the various ethnic groups, excluding the use of violence from any quarter. Such violence, frequently gratuitous and revolting, was particularly inexcusable when it emanated from a policy and a Government. Operative paragraphs 6 and 7, which called for the total isolation of South Africa, would not necessarily meet the objectives of all the members of the Council—the complete eradication of *apartheid*. Even in the current circumstances, means of communication should be maintained so that the outside world could be in a better position to persuade South Africa unequivocally to reject the abhorrent and morally unacceptable system of *apartheid* and to convince it of the urgent need to introduce rapid and fundamental changes. The Federal Republic of Germany, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom had previously indicated the reasons why they were not in a position to support other paragraphs of the draft under consideration. They found it difficult, in particular, to endorse the provisions of operative paragraph 9 and of the thirteenth preambular paragraph, which was a corollary, concerning the activities of IMF. They believed that the independence of IMF should be respected; similarly, they considered the reference to the World Bank unjustified.

145. Turning to draft resolution I on assistance to the Palestinian people, the pointed out, on behalf of the above-mentioned States, that they had expressed support for the draft resolution as a whole. He pointed out,

in that regard, that those States continued to provide humanitarian assistance to the Palestinian people in the form of foodstuffs and emergency aid as well as the joint financing, together with non-governmental organizations, of projects benefiting the Palestinian people. Such assistance would continue to be granted directly by the Community and through the competent agencies and organizations within the United Nations system.

146. The member States of the EEC on whose behalf he was speaking had voted for draft resolution II concerning economic development projects in the occupied Palestinian territories, an action which implied no specific commitment on their part. They were of the view that economic development could play an important role by alleviating difficulties in the region. Of course, in their view, the projects to be implemented should be economically and technically viable, so that they could contribute to the strengthening of the region's economic prosperity, in the interest of all.

147. Mr. LEE (Canada) said that Canada had always been in favour of decolonization. The United Nations had played a key role in that process, which was fortunately, through its action, drawing to a close. Furthermore, Canada had always condemned South Africa's racist policy. Recently, the Canadian Government had announced a series of new measures aimed at bringing pressure to bear on the South African Government, particularly by strengthening the code of conduct for Canadian companies operating in South Africa and the embargo on arms shipments, by increasing the number of financial, fiscal and other provisions intended to curb economic relations between the two countries and by renewing the boycott on sports activities. With regard to Namibia, in accordance with Security Council resolution 283 (1970), the Canadian Government had decided, *inter alia*, to cease processing Namibian uranium in Canada, to discourage the sale of Krugerrands in the country and to monitor more closely the contacts between Canadian and South African ministries in sensitive areas. Those were a few of the measures adopted by the Canadian Government in respect of South Africa. It was clear, therefore, that his delegation's abstention during the vote on draft resolution III should not be interpreted as acceptance by the Canadian Government of the policy of *apartheid*; however, it considered that the text could hardly contribute to the success of the struggle against the racist policy in South Africa; moreover, the means of action proposed in the text might run counter to the objective sought, for example, the provision aimed at putting an end to IMF's co-operation with South Africa.

148. With regard to draft resolution I on assistance to the Palestinian people, the Canadian delegation, which had always been in favour of any assistance designed to promote the economic and social development of the Palestinian people, had voted in favour of the text.

149. Lastly, referring to draft resolution II, he said that the Canadian delegation had abstained because it

considered that the Council was not an appropriate place to discuss such projects. It would, in fact, have been sufficient to indicate to the competent organizations that emphasis should be placed on the economic and social development of the Palestinian people, which the Council had already done in draft resolution I.

150. Mr. NVENDO IYAGWI-KATH (Zaire) said that if the delegation of Zaire had been present at the time of the voting on draft resolutions I and III it would have voted in favour of the texts.

151. Mr. DHANAPALA (Sri Lanka) said that if the delegation of Sri Lanka had been present during the voting on draft resolution III it would have supported the two preambular paragraphs and the three operative paragraphs which had been voted on separately, as well as the draft resolution as a whole.

152. Mr. DE LA SERNA (Spain) recalled that his delegation had already made known Spain's position with regard to South Africa, Namibia and the policy of *apartheid*, when the draft resolution had been adopted in the Third Committee. That position had also been expressed in various United Nations organizations, particularly in ILO in June 1985 on the occasion of the seventy-first session of the International Labour Conference. Recently, the Spanish Ministry of Foreign Affairs had issued a communiqué in which the Spanish Government strongly condemned the interventions of the South African Government in Angola and Botswana, stated that it did not recognize the Government set up in Namibia by South Africa and urged the South African Government to renounce violence and respect the relevant resolutions of the United Nations. The Spanish point of view on problems in southern Africa was therefore clear, but the terms used in draft resolution III and the contents of some preambular and operative paragraphs of the draft, in particular the references to IMF and the World Bank, had led his delegation to abstain during the voting.

153. Mr. DE ROJAS (Venezuela) said that if the Venezuelan delegation had been present, it would have supported the preambular and operative paragraphs voted on separately, as well as draft resolution III as a whole.

154. Mr. LEWU (Nigeria) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution III, since to vote otherwise would be tantamount to approving the policy of the *apartheid* régime of South Africa. No peace-loving country could support such a régime, and those who did so should reflect on the fact that by providing assistance to South Africa they condemned to death the populations fighting for their freedom.

155. Mr. WAKE (United States of America), speaking in explanation of his delegation's vote on the various draft resolutions submitted under agenda item 21, said he was sure that the vote cast by it on draft resolutions I and II had surprised no one. It considered that those texts offered no real possibility of solution. If their objective was truly to promote the interests and well-being

of the Palestinian people, it would also have been necessary to refer to the attacks committed, and not by Israel, against Palestinian refugees in Lebanon. The United States did not believe that such an essentially political question should be raised in the Economic and Social Council. It deplored the fact that so much time had been lost during the session on sterile discussions of that kind, which served only the interests of a small number of Member States. The Council had been established to discuss questions of international co-operation and in that way to promote economic and social development, not to lose time in making political statements. The texts under consideration could not provide a solution to the Palestinian problem and in fact they were, rather, part of the problem. His delegation thought that the Member States which had supported them should reconsider their position and ask not only whether those resolutions did not adversely affect the process of peaceful settlement of the Palestinian question but also whether they did not harm the prestige of the Council itself.

156. Lastly, his delegation had voted against draft resolution III because it did not believe that the text represented the best way of eliminating *apartheid*. It wished to point out that the Government of the United States had recently strongly condemned the *apartheid* régime once again and had stated that it held it directly responsible for recent events, particularly with regard to the state of emergency.

157. Mr. RANASINGHE (Sri Lanka) said that if the Sri Lankan delegation had been present during the vote on draft resolutions I and II, it would have voted in favour.

158. Mr. SENE (Senegal) said that following the adoption of draft resolution III it seemed appropriate to read out the following statement made by Mr. Diouf, current Chairman of OAU and President of Senegal, on the state of emergency in South Africa:

“The segregationist South African Government, which is becoming more and more helpless in view of the magnitude and persistence of the resistance shown by our black brothers to its policy of *apartheid*, has recently decreed a state of emergency. Thus, the security forces left to themselves are acting in a totally arbitrary manner, oppressing, arresting and killing people who are merely claiming their most elementary rights as human beings. Africa unanimously calls on the international community and places it before its responsibility. It specifically calls on those who lived through and fought nazism so courageously, in the interest of mankind as a whole, to remember, to react and especially to adopt appropriate sanctions, particularly economic sanctions, so that *apartheid* will suffer the same fate as its sinister predecessor. I appeal to public opinion, particularly to the Governments of the countries to which the Charter of the United Nations assigns primary responsibility for the establishment of peace in the world. Let not the South African Government and its accomplices be mistaken. So long as *apartheid* is not entirely

eliminated, that country and therefore our planet will never know real peace. Africa, through my voice, reaffirms its active solidarity with our brothers of the African National Congress and the Pan African Congress in their just struggle, and confirms its determination to adopt the measures which it has just drawn up at Addis Ababa, with a view to the total eradication of the shame of our century that is *apartheid*.”

159. The PRESIDENT said that the Council had concluded its consideration of agenda item 21.

AGENDA ITEM 24

Elections (E/1985/100)

160. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to take up agenda item 24, concerning the elections of members of subsidiary bodies of the Council whose elections had been postponed at previous sessions and who appeared in a list in the agenda (E/1985/100).

161. With regard to the vacancies in the Commission for Social Development, the Commission on Human Settlements, the Committee on Natural Resources, the Commission on Transnational Corporations and the Sessional Working Group of Governmental Experts on the Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the Chairmen of the regional groups had not notified the Secretariat of any candidacies. Unless candidates were proposed for the vacant seats, and if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council wished the elections to be postponed to a subsequent session.

It was so decided.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL WORKING GROUP OF EXPERTS ON INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS OF ACCOUNTING AND REPORTING

162. The PRESIDENT recalled that, in accordance with the decisions taken by the Council on the subject, 17 members were to be elected from States, for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1986, according to the following pattern of geographical distribution: four members from African States, four members from Asian States, two members from East European States, three members from Latin American States, and four members from West European and other States.

163. The OAU secretariat, on behalf of the group of African States, had informed the Secretariat that it had endorsed the candidacy of Nigeria for one of the vacancies to be filled by African States. In the absence of other candidates, and if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to elect Nigeria by acclamation and to postpone the election of three members from the group of African States to a later stage.

It was so decided.

164. The PRESIDENT said that the Chairman of the group of Asian States had informed the Secretariat that the group had endorsed the candidacies of Cyprus, India and Japan for three of the four vacancies to be filled by Asian States. As the number of candidates from the group of Asian States was less than the number of seats to be filled, he would take it, if there was no objection, that the Council wished to elect the candidates proposed by acclamation and to postpone the election of one member from the group of Asian States to a later stage.

It was so decided.

165. The PRESIDENT said that the Secretariat had not been informed of any candidacies for the group of East European States or the group of Latin American States. Unless candidates were proposed for the vacancies to be filled by States from those two groups, and if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to postpone the elections to those seats to a subsequent session.

It was so decided.

