



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 27th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. AL-ASITAI (Democratic Yemen)

CONTENTS

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

AGENDA ITEM 79: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued)

(a) TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 82: SPECIAL ECONOMIC AND DISASTER RELIEF ASSISTANCE (continued)

**(b) SPECIAL PROGRAMMES OF ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE: REPORTS OF THE
SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)**

AGENDA ITEM 81: TRAINING AND RESEARCH (continued)

**(b) UNITED NATIONS UNIVERSITY: REPORT OF THE COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS
UNIVERSITY (continued)**

(d) UNIVERSITY FOR PEACE (continued)

*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.2/41/SR.27
6 November 1986

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

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

Draft resolution on the inclusion of Kiribati, Mauritania and Tuvalu in the list of the least developed countries (A/C.2/41/L.25)

1. Mr. VAN LIEROP (Vanuatu), introducing the draft resolution, said that its sponsors had been joined by Barbados, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Djibouti, the Niger, Peru, Saint Christopher and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Trinidad and Tobago and Zimbabwe. Following the recommendation of the Committee for Development Planning to confer least developed country status on Kiribati, Mauritania and Tuvalu and the Economic and Social Council resolution endorsing that decision, it was now for the General Assembly to agree that the three countries should be added to the list of least developed countries.

2. As the representative of the most recently designated least developed country, he could state categorically that all such countries would prefer to have the economic growth, the per capita gross domestic product and the development prospects which would take them out of that category. But, until those levels of economic achievement were attained, the least developed countries looked to the United Nations for assistance. He was confident that the three countries, which had all met the criteria established for least developed country status, would receive the Committee's unanimous endorsement for their inclusion in that category.

Draft resolution on the role of entrepreneurs in economic development (A/C.2/41/L.28)

3. Mr. LABERGE (Canada), introducing draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.28 on behalf of its sponsors, said that the role of entrepreneurs in economic development had been discussed at length by the Economic and Social Council at its second regular session of 1986 and that efforts had been made in informal consultations to accommodate different points of view. The concept was now being reintroduced in the draft resolution and was again the subject of consultations in the broader framework of the General Assembly. It was to be hoped that the Second Committee would adopt it by consensus.

Draft resolutions on the "Tenth session of the Commission on Human Settlements" and the "International Year of Shelter for the Homeless" (A/C.2/41/L.4)

4. Mr. JØNCK (Denmark), Vice-Chairman, said that the two draft resolutions contained in document A/C.2/41/L.4 had met with unanimous support in informal consultations. He therefore recommended them for adoption by consensus, subject only to the amendment of paragraph 4 of the draft resolution on the International Year of Shelter for the Homeless to request Governments to submit detailed reports on their activities in the Year as soon as possible, not "before 31 October 1986".

/...

5. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution entitled "Tenth session of the Commission on Human Settlements".

6. It was so decided.

7. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution entitled "International Year of Shelter for the Homeless", as orally revised.

8. It was so decided.

Draft resolution on assistance to the Palestinian people (A/C.2/41/L.21)

9. Mr. JØNCK (Denmark), Vice-Chairman, said that informal consultations had failed to produce consensus on the draft resolution, and it was therefore before the Committee for action.

10. The CHAIRMAN announced that Algeria, Bangladesh, Madagascar, Senegal, the Syrian Arab Republic and Tunisia had become sponsors of the draft resolution.

11. Mr. HARAN (Israel) said that his delegation would vote against the draft resolution, but wished to stress that Israel did not oppose assistance to the Palestinian people. Indeed, the main purpose of the draft resolution should be to encourage countries that claimed to want to help the Palestinian people to provide additional resources. Plans already existed to spend more than had been contributed to date and it would have been natural for the draft to include a specific call on such countries to contribute more. However, that had not been done. Moreover, the draft resolution wrongly implied that the situation of the Palestinian people had deteriorated. Finally, the reference to the Israeli occupation in operative paragraph 6 was gratuitous and out of order. Instead of calling for negotiations that might lead to positive changes, the draft resolution was trying to encourage confrontation. If adopted as it stood, it might create serious obstacles to progress on the Palestinian problem.

12. The CHAIRMAN put the draft resolution to the vote.

13. Draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.21 was adopted by 137 votes to 2.

14. Mr. SCOTT (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote after the vote, said that his Government had been the largest single donor of economic assistance to the Palestinian people. For over a decade, it had had a direct programme for those living in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip under which it had provided over \$80 million worth of assistance, \$14 million in 1986 alone. His country was also the primary contributor to United Nations agencies assisting the Palestinian people and each year sponsored the resolution providing for the continuation of UNRWA, as well as contributing a third of its budget. In addition to the \$24 million which that represented, a special supplement of \$18 million had been authorized in 1986 to help UNRWA meet its budget crisis. The United States also contributed 17 per cent of the budget of UNDP and had pledged additional funds to its special programme of assistance to the Palestinian people.

(Mr. Scott, United States)

15. No Government was more committed than his own to achieving a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. However, the draft resolution just adopted had unnecessarily politicized the debate on the need to assist the Palestinian people, and his delegation had therefore voted against it. His delegation challenged those who talked ceaselessly of assisting the Palestinians to match the efforts and contributions of the United States to that cause.

16. Mr. DUN (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), speaking on behalf of the European Economic Community and its member States, said that those States had voted in favour of the draft resolution and would continue to provide humanitarian assistance in various ways, such as supplies of food, emergency aid, and the co-financing of measures to benefit the Palestinian people in the occupied territories and elsewhere. Only the previous week, the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the EEC countries had approved a programme of aid for the Palestinian people and had decided to give their agricultural and industrial exports preferential access to Community markets, since that seemed to be the best way of responding to their urgent needs.

17. Mr. WALTER (Czechoslovakia), speaking also on behalf of the delegations of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian SSR and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, said that they had voted in favour of the draft resolution because they attached great importance to the socio-economic aspects of the Middle East problem and firmly supported the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to establish its own independent State. They also condemned Israel's action in preventing the exercise of that right, for which those who were financing and arming the aggressors, giving them political cover and impeding the establishment of a just and stable peace in the Middle East bore their own share of responsibility.

18. The way to achieve a comprehensive settlement of the Middle East problem was through the collective efforts of all interested parties, including the Palestine Liberation Organization. The most effective means would be to call an international peace conference on the Middle East. The delegations on whose behalf he was speaking would continue to support United Nations activities on the socio-economic aspects of the Middle East problem such as those dealt with by the draft resolution just adopted.

19. Mr. BATTAINEH (Jordan) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it supported the provision of all possible aid to ease the sufferings of the Palestinian people. His country had always sought to alleviate those sufferings and to enable the Palestinian people to enjoy their sovereign rights in the occupied territories. However, with respect to paragraph 9 of the draft resolution, he had to point out that all measures of United Nations assistance to the Palestinians in Jordan must be carried out only with the prior cognizance of his Government, since they were subject to Jordanian sovereignty.

Draft resolution on strengthening the work of the United Nations in integrating women effectively into economic development programmes and activities (A/C.2/41/L.26)

20. The CHAIRMAN announced that Bangladesh, Kenya, Lesotho, Malaysia, Morocco, New Zealand and Thailand had joined in sponsoring the draft resolution.

/...

AGENDA ITEM 79: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued)

Draft decision on the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States (A/C.2/41/L.13)