166. The PRESIDENT informed the Council that the Chairman of the group of West European and other States had notified the Secretariat that there were the five following candidates for that group: Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America. Since the number of candidates from the group of West European and other States was greater than the number of seats to be filled, he invited the Council to elect four members from that group by secret ballot.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Gafai (Nigeria) and Mr. Satjipanon (Thailand) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

<i>Number of ballot papers:</i>	50
<i>Number of valid ballots:</i>	50
<i>Number of members voting:</i>	50
<i>Required majority:</i>	26

Number of votes obtained:

Germany, Federal Republic of:	40
United States of America:	40
Italy:	35
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:	34
Netherlands:	33

Having obtained the required majority, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America were elected members of the Intergovernmental Working Group of Experts on International Standards of Accounting and Reporting for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 1986

167. The PRESIDENT recalled that the election of seven members of the Intergovernmental Working Group of Experts on International Standards of Accounting and Reporting had been postponed at previous sessions. They were: one member to be designated from Asian States and two members from East European

States for a term beginning on the date of election and expiring on 31 December 1985, and two members to be designated from African States, one member from East European States and one member from Latin American States for a term beginning on the date of election and expiring on 31 December 1987. As no candidates had been proposed for the seven vacancies, and if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to postpone the elections until a later stage.

It was so decided.

COMMITTEE FOR THE UNITED NATIONS POPULATION AWARD

168. The PRESIDENT said that the Chairman of the group of West European and other States had informed the Secretariat that Spain had put forward its candidacy for the vacant seat to be filled from that group for a three-year term. In the absence of other candidates, and if there was no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to elect Spain by acclamation.

The decisions concerning the elections as a whole were adopted (decision 1985/204).

169. The PRESIDENT said that the Council had completed its consideration of agenda item 24.

AGENDA ITEM 19

International co-operation and co-ordination within the United Nations system

REPORT OF THE THIRD (PROGRAMME AND CO-ORDINATION) COMMITTEE (E/1985/141)

170. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to take action on the four draft resolutions and the two draft decisions which the Third Committee had recommended to the Council for adoption in paragraphs 25 and 26 of its report (E/1985/141). He drew the Council's attention to the Soviet amendment (E/1985/L.54) to operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution I.

Draft resolution I: Economic and technical aspect of marine affairs

171. Mr. RAOELINA (Observer for Madagascar), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution E/1985/C.3/L.5 submitted in the Third Committee and reproduced in the report as draft resolution 1, said he feared that the amendment proposed by the Soviet delegation which had been before the members of the Council only since that morning—might prevent the draft resolution, which had been supported in general by the Third Committee, from being adopted by consensus in the Council; that would run counter to the principle of the adoption by consensus of any draft resolution concerning technical assistance.

172. At present, the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea had been signed by 159 States but ratified by only about 20 of them. No one could say when it would enter into force. In submitting the draft resolution, the sponsors had sought to request that technical assistance relating to economic and technical aspects of marine affairs should be provided to developing countries without delay to help them to introduce the dimension of the resources of the sea into their development.

173. Mr. BUGROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said his delegation was surprised that the amendment proposed by it (E/1985/L.54) should be discussed even before it had been able to submit it. The purpose of the amendment was to ensure that the report which the Secretary-General was requested to prepare concerning the difficulties encountered in the management of the exclusive economic zone of countries and the development of their resources was drawn up in accordance with the provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. That addition was entirely in keeping with previous resolutions of the Council concerning marine affairs, in particular resolution 1983/48, which referred to the Convention. The Convention had for some time determined United Nations activities relating to the resources of the sea, as was clear from chapter 25 of the medium-term plan for the period 1984-1989 and the consideration of the programme budget for the next biennium. The addition proposed by the Soviet delegation to draft resolution I was therefore justified, from the standpoint both of form and of substance.

174. During the work of the Third Committee, the Soviet delegation, wishing to participate in the preparation of the draft resolution, had requested the holding of consultations. That had not been done because the sponsors had pressed for an immediate decision. The Soviet delegation, thus deprived of the opportunity of participating in the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus, had, as indicated in paragraph 11 of the report (E/1985/141) of the Third Committee, stated that it reserved its position on the draft until it was taken up in plenary. The Soviet amendment had been transmitted to the Secretariat on 23 July and was dated 24 July; the members of the Council had therefore had sufficient time to examine it. His delegation therefore requested that it should be put to the vote. If his delegation's amendment was adopted, it was prepared to vote for the draft resolution as a whole.

175. Mr. RAOELINA (Observer for Madagascar) stressed that, on the contrary, the consultations on the draft resolutions had not ended. The consultations, initiated two weeks before the adoption of the text by consensus in the Third Committee, had been continued up to noon that very day.

176. Mr. LEE (Canada), recalling that the Canadian delegation was one of the sponsors of draft resolution E/1985/C.3/L.5, supported the statement of the Observer for Madagascar. It was known that Canada was in favour of the United Nations Convention on the

Law of the Sea, but that Convention had not yet entered into force. The draft resolution under consideration could already be very useful for the development efforts which developing countries were making in their exclusive economic zones. His delegation considered that the amendment proposed by the Soviet Union added nothing from the standpoint of substance to the draft resolution. It appealed to the Soviet delegation to withdraw its amendment, in the interest of a consensus.

177. In reply to a question from the PRESIDENT, Mr. BUGROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Soviet delegation maintained its request that its amendment should be put to the vote. It had already indicated, in its earlier statement, the reasons for that position, which were also clear from paragraphs 9, 10 and 11 of the report of the Third Committee, to which it drew the attention of the members of the Council.

178. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the amendment proposed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The amendment proposed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was rejected by 13 votes to 9, with 16 abstentions.

179. Mr. EKBLÖM (Finland) said that in the vote which had just taken place, the Finnish delegation had abstained because it regretted that draft resolution I was not to be adopted by consensus. The amendment proposed by the USSR had not, however, created any difficulty for it from the standpoint of substance.

180. Mr. LUNA (Colombia) associated himself with the statement made by the representative of Finland.

At the request of the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, draft resolution I was put to the vote.

The draft resolution was adopted by 43 votes to none with 4 abstentions (resolution 1985/75).

181. Mr. BUGROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that during the vote which had just taken place, the Soviet delegation had been obliged to abstain because in its opinion the report which the Secretary-General was requested to submit under the resolution that had just been adopted to some extent covered the programme of work of some bodies and departments of the Secretariat of the United Nations concerning marine affairs. It considered that in the preparation of reports, the Secretariat should be guided by the provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

Draft resolution II: Report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination on the work of its twenty-fifth session

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 1985/76).

182. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) said that his delegation had joined in the consensus on draft

resolution II, but had several reservations to make concerning the report of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (E/1985/L.39), in particular chapter 9, entitled "Transnational corporations".

Draft resolution III: Joint Meetings of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination and the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 1985/77).

Draft resolution IV: Hiring and use of consultant services

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 1985/78).

183. Mr. CHOWDHURY (Bangladesh) recalled that in its report on the work of its twenty-fifth session (E/1985/L.39), the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination had been firmly of the view that use of consultant services within the United Nations system was excessive and not conducive to an optimum utilization of regular staff resources, and had also stressed the need to hire consultants on as broad a geographical basis as possible. That was why his delegation had taken the initiative of submitting in the Third Committee a draft resolution (E/1985/C.3/L.6)—which had subsequently become draft resolution IV—aimed at enabling the General Assembly to consider the question in a comprehensive manner and in particular to provide the Secretariat with clear guidelines in the matter. His delegation was therefore pleased that the Council had supported its initiative unanimously and hoped that the report requested of the Secretary-General in operative paragraph 3 would contain more relevant information and useful recommendations.

Draft decision I: Reports considered by the Economic and Social Council in connection with the question of international co-operation and co-ordination within the United Nations system

The draft decision was adopted (decision 1985/198).

Draft decision II: International Year for the mobilization of financial and technological resources to increase food and agricultural production in Africa

The draft decision was adopted (decision 1985/199).

184. The PRESIDENT announced that the Council had concluded its consideration of agenda item 19.

AGENDA ITEM 20

Proposed programme budget for the biennium 1986-1987

REPORT OF THE THIRD (PROGRAMME AND CO-ORDINATION)
COMMITTEE (E/1985/154)

185. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to take note of the report (E/1985/154) of the Third Committee

on the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1986-1987.

186. Mr. LEE (Canada) said he wished to make it clear that his delegation endorsed all the recommendations and conclusions put forward by the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination in its report on the work of its twenty-fifth session (E/1985/L.39), particularly those concerning the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1986-1987. In particular, his delegation noted with satisfaction that CPC approved the biennialization process applied to the preparation of the programme budget and reiterated its request to the intergovernmental bodies which reported to the Second Committee of the General Assembly to adjust their cycle of meetings to conform to that Committee's biennial programme of work; that it also requested a report on further experience gained in the provision of statements on programme budget implications of draft resolutions, since those statements were an extremely useful decision-making tool; and that it also approved the cross-organizational programme analyses which made it possible to have an overall view of a particular area of activities within the United Nations system.

187. With regard to the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1986-1987 itself,²¹ his delegation noted that real growth had been limited to 0.4 per cent and congratulated the Secretary-General for his efforts to maximize cost-effectiveness. It was encouraging to know that substantive programmes were growing at twice the rate of administration and support programmes and that allocations for travel costs, consultant services and *ad hoc* meetings of groups of experts had been reduced.

188. The PRESIDENT announced that the Council had completed its consideration of agenda item 20.

AGENDA ITEM 12

Industrial development co-operation (*concluded*)

189. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to take action on draft resolution E/1985/L.59 proposed by the President of the Economic and Social Council and entitled "Arrangements for the negotiation of an agreement between the United Nations and the United Nations Industrial Development Organization".

190. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) asked for an assurance that the draft resolution proposed by the President would have no financial implications, particularly with regard to operative paragraph 4.

191. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Council) said that the reason why the formula "within existing resources", in operative paragraph 5, did not appear in paragraph 4 was that, if it was actually decided to hold a resumed session of the Council, the cost of the necessary services

²¹ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fortieth Session, Supplement No. 6 (A/40/6), vols. I and II.*

would be charged to the budget of the Second Committee, so that there would be no financial implications.