21. Mr. JØNCK (Denmark), Vice-Chairman, said that it had not been possible to reach agreement in informal consultations on the draft decision, and it was therefore before the Committee for action.
22. Mr. HARAN (Israel), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that his delegation would vote against the draft decision because it did not believe it was appropriate for the Committee to instruct the Secretary-General as to how he should go about elaborating the comprehensive and analytical report requested in General Assembly resolution 40/182. Having been given the mandate by the General Assembly to prepare the report, the Secretary-General should be allowed to do so as he sought fit.
23. The CHAIRMAN put the draft decision to the vote.
24. Draft decision A/C.2/41/L.13 was adopted by 115 votes to 3, with 21 abstentions.
25. Mr. DUN (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the States members of the European Community, said that they had abstained in the vote on the draft decision. Their position with regard to the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States was well known. However, in the light of the unenthusiastic response to the letter which the Secretariat had circulated following the adoption of General Assembly resolution 40/182, they questioned the utility of requesting the Secretary-General to devote more time and resources to the circulation of a questionnaire on the subject.
26. Mr. OLSSON (Sweden), speaking on behalf of the delegation of Finland as well as his own, said that the two countries had supported the adoption of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States in 1974, although they had had and continued to have reservations on that subject. They had also voted in favour of General Assembly resolution 40/182, on the same subject. However, they had been unable to support the decision which the Committee had just adopted. Given that paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 40/182 called for the Secretary-General's report to be submitted to the General Assembly at its forty-fourth session, there seemed to be little use in adopting a decision on the matter at the forty-first session. They also questioned whether the Committee ought to be advising the Secretary-General how to carry out tasks with which it had already entrusted him.
27. Mr. WALTER (Czechoslovakia), speaking also on behalf of the delegations of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian SSR and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, said that they had voted in favour of the draft decision because the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States was one of the fundamental United Nations documents that must form the basis for the restructuring of international economic relations on democratic lines. It was important for the United Nations to review and appraise implementation of the Charter, the main aim being to expose the remaining obstacles to implementation of its provisions. The analytical preparatory work of the Secretariat had a major part to play in that process.

(Mr. Walter, Czechoslovakia)

28. The draft resolution would help the Secretary-General to implement General Assembly resolution 40/182. Because the Charter was addressed to States, it was important to determine which of them fulfilled its provisions and which declined to do so and why. Government replies to the proposed questionnaire from the Secretariat could be a useful aid to such an analysis. The delegate is on whose behalf he was speaking hoped that consideration of the results might encourage countries that were still not doing so to observe the provisions of the Charter in their foreign economic policies and activities.

29. Mr. PAYTON (New Zealand) said that his delegation had been absent at the time of the vote; however, if it had been present, it would have abstained, for the reasons given by the representative of Sweden.

30. Mr. PALOMO (Guatemala) said that, although its vote had been shown as against the draft decision, his delegation had intended to vote in favour.

(a) TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT (continued)

Draft resolution on the trade embargo against Nicaragua (A/C.2/41/L.29)

31. Ms. ASTORGA-GADEA (Nicaragua), introducing draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.29 on behalf of its sponsors, which had been joined by Angola, said that, contrary to the wishes of the international community as expressed in General Assembly resolution 40/188, the trade embargo against Nicaragua, far from being revoked had been broadened and renewed every six months. The embargo had affected 14.9 per cent of Nicaragua's world trade, with direct negative effects on a series of export goods. The consequences were even more serious with regard to imports, in view of the country's traditional industrial and technological dependence on the United States. As a result, the damages suffered by the Nicaraguan economy had, as of mid-1986, amounted to \$93.3 million.

32. Her country was therefore facing an economic problem which not only impeded the development of its foreign trade but also limited its future economic development. The imposition of trade embargoes and other coercive economic measures did not help to promote trade, development and just and equitable international economic relations. It was therefore for the Second Committee, which discussed those items year after year, to consider those problems in detail in order to avoid their proliferation. By submitting the draft resolution, the sponsors were also defending the principles enshrined in General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV), the Charter of the United Nations, and other United Nations documents and resolutions.

33. Since 19 July 1979 when Nicaragua had become an independent nation, it had been endeavouring to diversify its trade. Because it believed in its right to maintain just and equitable relations with all countries and in the need to abolish coercive economic measures, it once again called for a lifting of the trade embargo against Nicaragua.

34. Mr. NORRIS (United States of America) said that his country welcomed the opportunity to discuss its trade embargo against Nicaragua within the context of the overall situation in Central America. However, the draft resolution addressed only one facet of a very complex situation, which also involved the question of human rights, free elections, security concerns and non-interference in the affairs of the States of the Central American region. The agenda approved by the General Assembly for its forty-first session included agenda item 42, on the situation in Central America, and that was the appropriate context for a comprehensive discussion of those issues.

35. In order to rationalize the Committee's work and maintain the high quality of its debate, the United States formally proposed that draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.29 and the Secretary-General's report contained in documents A/41/596 and 596/Add.1 and 2 should be referred to plenary meeting for discussion under agenda item 42. That proposal was in no way an attempt to stifle discussion of the issue or limit Nicaragua's desire to debate the matter in detail. Debate in plenary would allow broad discussion of the economic and financial aspects in connection with the important social, political and security considerations which were intrinsically tied to that issue. On the basis of the provisions of rule 31 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, he requested that that proposal should be given priority over further consideration of the draft resolution.

36. Mr. MARIN-BOSCH (Mexico) said that the United States proposal was an example of the many ways in which a delegation could complicate the consideration of a subject which was not to its liking. Attempts had also been made in the Committee at the fortieth session of the General Assembly to divert the contents of the draft resolution on the embargo against Nicaragua and, by a similar motion of procedure, to prevent the Committee from taking a decision, but those attempts had failed.

37. The trade embargo, which was being considered under agenda item 79, was of special importance to all members of the Committee and especially to the Latin American countries. The members of the Contadora Group and the Contadora Support Group would therefore vote against the United States proposal.

38. Mr. WALTER (Czechoslovakia), speaking in his capacity as Chairman of the Socialist group of Eastern European countries, said that he was opposed to the proposal made by the United States. The Second Committee had unanimously adopted the agenda for the forty-first session of the General Assembly. Under item 79 of that agenda, the Secretary-General had submitted a report on the implementation of General Assembly resolution 40/188 on the trade embargo against Nicaragua. Draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.29 was a logical conclusion of the Second Committee's discussion of agenda item 79 (a) and should therefore be considered by that Committee.

39. Mr. MANZOU (Zimbabwe) said that his delegation was aware of the motivations prompting delegations to seek once again to block discussion on the trade embargo against Nicaragua in the Second Committee. But, as emphasized by earlier speakers, the draft resolution was the result of the adoption of General Assembly resolution 40/188. Moreover, the General Committee had decided that the Second Committee should consider agenda item 79. The situation in Central America, which the General Assembly would consider under agenda item 42, was a specific issue which should not prejudice or prevent discussion on the trade embargo in the Second Committee. His delegation was therefore opposed to the United States proposal.

40. Mr. MASRI (Syrian Arab Republic) said that draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.29 was fully consistent with agenda item 79 (a) because the trade embargo posed obstacles to Nicaragua's trade and development. Consequently, the Committee was duty bound to adopt a resolution on that question. His delegation was therefore opposed to the United States proposal and supported the draft resolution.

41. The CHAIRMAN said that, under rule 131 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the United States had requested that priority should be given to its proposal over the proposal contained in draft resolution A/C.2/41/SR.29. He invited the members of the Committee to vote on whether that priority should be accorded.

42. The request for priority was rejected by 65 votes to 33, with 21 abstentions.

43. Mr. LOHIA (Papua New Guinea), Mr. MUSOKE (Uganda) and Mr. AL-OSTA (Yemen) said that the voting machine had been turned off before they could register their votes; they had wished to vote against the request for priority.

44. Mr. NGREGAI (Central African Republic) said that his vote would have been in favour of the request.

45. The CHAIRMAN said that, since the request had been rejected, the Committee would consider the proposals in the order in which they had been submitted, which meant that the proposal contained in draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.29 would be considered first at a later stage.

Draft resolution on economic measures as a means of political and economic coercion against developing countries (A/C.2/41/L.30)

46. Mr. SEKULIC (Yugoslavia), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Group of 77, said that it was being submitted as an expression of the Group's concern at the growing use of economic measures to coerce developing countries and infringe their sovereign rights. The importance of the issue had moved the Group to ask the Secretary-General for a new report including information not only from Governments, but also from all the organs and organizations of the United Nations system concerned. The Group was also asking for suggestions for monitoring the use of economic measures as a means of political and economic coercion against developing countries.

47. Since the essence of the problem was not new, the draft resolution should come as no surprise and its sponsors hoped that other groups would adopt a more positive approach to the matter than they had in the past.