Draft resolution E/1985/L.59 was adopted (resolution 1985/74).

192. The PRESIDENT said that the Council had completed its consideration of agenda item 12.

AGENDA ITEM 6

Permanent sovereignty over national resources in the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories (concluded)

Statement made in exercise of the right of reply following the adoption of draft resolution E/1985/L.50

193. Mr. HARAN (Observer for Israel) noted that on the occasion of the discussion on draft resolution E/1985/L.50 on Israeli economic practices in the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories, the observer for Jordan had said that Israel was endeavouring to halt any economic activity in the occupied Arab territories. The facts, particularly those mentioned in the report of the Secretary-General on the living conditions of the Palestinian people in the occupied Palestinian territories (E/1985/99), refuted that statement, with regard to both agricultural and industrial development. It was clear, for example, from the documentation prepared by UNIDO that GNP growth in the occupied Arab territories was twice that in Jordan. For the purpose of the new report whose preparation had been requested in draft resolution E/1985/L.50, Israel intended to provide, as it had previously done, data from sources which were independent and even hostile to Israel; those figures would once again be conclusive, even if they came from Arab experts.

194. Mr. BARAKAT (Observer for Japan) said that the Observer for Israel was wrong to refer to the report of the Secretary-General on living conditions of the Palestinian people in the occupied Palestinian territories in an attempt to prove that prosperity reigned on the West Bank. In fact, that report indicated very clearly that the occupation authorities did not authorize, for example, the establishment of any bank in the occupied Arab territories, and that they systematically confiscated those territories to establish settlements there which alone benefited from the necessary infrastructure and received development credits on a priority basis. The owners of Israeli factories imported the raw materials they required from Israel and paid taxes to Israel. How could prosperity be created in such conditions?

195. Mr. ABU KOASH (Palestine Liberation Organization) noted that the statement made by the representative of the United States to explain his vote on the draft resolution on assistance to the Palestinian people—which subsequently became resolution 1985/57—and the draft resolution on economic development projects in the occupied Palestinian ter-

ritories—which subsequently became resolution 1985/58—was vitiated by many contradictions. Such a statement could have been made by the representative of Israel.

196. The Observer for Israel boasted of being able to cite figures concerning the economic development of the occupied Arab territories, from independent sources, whereas most of them were in fact provided by the Israeli Statistical Office, which manipulated all the figures as it wished. Even if economic prosperity were a reality in the occupied Arab territories, the populations would still choose to demand their freedom.

197. Mr. HARAN (Observer for Israel) said, for the benefit of the Observer for Jordan, giving credence to the information contained in the report of the Secretary-General on the living conditions of the Palestinian people in the occupied Arab territories (E/1985/99) in fact meant believing Arab experts; the list of names of experts who had been invited to participate in the preparation of the report was eminently clear in that regard. In other words, it was Arab experts who showed that, in regard to economic development, Israel's balance sheet in the occupied Arab territories was positive.

198. Mr. BARAKAT (Observer for Jordan) recalled that the Council, in adopting virtually unanimously a resolution in which it called for an improvement in the economic situation in the West Bank, had based itself on the many documents before it, all of which concluded that there was an alarming deterioration in the economic situation in the occupied Arab territories. How could the Observer for Israel claim that prosperity prevailed and hope to convince the Council?

199. Mr. ABU KOASH (Palestine Liberation Organization) said that the Arab experts who had participated in the preparation of the report on the living conditions of the Palestinian people in the occupied Palestinian territories lived in Israel or under Israeli occupation and that some were even Israeli citizens. It would of course be quite acceptable in the future to request the assistance of Israeli experts, such as the former Mayor of Jerusalem, for whom the deterioration of the economic situation in the occupied Palestinian territories was beyond any doubt.

200. The PRESIDENT said that the Council had concluded its consideration of agenda item 6.

AGENDA ITEM 4

Review of the immediate and longer-term aspects of the critical economic situation in Africa and the follow-up of the response by the international community and the United Nations system (continued)

201. The PRESIDENT read out a message which had just been transmitted to him from the President of the Republic of Senegal in his capacity as current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity. The message

pointed out that OAU, after having considered the means capable of assisting the recovery of the African economy, had recently adopted a priority programme of action relating in particular to the sectors of agriculture and debt. In the opinion of the OAU Chairman, it would be appropriate for the Council, in its examination of the critical economic situation in Africa, to give prominence to consideration of the specific measures contained in the priority programme. In that way, the international community would know exactly what Africa expected from it and what it itself undertook to do.

The meeting was suspended at 6.05 p.m. and resumed at 7.30 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 8

Regional co-operation

REPORT OF THE FIRST (ECONOMIC) COMMITTEE (E/1985/145 and Add.1)

202. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the seven draft resolutions and the two draft decisions which the First Committee had recommended for adoption by the Council in paragraphs 50 and 51 of part I (E/1985/145) of its report.

Draft resolution I: Amendment of the terms of reference of the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific: membership of Brunei Darussalam and Tuvalu

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 1985/60).

Draft resolution II: Industrial Development Decade for Africa

203. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Council) said that the word "allocate" in the first line of operative paragraph 3 in the English version should be replaced by "consider the allocation" and the word "of" should be inserted after the word "Africa" in the second line. The changes would of course be incorporated in the other languages.

204. Mr. LEE (Canada) said that his delegation had serious reservations in regard to draft resolution II. The First Committee had spent so much time considering draft resolutions prepared mainly by ECA, including five with budgetary implications, that it had been unable to discuss the question of regional co-operation in detail. As the Council was not a budgetary body it was not therefore competent to consider the type of draft resolution submitted by ECA and was not in a position to allocate priorities to the different draft resolutions. His delegation felt bound to abstain on the majority of them since the United Nations would be in no position to increase budgetary allocations to ECA. He hoped ECA would take due note of his views.

205. Mr. WAKE (United States of America) said that the Council, having decided to give priority to the critical economic situation in Africa, had spent several days on a debate which had been for the most part dignified, serious and constructive. Unfortunately, while a serious and constructive debate had been held in plenary session, the Council's First Committee had considered proposals from ECA that were neither serious nor constructive. The Council had discussed logistics and the co-ordination of famine relief, whereas the First Committee's time had been taken up with the provision of comfortable bureaucratic jobs and travel budgets for a few select individuals, the results of which were included in the series of draft resolutions recommended for adoption. He delegation objected strongly to the manner of presentation of the draft resolutions and to their content. From the procedural point of view it was totally inappropriate for one economic commission to put forward draft resolutions calling for the establishment of new posts to be funded from the regular United Nations budget and for direct appropriations to technical co-operation projects, especially since no reasons had been given why those posts and projects should be given priority over emergency aid and long-term development assistance.

206. Even if reasons had been given, it was not the United Nations regular budget which should be providing funds for that purpose. It had been clearly demonstrated in Council discussions that the international community was fully prepared to contribute voluntarily to activities likely to promote self-reliant growth and development in Africa. The Secretary-General's proposed Programme Budget for 1986-1987, on the other hand, was still being processed prior to approval by the General Assembly and it would be quite improper for the Council to suggest additional mandates which would necessarily increase the budget.

207. His delegation objected in particular to draft resolution II. It would not oppose the draft resolution in a vote, since he had been assured it had no additional financial implications, but passing of the draft resolution should merely be interpreted to mean that certain projects of the Industrial Development Decade for Africa were of priority concern to ECA. His Government would continue to oppose the allocation of regular budget funds to those decade activities and reiterated its opposition to General Assembly resolution 39/233. His delegation would vote against resolutions III and VI, since they involved substantial and totally unjustified financial implications for the regular budget. His opposition to draft resolution VII was based on the fact that it was not the function of the Council to instruct the Secretary-General to hire individuals of particular nationalities. Operative paragraph 2 appeared to exemplify the pettiness and lack of seriousness of many ECA proposals ostensibly designed to promote the development of Africa. His delegation would also oppose draft resolution II in part II (E/1985/145/Add.1) of the report concerning the use of the Portuguese language in the ECA, on the grounds of its financial implications and the prospects of much greater costs in the

future. It was inappropriate for a regional commission to add official or working languages over and above the official languages of the General Assembly.

208. His delegation's single vote could not prevent the adoption of what it regarded as a number of very ill-conceived proposals. It was important to realize, however, that approving those proposals for major new expenditure by majority vote would not build up confidence in the Council or enhance its prestige. It merely encouraged others to pile their excess baggage of pet projects onto the bandwagon of the United Nations regular budget. If the progress continued, the wagon would break down.

The draft resolution was adopted as orally revised (resolution 1985/61).

Draft resolution III: African Institute for Economic Development and Planning

209. The PRESIDENT said that operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution III had been adopted in the First Committee by 28 votes to 7, with 7 abstentions, and the draft resolution as a whole by 26 votes to 5, with 12 abstentions, a roll-call vote having been taken in each case. He suggested that a separate vote be taken on operative paragraph 2 and on the draft resolution as a whole.

Operative paragraph 2 was adopted by 28 votes to 7, with 8 abstentions.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 28 votes to 5, with 12 abstentions (resolution 1985/62).

Draft resolution IV: Measures to ensure the effective and accelerated implementation of the Substantial New Programme of Action in the African least developed countries during the second half of the 1980s.

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 1985/63).

210. Mr. WAKE (United States of America) said that although his delegation had not voted against the draft resolution, it had previously reserved its position on the ODA target contained in the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade as well as on the Substantial New Programme of Action. His Government did not therefore hold itself committed to reaching those targets.

211. Mr. MICHAEL (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had joined the consensus in accepting the draft resolution as an expression of the wish of members of the Council to implement the Substantial New Programme of Action. He noted that operative paragraph 4 drew on language agreed on at the sixth session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. Although his Government had agreed to the adoption of that language in the Council, its agreement should not be taken to imply any change of attitude. His Government had made its position clear in statements made at the above Conference in 1983 and

at the United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries in 1981. It was prepared to accept the targets set in the draft resolution but not the time scales envisaged.

212. Mr. VON STECHOW (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation had joined the consensus in favour of accelerated implementation of the Substantial New Programme of Action because it shared the general concern for the countries of Africa. In the informal consultations it had agreed to the wording of operative paragraph 4 in regard to the targets but not to the time scale set out in paragraph 4 (b). Acceptance of operative paragraph 4 could not prejudice the outcome of the forthcoming negotiations on the mid-term global review of the Substantial New Programme of Action, to be held in Geneva in September 1985.

Draft resolution V: Developmental social welfare policies and programmes on the situation of African migrant workers.

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 1985/64).

Draft resolution VI: Transport and Communications Decade in Africa

213. The PRESIDENT said that operative paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 had been adopted in the First Committee by 27 votes to 4, with 13 abstentions and the draft resolution as a whole by 27 votes to 1, with 16 abstentions, a roll-call vote having been taken in each case. He suggested that a separate vote be taken on operative paragraphs 3, 4 and 5, and on the draft resolution as a whole.

214. Mr. VON STECHOW (Federal Republic of Germany) said that the combined vote on the three paragraphs in the First Committee had been taken at the instigation of his delegation. In view of the shortage of time, he suggested that voting in the Council might be by a show of hands, since the voting procedure would be unlikely to change the final result.

Operative paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 were adopted by 26 votes to 7, with 10 abstentions.

215. Mr. DELMI (Algeria) said that he had inadvertently failed to record his vote, which would have been in favour of operative paragraphs 3, 4 and 5.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 27 votes to 1, with 16 abstentions (resolution 1985/65).

216. Mr. GRAMEGNA (Luxembourg) said that the EEC member countries had been unable to support draft resolutions III and VI. The practice followed for some years by ECA of submitting a series of draft resolutions with financial implications to the Council was not acceptable. Furthermore, the resolutions had been submitted without adequate explanation and any information provided by ECA or its secretariat had come too late for consideration by delegations or for reference to individual governments. Member States of EEC had already made clear their concern for the

developing countries, especially those in Africa, and demonstrated their flexible attitude during the negotiations. In view of the procedure followed by ECA, they would be adopting a very much stricter attitude in future.

217. Mr. SHABAAN (Observer for Egypt) said that the critical economic situation in Africa had been a priority item on the Council's agenda for two years in succession and a resolution on that subject had been adopted by the General Assembly at its thirty-ninth session. All speakers on draft resolution IV had emphasized the importance of promoting the longer-term development of Africa. Draft resolutions II, III and VI dealt in the main with precisely those aspects. If all countries favoured the long-term development of Africa, he saw no reason why some delegations should object to contributing to such vital projects as the Industrial Development Decade for Africa and the Transport and Communications Decade in Africa. The African countries themselves had accepted that the main responsibility for economic development was their own, but in the present unfavourable economic conjuncture, which had largely originated in the developed countries, they needed the support of the international community. The African countries were grateful for emergency aid to enable them to overcome the ravages of natural phenomena such as drought and desertification. It had been hoped however, that in the interests of solidarity and interdependence the ECA draft resolutions would have been adopted by consensus. It was time for the developed world to realize that good intentions alone were not enough.

Draft resolution VII: Appointment of Directors of the Multinational Programming and Operational Centres

218. The PRESIDENT said that operative paragraph 2 had been recommended by the First Committee by 31 votes to 10, with 3 abstentions, and the draft resolution as a whole by 34 votes to 1, with 9 abstentions, a roll-call vote having been taken in each case. He suggested that a separate vote be taken on operative paragraph 2 and on the draft resolution as a whole.

Operative paragraph 2 was adopted by 33 votes to 10, with 3 abstentions.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 34 votes to 1, with 9 abstentions (resolution 1985/66).

219. Mr. GRAMEGNA (Luxembourg) said that although member States of the EEC were in favour of strengthening the Multinational Programming and Operational Centres, they were unable to vote in favour of draft resolution VII since operative paragraph 2, which specified particular nationalities for particular posts, ran counter to the principle of universality which was at the heart of the United Nations system. Any such decision could prove an unfortunate precedent.

Draft decision I: Venue of the twenty-first session of the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean

220. The PRESIDENT said that draft decision I had been adopted by the First Committee by 38 votes to 8, with 5 abstentions. He suggested that a vote be taken on this draft decision.

221. Mr. WAKE (United States of America) requested information on any budgetary implications that might result from the Council's failure to approve draft decision I.

222. Mr. UY (Assistant Director, Budget Division) said that the financial provision for the ECLAC meeting in section 12 of the Programme Budget had been underestimated by approximately \$90,000.

223. Mr. WAKE (United States of America) expressed his delegation's deep gratitude to the Government and people of the Republic of Cameroon for offering to host the twenty-first session of ECA and the twelfth meeting of the ECA Conference of Ministers in 1986 and meet any additional costs involved in holding those meetings away from Commission's headquarters. His delegation would gladly join in the consensus adoption of draft decision II.

224. It also welcomed the holding of the twenty-first session of ECLAC in Mexico City in 1986. There was however a difficulty in the latter case. It had now been confirmed that there was a discrepancy in the Secretary-General's proposed Programme Budget, the narrative portion of which clearly stated in section 12.5 that resources had been requested for holding the twenty-first session of ECLAC in 1986. The representative of the Budget Division had previously informed the Council that \$256,000 would be required for holding that meeting at the established headquarters of the Commission and more recently that \$163,000 had been included in the budget for that purpose. Taken together those statements meant that the meeting could not be held at the Commission's established headquarters unless an additional appropriation of over \$90,000 was made. It was, in his view, a serious matter. The Secretary-General was required every two years to inform member States what it would cost to run the organization on the basis of existing mandates. Although every effort was made to curtail the growth of the budget, member States were entitled to—and did—approve new mandates for activities requiring additional expenditure, but it was reasonable to expect the Secretary-General's proposed Programme Budget to be sufficient to cover activities which had already been mandated. His delegation could not therefore approve any decision on the ECLAC meeting until the financial situation was clarified.

225. There was a further objection to draft decision I in that it did not adhere to the principle that any host country, in the present case Mexico, should be responsible for any additional costs of a meeting away from the Commission's established headquarters. Although the Council had been informed that Mexico would be making a contribution of \$120,000, the host country was not proposing to cover the full additional costs of the meeting. Ninety thousand dollars could be met from the accounting discrepancy to which he had already

referred, but additional expenditure would remain and should be borne by the host country. Unlike draft decision II, where the additional costs were being borne by the Republic of Cameroon, draft decision I was not acceptable to his delegation.

The draft decision was adopted by 34 votes to 8, with 4 abstentions (decision 1985/188).

226. Mr. GRAMEGNA (Luxembourg) said that the ECE member countries could not support the holding of the next session of ECLAC away from its headquarters because the decision conflicted with the terms of General Assembly resolution 31/140.

227. Mr. HUERTA (Mexico) pointed out that resolution 31/140 stated that regular sessions of the regional commissions might be held away from their headquarters if the Commission so decided. His delegation could not understand the objections of some delegations to drafting decision I.

228. Mr. MOTAI (Japan) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft decision I although it was greatly concerned about the Organization's serious financial situation and believed that financial implications must be taken fully into account. Regular sessions should in principle be held at the Commission's headquarters. Since the financial situation of the United Nations was likely to deteriorate further, his country would be bound in future to adopt a stricter attitude to such proposals.

Draft decision II: Venue of the twenty-first session of the Economic Commission for Africa and the twelfth meeting of the Conference of Ministers of the Commission

The draft decision was adopted (decision 1985/189).

229. Mr. LEE (Canada) said that his country's position with regard to the holding of regular sessions of regional commissions away from the established headquarters was well known. In the light of that position, his delegation had had no option but to vote against draft decision I and for draft decision II.

230. Mr. NGOUBEYOU (Observer for Cameroon) said that his Government greatly appreciated the honour done to his country in holding the twenty-first session of ECA and the twelfth meeting of the Conference of Ministers at Yaoundé. The decision to do so had been welcomed at all levels of government and by the people of the Republic of Cameroon as a whole.

231. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the four draft resolutions and the two draft decisions which the First Committee had recommended for adoption to the Council in paragraphs 27 and 28 of part II (E/1985/145/Add.1) of its report.

Draft resolution I: Women and development in Africa

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 1985/67).

Draft resolution II: Inclusion of Portuguese among the official working languages of the Economic Commission for Africa.

232. The PRESIDENT said that draft resolution II had been approved by the First Committee by 28 votes to 11, with 5 abstentions, a roll-call vote having been taken. He suggested to the Council that a vote be taken on this draft resolution.

The draft resolution was adopted by 34 votes to 12, with 5 abstentions (resolution 1985/68).

233. Mr. GRAMEGNA (Luxembourg) said that the EEC member countries had listened carefully to the arguments in favour of the inclusion of Portuguese as an official working language in ECA. Since Portuguese was not an official United Nations language, its introduction into ECA could not fail to provide an unfortunate precedent and could not therefore be supported. In view of the Organization's continuing unsatisfactory financial situation, further charges on the regular budget should be avoided.

234. Ms. ERIKSSON (Sweden), speaking on behalf of the delegations of Finland, Iceland and Sweden, commended the spirit of compromise which had permitted the adoption by consensus of draft resolutions II, IV and V in document E/1985/145 and of draft resolution I in E/1985/145/Add.1. The Nordic delegations had abstained from voting on operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution III and on the draft resolution as a whole, on operative paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of draft resolution VI, on the draft resolution as a whole and on draft resolution II in E/1985/145/Add.1. The Secretary-General had recently presented his Programme Budget for the 1986/1987 biennium, in which he had shown the greatest possible restraint in his requests for additional posts in the Headquarters Secretariat itself and for additional expenditure in general. As a matter of principle, the regular budget of the United Nations should be used to finance the conference machinery of the United Nations, technical assistance being funded by voluntary contributions. Those established procedures should be respected in the interests of cost-effective administration.

235. There was no dispute that the additional resources were needed for the development of African countries, especially in view of the critical economic and social situation in the continent. Since the resources of the international community were limited, priorities had, however, to be established. The Nordic countries were not convinced that the proposals recommended for financing from the regular budget of the United Nations could be regarded as priority projects. The Nordic delegations had abstained from voting on operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution VII, contained in document E/1985/145, because the financial implications of the proposal were not at all clear.