Draft resolution on protectionism and structural adjustment (A/C.2/41/L.7)

48. Mr. JØNCK (Denmark), Vice-Chairman, said that agreement had been reached in informal consultations to suggest that the draft resolution in document A/C.2/41/L.7 be referred to the General Assembly at its forty-second session for consideration.

49. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, in view of the information provided by the representative of Denmark, the Committee should adopt the following draft decision: "The General Assembly decides to defer consideration of the draft resolution entitled 'Protectionism and structural adjustment', contained in document A/C.2/L.7, to its forty-second session".

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

51. Mr. BAHADIAN (Brazil), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that, at the 25th meeting, the representative of the United States of America had inaccurately stated that the contracting parties to GATT had met at Punta del Este, Uruguay, in order, inter alia, to expand GATT rules to important new sectors of world trade, including services, and had indicated that the developing countries were in agreement with that position. It should be pointed out that, while negotiations for the elaboration of possible rules and principles on trade in services would take place with the support of the GATT secretariat, they did not fall within the scope of application of existing GATT principles. Negotiations on services at Punta del Este had been convened by the ministers meeting there, and not by the contracting parties, a distinction of fundamental importance that had been overlooked in the United States statement.

AGENDA ITEM 82: SPECIAL ECONOMIC AND DISASTER RELIEF ASSISTANCE (continued)

(b) SPECIAL PROGRAMMES OF ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE: REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/C.2/41/L.22, L.23 and L.27)

Draft resolution on assistance to Solomon Islands (A/C.2/41/L.23)

52. Mr. LOHIA (Papua New Guinea), introducing the draft resolution, said that its sponsors had been joined by Japan and Pakistan. The draft resolution was intended to place on record the General Assembly's concern at the cyclone damage inflicted in May 1986, to acknowledge the assistance given to Solomon Islands since then and to recognize the central role played by the United Nations system in the rehabilitation process. It was not intended to lead to a special economic assistance programme mission or to a written report to the Economic and Social Council in 1987. It sought instead to build upon arrangements already in place to assist Solomon Islands. Recognizing the outstanding work already done by UNDP, the sponsors were recommending the action set out in paragraphs 4 and 5 of the draft resolution, regarding it as being fully compatible with the Committee's wish to move away from long-term special economic assistance programmes and missions where they were not required and to look instead to an enhanced co-ordination role for UNDP.

53. The entire economic base of Solomon Islands had been seriously weakened and it would take many years to recover. It was vital that the strong support which Solomon Islands had been receiving from the international community should continue. He therefore commended the draft resolution for adoption by the Committee.

Draft resolution on assistance to El Salvador (A/C.2/41/L.27)

54. Mr. MARTINEZ-ORDONEZ (Honduras), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of its sponsors, said that it was intended to draw attention to the pressing need for massive aid to relieve the consequences of the recent earthquake that had left over 1,200 dead and many injured and homeless, and had caused losses estimated at over \$2 million. El Salvador required urgent assistance from the international community and he therefore called on the Committee to adopt the draft resolution unanimously.

Draft resolution on the Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator (A/C.2/41/L.22)

55. Mr. BEN MOUSSA (Morocco) announced that the following countries had joined in sponsoring the draft resolution: Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Jamaica, Jordan, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malta, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Suriname, Swaziland, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen and Zimbabwe.

AGENDA ITEM 81: TRAINING AND RESEARCH (continued)

- (b) UNITED NATIONS UNIVERSITY: REPORT OF THE COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS UNIVERSITY (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.16/Rev.1

56. Mr. de ROJAS (Venezuela), Vice-Chairman, said that informal consultations on the draft resolution, led to consensus on the revised text now before the Committee.

57. Draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.16/Rev.1 was adopted.

58. Mr. CAPRIROLO-CATTORETTI (Bolivia) said his delegation would have liked to become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

- (d) UNIVERSITY FOR PEACE (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.15

59. Mr. de ROJAS (Venezuela), Vice-Chairman, said that informal consultations had indicated the existence of a consensus on the draft resolution.

60. The CHAIRMAN announced that Argentina had become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

61. Draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.15 was adopted.

The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.