Draft resolution III: Amendment of the terms of reference of the Economic Commission for Western Asia: change of name of the Commission

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 1985/69).

Draft resolution IV: Europe-Africa permanent link through the Strait of Gibraltar

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 1985/70).

236. Mr. DELMI (Algeria) said that his delegation, while joining the consensus on draft resolution IV, was concerned by a reference in paragraph 11 of document E/1985/108 to a controversial route which had not received the approval of the majority of members of ECA. His delegation had explained the problems in detail in the First Committee. He asked that the secretariat take cognizance of the absence of consensus on that route.

237. Mr. KITIKITI (Zimbabwe) associated himself with those views.

238. Mr. SBIHI (Morocco) said that in paragraph 11 of their interim report (E/1985/108), the Executive Secretaries of ECA and ECE had merely reported without comment a decision adopted by the African Ministers of Transport, Communications and Planning at Conakry, Guinea, in 1984, calling for "the establishment, in co-operation with the specialized international organizations, of a steering committee for the Tangier/Lagos trans-African highway in order to ensure the speedy development of that axis". It was not the practice for ECA to notify the Council of reservations made by individual members regarding draft resolutions.

239. Mr. DELMI (Algeria) said that the decision referred to by the Moroccan representative had been subsequently called in question at ECA's nineteenth regular session in 1984, when a number of member States had voiced serious reservations.

Draft decision I: Rules of procedure of the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean

The draft decision was adopted (decision 1985/190).

Draft decision II: Reports considered by the Economic and Social Council in connection with the question of regional co-operation

The draft decision was adopted (decision 1985/191).

240. Mr. DELMI (Algeria) said that during the Council's consideration of agenda item 8, a number of delegations had decided to hold informal consultations on the adoption of a package. As a result, the three draft resolutions relating to the Industrial Development Decade for Africa, the Transport and Communications Decade in Africa and the African Institute for Economic Development and Planning had been considered for joint action. His delegation had not been able to agree, however, to serious matters such as industrial development and transport and communications being combined in a joint draft resolution with

matters of lesser moment such as the African Institute for Economic Development and Planning.

241. The PRESIDENT announced that the Council had completed its consideration of agenda item 8.

AGENDA ITEM 9

Transnational Corporations

REPORT OF THE FIRST (ECONOMIC) COMMITTEE (E/1985/146)

242. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the two draft resolutions and the four draft decisions which the First Committee had recommended for adoption to the Council in paragraphs 41 and 42 of its report (E/1985/146).

243. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Council) said that paragraph 35 of the report had been misplaced. It should appear after paragraph 32, as paragraph 33. The present paragraphs 33 and 34 should be renumbered accordingly.

Draft resolution I: Intergovernmental Working Group of Experts on International Standards of Accounting and Reporting

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 1985/71).

Draft resolution II: Activities of transnational corporations in South Africa and Namibia and their collaboration with the racist minority régime of South Africa

244. The PRESIDENT said that operative paragraph 3 had been approved by the First Committee by 28 votes to 5, with 8 abstentions, operative paragraph 6 by 28 votes to 3, with 10 abstentions, and the draft resolution as a whole by 34 votes to 2, with 8 abstentions. He suggested that a separate vote be taken on these paragraphs before voting on the draft resolution as a whole.

245. Mr. KITIKITI (Zimbabwe) requested a roll-call vote on operative paragraph 3.

A roll-call vote was taken on operative paragraph 3.

Nigeria, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Brazil, Bulgaria, China, Colombia, Ecuador, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Thailand, Turkey, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Against: France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Spain, United Kingdom, United States.

Abstaining: Botswana, Canada, Finland, Iceland, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Sweden.

Operative paragraph 3 was adopted by 32 votes to 5, with 9 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 6 was adopted by 32 votes to 3, with 10 abstentions.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 35 votes to 2, with 8 abstentions (resolution 1985/72).

246 Ms. ERIKSSON (Sweden), speaking on behalf of the delegations of Finland, Iceland and Sweden, said that the Nordic delegations had been able to vote for the draft resolution because of a number of welcome improvements in the text. The delegations shared the overall objectives of the text, as pointed out in the Nordic statement made in the First Committee, but had felt obliged to abstain on operative paragraphs 3 and 6 because the language went further than they could currently endorse. The joint Nordic Programme of Action regarding South Africa was being reviewed and a new programme was likely to be presented for approval by the Nordic Foreign Ministers in October 1985.

247. Mr. GRAMEGNA (Luxembourg), speaking on behalf of the delegations of France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, said that those countries remained convinced that the progress made by European firms in applying the provisions of the EEC Code of Conduct would contribute to solving the *apartheid* problem, thus encouraging, by means of existing economic relations, the possibility of a peaceful change in South African society. They had therefore been unable to support the draft resolution.

248. Mr. PÉREZ HERNANDEZ (Spain) said that his Government had made clear its energetic opposition of *apartheid* and had repeatedly condemned the illegal occupation of Namibia and called for the withdrawal of South African forces. In view of the language used his delegation had, however, been obliged to vote against operative paragraph 3 and to abstain on the draft resolution as a whole.

Draft decision I: Provisional agenda and documentation for the twelfth session of the Commission on Transnational Corporations

The draft decision was adopted (decision 1985/192).

Draft decision II: Reconvened special session of the Commission on Transnational Corporations

249. Mr. CHOWDHURY (Bangladesh) requested that paragraph 17 of document E/1985/109 be corrected to reflect the participation of Bangladesh in that session.

250. The PRESIDENT said that the secretariat would take note of the change.

The draft decision was adopted (decision 1985/193).

Draft decision III: Report of the Commission on Transnational Corporations at its eleventh session

The draft decision was adopted (decision 1985/194).

Draft decision IV: Work of the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations

251. The PRESIDENT said that draft decision IV had been approved by the First Committee by 29 votes to 7, a roll-call vote having been taken. He invited the Council to take action on this draft decision.

252. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) said that his delegation would vote against the draft decision, mainly because the text ensured that the mandate of the Centre on Transnational Corporations would continue to be unbalanced and unfair and that the Centre would lack clear and unambiguous approval to include State-owned transnational enterprises from both market and centrally planned economies in its work programme. He very much regretted the Council's inability to approve a version which would have enabled the Centre to work on the accepted United Nations basis of universality.

253. The discussion of the question in the Council had been a divisive issue. At a previous meeting three hours of procedural debate on the problem had resulted in the draft resolution before the Council. To reach that point, two groups of countries, the socialist bloc and the Group of 77, with their preponderant majority, had found it necessary to ride roughshod over the interests of the Western developed countries and over their efforts even to have their views aired before the Council. As a result there would be no voting on draft resolution E/1985/C.1/L.14, proposed by the EEC countries, or on draft resolution E/1985/C.1/L.15, proposed by the United States. Amendments submitted by the EEC countries to draft decision E/1985/C.1/L.20, the predecessor of the present draft decision IV, had never been directly voted on. Attempts by the United States to amend draft decision E/1985/C.1/L.20 had in effect been shouted down.

254. Apart from the question as to whether the rules of procedure had been properly followed, there could be no doubt that at a time when there was incessant talk about the need to revitalize the Council and strengthen the role of the United Nations in the field of international economic relations, the Council had in a truly massive way undermined its—and the United Nations'—credibility by allowing free and open democratic discussion to be snuffed out. The Group of 77, fully supported by the communist countries, had made it impossible even to submit amendments to draft decision E/1985/C.1/L.20. What could those countries have possibly lost by listening to proposals by the EEC countries and the United States and then voting against them, or by not insisting that draft decision E/1985/C.1/L.20 be acted on first? In that connection, he pointed out that the First Committee's report (E/1985/146) did not accurately reflect the relevant discussion. Paragraph 37 of the report noted that the

Observer for Egypt had moved the closure of the debate. Before he did so, however, the United States had attempted repeatedly but without success to introduce amendments to draft decision E/1985/C.1/L.20. The report should be amended to make that point clear.

255. The transnational corporation issue had indeed been a sad exercise and a sorry affair for the Council and one that was likely to have wider repercussions. The fact that a problem was not discussed did not mean that it would go away. The Centre was still operating on a basis other than universality. There was still a group of countries, the communist countries, insisting that they had no transnational corporations. They had said so explicitly. Yet some delegations continued to argue that those countries were serious participants in the code of conduct exercise, even though they had no intention of letting such a code apply to them. In the light of the attitudes adopted in the Council, his Government would be forced to reassess its support for the United Nations Centre on Transnational Corporations. No nation was compelled to go on supporting international bodies which worked against its basic interests.

256. The PRESIDENT informed the Council that it would be necessary to suspend the meeting until 11 p.m. for administrative reasons.

257. MR. DE ROJAS (Venezuela), speaking on a point of order, suggested that it would be preferable for the Council to complete action on draft decision IV before suspending the meeting.

258. Mr. BAKALOV (Bulgaria) supported that view.

259. The PRESIDENT said that the vote could be taken before the suspension if delegations were prepared to make their statements after the vote.

260. Mr. GRAMEGNA (Luxembourg), speaking on behalf of the EEC member countries, said that unfortunately he could not agree to make his statement after the vote.

The meeting was suspended at 9.35 p.m. and resumed at midnight

261. Mr. GRAMEGNA (Luxembourg) said that the EEC member countries would be unable to participate in the voting on draft decision IV. That decision had been taken in the light of the extraordinary and deplorable events which had taken place in the First Committee during discussion of the issue. It had been anticipated on the basis of informal consultations that draft resolution E/1985/C.1/L.14, of which his delegation was a co-sponsor, would have obtained a large measure of support. That impression had been confirmed by statements made by members of the Group of 77 and by the Director of the Centre on Transnational Corporations. The draft resolution, which was both objective and realistic, had been aimed at ensuring that the principle of universality should be implemented in practice in the activities of the Centre, so as to exclude any question of discrimination, and at reducing if

not eliminating the political aspect which had for some time been poisoning the atmosphere during discussion of the universality issue. Draft decision IV, which had been put forward at the last minute, merely delayed any decision on the issue.

262. In addition to those matters of substance, there was the procedural aspect. The spokesman of the Group of 77 had officially presented draft decision IV to the First Committee long after the deadline for the submission of draft decisions. The problem of late submission had been got round by a motion on a point of order and the priority which draft resolution E/1985/C.1/L.14 should have enjoyed, had then been annulled by a vote in the Committee in accordance with rule 67, paragraph 2, of the Council's rules of procedure. Amendments to draft decision IV proposed by the EEC had met with the same fate, being ruled out of order by a majority vote. That had been followed by a most discreditable episode in which a motion refusing a delegation the right to submit an amendment (as laid down in rule 54 of the rules of procedure) had been adopted by majority vote, thus denying the right of freedom of expression, a right which lay at the very foundation of the democratic process. All member States of EEC accepted that decisions were taken by majority vote. But the rights of the majority involved compensating duties and responsibilities, one of which was to listen to and respect minority views. By using the voting procedure to impose silence on the minority, the majority had succeeded in reflecting great discredit on the Council itself.

263. In regard to the work of the Centre for Transnational Corporations, he welcomed the progress made during the year in clarifying its mandate. He had noted with interest the views which had been put forward by the Group of 77 in the Commission on Transnational Corporations and also in the Director's report to the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination.

264. In the light of what he had said, he requested a roll-call vote on draft decision IV.

265. Mr. PÉREZ HERNANDEZ (Spain) said that his delegation also would be unable to participate in the voting on draft decision IV in view of the regrettable events which had taken place in the First Committee. He fully endorsed the statement made by the Luxembourg representative on behalf of the member States of EEC.

266. Mr. KHALIL (Observer for Egypt) said that the atmosphere at the reconvened special session of the Commission on Transnational Corporations had been one of hope, as the Luxembourg representative had confirmed, and the Group of 77 had been anxious to build on that foundation. The Group had expressed continuing interest in the code of conduct for transnational corporations—and indeed in the definition of transnational corporations—and also in the type of solution which could be worked out within the framework of the code. The situation had now evolved. Publicly owned corporations from a wide range of countries were operating in many developing countries. Ownership should not

therefore be a determining criterion; the main concern was the manner in which corporations operated.

267. The Group of 77 had entered into informal consultations with a view to finding a jointly acceptable solution. When, however, it had become clear that consensus was unlikely, it had decided to put forward its own proposal aimed at safeguarding the ongoing negotiations on a code of conduct, leaving outstanding issues to be discussed after the Commission on Transnational Corporations' next session in January 1986. When the text had been presented to the First Committee, it had, to the Group's great surprise, given rise to an unnecessary procedural exchange which, if continued, would only widen the gap the Group was trying to bridge.

268. The Group deplored the fact that its intentions had been misinterpreted and distorted. Its members had been dismayed and shocked to hear the Group vilified by the United States representative. They spoke for themselves in the Council and defended what they understood to be their interests. They sought consensus but were not prepared to be intimidated when resorting to their democratic right of voting in order to defend those interests. Difficulties there certainly were, but that was all the more reason to intensify collective efforts to reach agreement on a universal code of conduct for transnational corporations.

269. Mr. LEE (Canada) said that his delegation would vote against draft decision IV for the reasons explained by the Luxembourg representative, in particular because of the procedure which had been adopted in the First Committee. There were, however, grounds for hope. The right course was to pursue energetically negotiations on matters of substance and to avoid the traps of procedural disputes and motions of closure.

A roll-call vote was taken on draft decision IV.

Uganda, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon the vote first.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Brazil, Bulgaria, China, Colombia, Ecuador, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Thailand, Turkey, Uganda, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Against: Canada, Finland, Iceland, Japan, New Zealand, Sweden, United States.

Abstaining: None.

The delegations of the following six countries: France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Spain, United Kingdom, stated that they were not participating in the vote.

The draft decision was adopted by 33 votes to 7 (decision 1985/195).

270. Mr. GAFAI (Nigeria) regretted that his delegation had not been present during consideration of

agenda items 8 and 9. It would otherwise have voted in favour of operative paragraph 2 and draft resolution III as a whole, operative paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 and draft resolution VI as a whole, operative paragraph 2 and draft resolution VII as a whole, and draft decision I in document E/1985/145, and also of draft resolution II in document E/1985/145/Add.1, and of operative paragraphs 3 and 6 and draft resolution II as a whole in document E/1985/146.

271. Mr. BAKALOV (Bulgaria), speaking on behalf of the delegations of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR, said that the socialist countries had voted in favour of the draft resolutions and decisions recommended in paragraphs 41 and 42 of document E/1985/146 in accordance with their general policy in favour of the compilation of a code of conduct for transnational corporations. Informal consultations had been held on a possible consensus but it had not gained the support of the majority of delegations. It was therefore preferable to allow the Commission on Transnational Corporations to continue its work, leaving outstanding questions to be settled after the Commission's next meeting in January 1986.

272. In regard to the activities of transnational corporations, the delegations of the socialist countries had recorded votes in favour of operative paragraphs 3 and 6 and of draft resolution II as a whole (E/1985/146). At the same time, they appealed to the international community to take all necessary steps to bring to an end the occupation of Namibia, the continuing military and economic threats by the racist Government of South Africa against neighbouring countries and its repressive domestic measures against black Africans within the country.

273. The PRESIDENT announced that the Council had completed its consideration of agenda item 9.

AGENDA ITEM 10

Food problems

REPORT OF THE FIRST (ECONOMIC) COMMITTEE (E/1985/147)

274. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to take action on the two draft resolutions and the draft decision contained in paragraphs 15 and 16 of the First Committee's report (E/1985/147).

Draft resolution I: Pledging target for contributions to the World Food Programme for the biennium 1987-1988

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 1985/73).

Draft resolution II: Food and agricultural problems

275. Mr. SAAD (Observer for Egypt) said that the text

of draft resolution II had been agreed in informal consultations and it had been anticipated that agreement would be formalized in the Committee. Unfortunately, a number of delegations had introduced amendments in the Committee sufficiently serious to involve the restructuring of several paragraphs, making final agreement impossible. He suggested that the draft resolution be transmitted to the General Assembly in its present form.

276. The PRESIDENT proposed that the Council transmit the draft resolution to the General Assembly at its fortieth session.

It was so decided (decision 1985/196).

Draft decision: Report of the Secretary-General on the critical situation of food and agriculture in Africa, 1984-1985

The draft decision was adopted (decision 1985/197).

277. The PRESIDENT said, with regard to the interim progress report on implementation of the decisions of the Secretary-General and the Director-General of FAO on WFP institutional relationships, that it was his understanding that the full report of the Committee on Food Aid Policies on its twentieth session would be made available as an exception to the General Assembly at its fortieth session. That understanding would be reflected in the annotated provisional agenda of the General Assembly under the item "Food problems".

278. He announced that the Council had completed its consideration of agenda item 10.

AGENDA ITEM 23

Calendar of conferences and meetings for 1986-1987

REPORT OF THE THIRD (PROGRAMME AND CO-ORDINATION) COMMITTEE (E/1985/144)

279. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to consider the draft resolution and the three draft decisions contained in paragraphs 10 and 11 of the Third Committee's report (E/1985/144).

Draft resolution: Ninth special session of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 1985/79).

Draft decision I: Summary records of sessional committees and subsidiary bodies of the Economic and Social Council

The draft decision was adopted (decision 1985/200).

Draft decision II: Provisional agenda and documentation for the ninth special session of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs

The draft decision was adopted (decision 1985/201).

Draft decision III: Calendar of conferences and meetings for 1986 and 1987

280. The PRESIDENT said that draft decision III took into account the decisions taken earlier in the meeting in connection with the reports of the First and Third Committees.

281. The SECRETARY explained that the following further meetings, already authorized by the Council at its first regular session in 1985, had inadvertently been omitted from the report:

Commission on Human Rights, *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts on South Africa (authorized by Council decision 1985/140) 6-17 January 1986

Commission on Human Rights, Open-ended Working Group to draft a declaration on the rights and responsibilities of individuals and organs of society to promote and protect universally recognized human rights and fundamental freedoms (authorized by Council decision 1985/152)..... 27-31 January 1986

282. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to adopt the calendar of conferences and meetings for 1986 and 1987, annexed to draft decision III, as orally revised.

The draft decision, as orally revised, was adopted (decision 1985/202).

283. The PRESIDENT announced that the Council had completed its consideration of agenda item 23.

The meeting was suspended on Saturday 27 July 1985 from 12.50 a.m. to 1.20 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 4

Review of the immediate and longer-term aspects of the critical economic situation in Africa and the follow-up of the response by the international community and the United Nations system (concluded)

284. Mr. KUMLIN (Sweden) (Vice-President of the Council) said that a series of informal consultations had been held and individual contacts made in connection with agenda item 4, with a view to reaching a conclusion satisfactory to all participants and members of the Council. The results of the consultations and contacts was now before the Council in the form of a draft resolution submitted in his name (E/1985/L.58), entitled "Critical economic situation in Africa". There were a few minor changes to be made.

Preambular paragraph 7: Delete the words [Taking note of] and the square brackets round the word "Welcoming".

Operative paragraph 1: Delete the square brackets round the words "adoption of the" and "adopted".

Operative paragraph 3: Delete the words [and inter-related] and the square brackets round the words "in a comprehensive manner".

Operative paragraph 5: Insert after *Recognizes* the word "also".

Operative paragraph 8: Delete the square brackets round the words "consider generous contributions".

Operative paragraph 10: Delete the words [and the existence of mechanisms for the solution of these problems] and delete all after the word "debt" in line 5.

Operative paragraph 11: Delete the square brackets round the words "with interest".

285. He thanked all delegations for their participation in the work on the text, which he hoped the Council would be able to adopt by consensus.

286. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to comment on draft resolution E/1985/L.58 in the form in which it was at present submitted.

287. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) said that, in spite of conscientious negotiations, there were still a number of points in operative paragraph 10 which his Government wished to study further. His delegation would, accordingly, have to request a vote on that paragraph.

288. Mr. KUMLIN (Sweden) recalled that, in introducing the draft resolution, he had expressed the hope that it would prove possible for the Council to adopt it by consensus. Since that did not, unfortunately, seem to be the case, he had no choice but to withdraw the draft.

289. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) said that, as it was his delegation's intention merely to abstain in the vote on operative paragraph 10, he believed that it would still be possible for the draft resolution as a whole to be adopted by consensus. There was, therefore, no necessity for it to be withdrawn.

290. Mr. KUMLIN (Sweden) said that, technically speaking, it was doubtless the case that the draft resolution as a whole could be adopted by consensus, even if a vote had been taken on a particular paragraph. His aim, however, had been to achieve its adoption by consensus, not only as a whole but in all its parts.

291. Mr. REDOUANE (Algeria), speaking on behalf of the Group of African States, said that he wished to resubmit draft resolution E/1985/L.58. If a vote were to be taken, he would request that operative paragraph 10 should be replaced by the original wording submitted by the sponsors in operative paragraph 9 of draft resolution E/1985/L.53. He continued, however, to hope that the Council would succeed in reaching a consensus.

292. He wished to make a formal statement in the name of the Group of African States. The message from the President of OAU reflected the African countries' confidence in the capabilities of the Council and the willingness of its Member States and of the international community as a whole to take a further step towards providing increased and systematic support for the African countries in their efforts to overcome their problems of destitution, famine and desertification, and to implement individually and collectively a priority

programme of rehabilitation and development. They had drawn further encouragement from the Council's decision to give priority consideration to a review of the situation in Africa at the current session. The Group of African States had submitted to the Council a draft resolution, whose carefully considered wording reflected the realism, openness to dialogue and wisdom of the African continent, rooted in age-old traditions. The draft embodied the basic principles laid down by the African Heads of State and was in accord with the encouraging sentiments expressed during discussion of agenda item 4 in the Council. It carried the political message of the recent OAU summit, renewing the expression of Africa's will to assume responsibility for its own destiny, and of faith in international co-operation, which would be furthered by the convening of a special session of the General Assembly. It also appealed for the convening of an international conference on Africa's external debt. The least the Group could have asked for was that the Council should take note of those proposals. After the prolonged negotiations that had taken place, the Group was disappointed at the reticence with which proposals emanating from the highest political level of the African continent had been received by some delegations. The energy, dedication and ingenuity with which the Vice-President of the Council, Mr. Kumlin, had endeavoured to achieve a consensus surely deserved a more positive response. The Group regretted that a vote had been called for at that late stage; the content of the draft resolution was an inseparable whole. The Group had made many concessions in order to maintain a constructive climate, and he continued to hope that that climate would eventually prevail.

293. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) said he did not think the Algerian representative's stated objective would be served by the course of action he proposed. Abstention by the United States delegation in the vote for which it had called would not have prevented the subsequent adoption by consensus of the draft resolution as a whole, but, if the wording of operative paragraph 9 of the original draft resolution (E/1985/L.53) were incorporated in the draft being considered by the Council, the United States delegation would be obliged not merely to abstain but to vote against that paragraph, which, as he understood it, would rule out the possibility of the Council adopting the draft resolution as a whole by consensus.

294. Mr. WOLZFELD (Luxembourg) expressed the hope that the Group of African States would give very careful consideration to that point. A return to the original wording of the paragraph would be an obstacle to consensus.

295. Mr. REDOUANE (Algeria) appealed to the United States delegation not to press for a vote on the paragraph. There were other ways in which a delegation could register its disagreement with a particular paragraph of a draft resolution.

296. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) thought that it might be helpful if the Chair could inform the Council whether, in the event of a delegation abstaining in a separate vote on a particular paragraph, the subsequent unopposed adoption of a draft resolution as a whole could be properly considered as adoption by consensus.

297. The PRESIDENT said that he understood that in those circumstances the correct term would be "adoption without a vote".

298. Mr. LEE (Canada) said that, whereas all delegations were agreed on the desirability of adopting the draft resolution by consensus, he saw a danger that the very attempt to achieve that objective might result in some delegations being forced to take up positions which they would have preferred to avoid, and which might make the eventual reopening of dialogue more difficult. He urged the Council to bear that risk in mind.

299. Mr. REDOUANE (Algeria) said that a vote taken on part of the draft resolution would inevitably convey the impression of a lack of consensus. It would surely be possible for the United States delegation to make a statement, after adoption of the draft resolution, to the effect that, if there had been a vote on such and such a paragraph, it would have abstained. He still hoped that the Council would succeed in reaching a consensus in view of the magnitude of the African crisis, the priority accorded by the Council to the agenda item, and the conciliatory efforts made by participants in the negotiations.

300. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) said that his delegation had, in fact, shown great willingness to co-operate throughout the negotiations on the draft resolution, but it appeared to be the case that the only means of achieving the desired consensus was by first voting, as he had proposed, on the controversial paragraph. He understood the clarification given by the Chair to mean that adoption of a draft resolution by consensus was possible in the circumstances indicated. Perhaps the Secretariat could provide further clarification.

301. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Council) said that he could only state what United Nations practice was in such circumstances. He drew attention to rule 60, paragraph 2, of the Council's rules of procedure, which stated that members abstaining from voting were considered as not voting. According to United Nations editorial directives and established practice, even when the phrase "by consensus" was used in a meeting, the report would merely say: "The resolution was adopted"; at most, the phrase "without a vote" might be added although that was not, at present, the usual practice. It had frequently happened that votes on a number of individual paragraphs of draft resolutions had been taken, and—irrespective of whether some delegations had voted against or abstained—the draft resolutions as a whole had subsequently been adopted without a vote, the result being recorded simply as "adopted" or more rarely, "adopted without a vote".

302. Mr. DIECKMANN (Federal Republic of Germany) said that the representative of Luxembourg, speaking on behalf of the EEC countries, had expressed their support for the flexible approach advocated by the delegation of the United States. It was not a question of a lack of co-operativeness. Most of the delegations that had some difficulty in accepting operative paragraph 10 represented countries that were the principal contributors of assistance to Africa in overcoming its problems, including the debt problem. That was why it was so important to give unanimous expression to concern about the future of Africa and reaffirm the common will to rally to the support of the continent. There was, he believed, universal support for the resolve expressed by the African Heads of State in their priority programme, and, if the Council were to disagree about a single paragraph of a draft resolution, it would give a misleading signal to the world at large.

303. Mr. RIPERT (Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation) thought that it might be helpful to the Council if he passed on to it the news which he had just received by telephone that the Nairobi Conference had adopted by consensus the document on future strategies, notwithstanding the fact that a vote had been taken on some of its constituent paragraphs. He thought it proper to ask all delegations to reflect on the signal that the Council should be seeking to give as it concluded its discussion of the situation in Africa.

304. Mr. REDOUANE (Algeria) said that it was essential not to lose sight of the fact that operative paragraphs 10 and 11 of the draft resolution referred to an appeal and a request by African Heads of State and Government. The African countries could not countenance a vote on those paragraphs which involved the slightest risk of a negative opinion being expressed—that would be an affront to the Heads of State of the continent. He hoped that point would be understood by all delegations. He repeated his appeal that the draft resolution should be adopted by consensus, and without a vote being taken on any of its parts.

305. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) said that a vote on the controversial paragraph appeared to be inevitable. His fear was that, because of a certain intransigence that had emerged, the Council would lose the opportunity of adopting the draft resolution as a whole by consensus.

306. Mr. LEE (Canada) wondered whether a way out might be found if the Council adopted the following draft decision: "The Economic and Social Council decides to recommend to the General Assembly the adoption of the annexed draft resolution (E/1985/L.58) by consensus."

307. Mr. SENE (Senegal) said that, bearing in mind the message from the President of OAU, the Declaration adopted by the General Assembly in its resolution 39/29, and the news that the Nairobi Conference had issued appeals similar to those that had originated from the OAU summit, and in view of the arduous negotia-

tions that had taken place in the Council, he thought it essential for the Council to make a further attempt to reach a decision which would strengthen the United Nations system and bring assistance and hope to the African people, whose Heads of State were waiting to learn the outcome of the present debate. He therefore, requested a suspension of the meeting to allow informal consultations to take place.

The meeting was suspended at 2.25 a.m. and resumed at 2.40 a.m.

308. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) formally proposed that a vote should be taken on operative paragraph 10 of the draft resolution.

309. Mr. FAREED (Observer for Pakistan), supported by Mr. MALIK (India), proposed that the Council should take no action on the United States proposal.

310. The PRESIDENT said that, under rule 67, paragraph 2, of the Council's rules of procedure, he would put the Pakistani and Indian proposal to the vote.

The Pakistani and Indian proposal was adopted by 31 votes to 5, with 5 abstentions.

311. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote because it had had no opportunity to discover precisely what was involved. It was not clear whether there had been some attempt at a deal or to evade the political issue. The fudging of issues could not redound to the Council's credit. It was, moreover, a sound and established practice for the results of informal consultations to be reported to the Council.

312. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to take action on draft resolution E/1985/L.58 as a whole and as amended orally by the Vice-President. The sponsors had informed him that they did not, in the circumstances, wish the wording of operative paragraph 9 of E/1985/L.83 to be substituted for operative paragraph 10.

Draft resolution E/1985/L.58, as orally amended by the Vice-President, was adopted by consensus (resolution 1985/80).

313. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) said that the procedure adopted to prevent action being taken on his delegation's proposal was a dangerous precedent as it could be used repeatedly to prevent delegations from securing votes on individual paragraphs of draft resolutions. He thought that all delegations should recognize that such procedures were open to abuse and that resort to them might hamper the work of the Council and similar bodies.

314. If a vote had been taken on operative paragraph 10, his delegation would have abstained, and it wished its vote against the Indian and Pakistani proposal to be considered as equivalent to abstention on that paragraph. That at least was how his delegation viewed the matter. It would have abstained because it

was convinced that the only productive method of dealing with debt problems was to ensure that they were given careful and expert consideration on a case-by-case basis in such appropriate forums as the Interim Committee of IMF, the World Bank/IMF Development Committee, and the Paris Club. It was counterproductive for doubt to be cast on the competence of such bodies.

315. He trusted that the Group of African States realized that they had a friend indeed in the United States of America, which in the current year would contribute more than \$2 billion to African relief and development. Despite the long and arduous negotiations on the draft resolution, no one should doubt the commitment of his country, its people and Government to the well-being of the African continent.

316. Mr. WOLZFELD (Luxembourg), speaking on behalf of the EEC member countries, said that the draft resolution reflected the international community's concern at the catastrophic situation in Africa. The EEC countries had shown, both through their activities within the framework of the Communities and bilaterally, their solidarity with the peoples of that continent, to which they were bound by so many ties. Although they had been able to support the adoption by consensus of the draft resolution, he wished to make it clear that, if there had been a vote on operative paragraph 10, they would have not been able to agree with its content. A constructive dialogue had in fact developed in the competent international bodies, particularly the Fund, the World Bank and the Paris Club, in which appropriate strategies were being worked out to deal with the debt problems of the African and other developing countries. The delegations on whose behalf he was speaking continued to think that the case-by-case approach was the best way to achieve the objectives stated in the Declaration adopted by the General Assembly.

317. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) expressed his delegation's gratification at the adoption by consensus of the draft resolution. The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries had always co-operated constructively in the solution of the problems facing the peoples of Africa and they would continue to provide every assistance to that end.

318. If operative paragraph 10 of the draft resolution had been put to the vote, his delegation would have voted for it.

319. Mr. LEE (Canada) said that his delegation had been very pleased to be able to join in the consensus because of the great importance it attached to strengthening international action in response to the emergency situation in Africa and to relaunching the development process.

320. If operative paragraph 10 had been put to the vote, his delegation would not have been able to support it. It continued to believe that debt problems should be dealt with in the appropriate bodies and on a case-by-case basis.

321. Mr. REDOUANE (Algeria) expressed his delegation's gratification at the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus. On behalf of the Group of African States, he thanked all delegations that had, by joining in the consensus, shown solidarity with the African countries at a time when they were passing through a severe ordeal. It was particularly pleasing to note that the cordial atmosphere that had prevailed during the initial consultations had been re-established at their conclusion. He wished particularly to express the Group's thanks to the Vice-President, Mr. Kumlin, to whose efforts success was mainly due, and to pay tribute to Sweden—the country that Mr. Kumlin represented—which had set an example by its generous contributions to assistance for Africa. Finally, he expressed his appreciation to the President, the Secretary-General, the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation and to the representatives of all the organizations in the United Nations system for their contributions to the success of the session.

322. Mr. WANG Boaliu (China) expressed his delegation's gratification at the adoption of the draft resolution by the consensus, and its thanks to the President and Vice-President for their contributions to that happy outcome. It would enable momentum to be maintained in providing assistance for the African countries, to which his delegation attached great importance.

323. The PRESIDENT announced that draft resolution E/1985/L.53 had been withdrawn.

324. He suggested that the Council adopt the following draft resolution concerning the reports examined under agenda item 4:

“The Council takes note of the following documents:

“(a) Report of the Secretary-General on the critical economic situation in Africa (E/1985/104 and Add.1 and 2);

“(b) Second Special Memorandum by the Economic Commission for Africa Conference of Ministers: International Action for Relaunching the Initiative for Long-term Development and Economic Growth in Africa, adopted on 29 April 1985 at the twentieth session of the Economic Commission for Africa (E/1985/122, annex).”

The draft decision, as orally presented, was adopted (decision 1985/203).

325. The PRESIDENT announced that the Council had completed its consideration of agenda item 4.

Summary of estimates of programme budget implications of resolutions and decisions adopted by the Economic and Social Council during its first and second regular sessions of 1985

326. The PRESIDENT drew the attention of the Council to the report of the Secretary-General containing the summary of estimated of programme budget implications of the resolutions and decisions adopted by

the Council during its first and second regular sessions of 1985 (E/1985/158). He invited the Council to take note of this report.

It was so decided (decision 1985/205).

327. Mr. BAKALOV (Bulgaria), speaking on behalf of the delegations of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, said that they shared the concern of the developing countries about their difficult economic situation. During the general discussion in the First and Third Committees, the socialist countries had supported the justified demands of the developing countries for increased assistance from the developed capitalist countries as compensation for the losses suffered by their economies as a result of colonial and neocolonial exploitation. They had also supported the efforts of the developing countries to overcome their economic difficulties within the framework of the regional commissions. The fact had to be faced, however, that United Nations resources were not unlimited, and every effort had to be made to use them as efficiently as possible. The resources of the United Nations regular budget were not intended to finance economic and technical assistance. They were intended to finance the work of the Secretariat in carrying out directives in resolutions and decisions of United Nations intergovernmental bodies. The financing of economic and social development was based on the resources of the countries concerned and on resources supplied by other countries on a voluntary basis. For that reason the socialist countries were opposed to the inclusion in the regular budget of voluntarily funded programmes and projects. The use of regular budget resources for such purposes should be confined to cases where economies could be achieved by dropping obsolete or subsidiary programmes or programmes that duplicated or overlapped with other activities of the United Nations and the Secretariat.

Closure of the session

328. The PRESIDENT announced that the Council had completed its discussion of all agenda items.

329. In spite of the intensive negotiations entailed by a number of the important questions discussed by the Council at the session, it had been possible to bring it to a fruitful conclusion thanks to the spirit of co-operation and compromise displayed by all delegations. He expressed his appreciation to all participants, including the Vice-Presidents, the secretariat and the technical services.

330. Mr. BAKALOV (Bulgaria) said that in view of the very late hour, he would not read out the statement he had intended to make on behalf of the socialist countries. He requested that it should be incorporated in the summary record.

331. The PRESIDENT assured the Bulgarian representative that his request would be taken into account.*

332. Mr. KHALIL (Observer for Egypt) expressed his delegation's admiration for the able manner in which the President had conducted the meetings of the Council. In his view, the Council had at its current session achieved unprecedented results that would have a positive impact for years to come.

333. Mr. EKBLÖM (Finland), speaking on behalf of the Group of West European and Other States, thanked the President, the officers of the Council and all others who had contributed to the successful outcome of the session. The discussions had helped to clarify points of convergence and points of divergence among the delegations, which was an important basis for further progress in dealing with issues of international economic co-operation.

334. Mr. REDOUANE (Algeria), speaking also on behalf of the Group of African States, thanked the President and all others who had contributed to the success of the session.

335. The PRESIDENT announced the closure of the second regular session of 1985 of the Economic and Social Council.

*The meeting rose on Saturday, 27 July 1985
at 3.25 a.m.*

Annex

1. Mr. BAKALOV (Bulgaria), speaking on behalf of the delegations of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, said that the fortieth anniversary of the victory over nazism, fascism and Japanese militarism and of the founding of the United Nations was an appropriate occasion to review the results of United Nations work, assess its contribution to the preservation and strengthening of peace and to the development of international economic co-operation, and to map out the lines on which co-operation should be extended in the future in the light of the tasks assigned to the Council under the Charter. The delegations of the socialist countries had participated actively in the work of the session and had made a number of constructive proposals. It had been rightly pointed out that the arms race was the main obstacle to the improvement of international economic relations because of the resources it diverted from social and economic development. The general opinion of members of the Council was that the number of acute problems facing the international community was continuing to increase, and that they bore most heavily upon the developing countries. Neo-colonial exploitation of those countries' natural and other resources was intensifying, their debt burden was becoming increasingly onerous, and the net outflow of their financial resources was also on the increase. The majority of delegations had rejected the view that the incipient recovery in some developed capitalist countries was hav-

ing a beneficial effect upon the economies of the developing countries. They had identified as causes of the deterioration in the international economy: artificially high interest rates and an unrealistic exchange rate of the dollar, protectionism, and the trade embargo imposed upon a number of developing and non-aligned countries. The overwhelming majority of delegations had called for a further strengthening of the universal role of the United Nations in fostering economic and social progress. There had been once again some talk of a "crisis of multilateralism". In the view of the socialist countries, that term had been invented as a cover for the policy of undermining equal and mutually advantageous international economic co-operation, and with a view to diverting the United Nations from the solution of the key problems of social and economic development.

2. The Council had adopted a number of useful and politically important resolutions and decisions at the current session, including the resolution on the critical economic situation in Africa, the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies assistance to the Palestinian people, assistance to Lebanon, the decision on Israeli economic practices in Palestine and the other occupied Arab territories and the decision on transnational corporations, which would enable the Commission to continue negotiations on the code of conduct.

3. The socialist countries were supporting the developing countries in their struggle to restructure international economic relations and to establish a new international economic order. The key to success in the struggle was for the developing countries to present a united front and take a stand on the principles embodied in the Charter of the Economic Rights and Duties of States, the Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, and the documents originating from the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries. Guided by the programme of action adopted at the economic summit of CMEA member countries in June 1984, the socialist delegations had submitted draft resolutions aimed at accelerating the economic decolonization of the developing countries and the establishment of economic security, the creation of favourable conditions for the holding of constructive and fruitful negotiations on international economic problems, and the study of long-term trends in world economic development. Those initiatives aimed at developing broad international co-operation had received support from many delegations, which had contributed constructive proposals. For a number of reasons the Council had been unable to adopt the draft resolutions, but they were to be transmitted to the General Assembly; the socialist delegations intended to co-operate with all other delegations in a constructive spirit in order to achieve their adoption by the Assembly. The Council could only carry out the tasks assigned it under the Charter of the United Nations when it concentrated its attention on the root causes of international economic problems and solved them on the basis of the progressive texts adopted by the General Assembly on the restructuring of international economic relations. The socialist countries would defend and develop the progressive principles worked out by the collective efforts of all Member States, and they hoped that other countries would take similar action.

4. The socialist delegations believed that, at the political level, the economic organs of the United Nations were faced with such inter-related problems as the establishment of the economic security of States, and the furthering of the economic decolonization of the developing countries. They believed that the way to attain those objectives was to exclude all exploitation and discrimination from international economic relations, and to promote equal and mutually advantageous co-operation between States. The establishment and development of relations between the socialist and the developing countries, based on principles of equality, non-interference in one another's internal affairs and respect for national sovereignty, were contributing to the strengthening of democratic trends in the world economy, and were a convincing demonstration of the superiority of stable international forms of co-operation. They had declared their readiness for peaceful, mutually advantageous co-operation with all countries. There was no reasonable alternative to co-operation based on the principles of peaceful coexistence.

* The text of the statement is contained in the annex to the present summary record.