



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 28th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. AL-ASHTAL (Democratic Yemen)

CONTENTS

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

AGENDA ITEM 81: TRAINING AND RESEARCH (continued)

(a) UNITED NATIONS INSTITUTE FOR TRAINING AND RESEARCH (continued)

(c) UNIFIED APPROACH TO DEVELOPMENT ANALYSIS AND PLANNING: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

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

(b) SPECIAL PROGRAMMES OF ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE (continued)

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

(a) TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT (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.28
14 November 1986

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 4.05 p.m.

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

(A/C.2/41/L.14, L.24 and L.42, L.25, L.26, L.33, L.34, L.35, L.49, L.50 and L.51)

Draft resolution on international economic security (A/C.2/41/L.33)

1. Mr. ZVEZDIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the purpose of the draft resolution was to provide guidelines for the preparation of the report on international economic security, which the Secretary-General was to submit to the General Assembly at its forty-second session. The consideration of that report should facilitate the search for common elements in countries' approaches to the solution of world economic problems. The draft resolution was not aimed at rescinding or replacing any of the numerous and useful United Nations decisions on development and international economic co-operation. On the contrary, it should provide further impetus to discussions in United Nations economic bodies regarding the economic interdependence of all States. The draft resolution reflected many specific observations and proposals which had been made by members of the Committee. A number of additional requests had been received after the draft resolution was issued, and its sponsors would consider them when preparing the final version of the text.

Draft resolution on countries stricken by desertification and drought in Africa (A/C.2/41/L.34)

2. Mr. FALL (Senegal), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, who had been joined by Cape Verde and Chad, said that in its resolution 40/209 of 17 December 1985, the General Assembly had requested the Secretary-General to ensure that the problem of desertification and drought was dealt with in odd years, in accordance with the biennial programme of work of the Second Committee. Since the Committee's draft biennial programme of work had scheduled consideration of the question for 1987, the sponsors of the draft resolution wished to refer it for consideration to the Assembly at its forty-second session.

3. Mr. de ROJAS (Venezuela), Vice-Chairman, said that the wish of the sponsors had been endorsed in the informal consultations on the subject.

4. The CHAIRMAN said that accordingly, the Committee might wish to adopt the following draft decision:

"The General Assembly decides to defer consideration of the draft resolution entitled 'Countries stricken by desertification and drought in Africa' (A/C.2/41/L.34) to its forty-second session."

5. It was so decided.

Draft resolution on the proclamation of the World Decade for Cultural Development
(A/C.2/41/L.49)

6. Mr. SEKULIĆ (Yugoslavia), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Group of 77, said that the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) at its twenty-second session had expressed its support for the observance of a world decade for cultural development under the auspices of the United Nations and UNESCO, and the Economic and Social Council at its second regular session of 1986 had recommended that the General Assembly at its forty-first session should take a decision on the proclamation of the decade, which should be inaugurated in 1988. The Group of 77 was confident that the proclamation of the Decade would contribute to the promotion of development policies, strategies and programmes which would take account of cultural aspects and goals, thus stressing the importance of the cultural dimension of development. Since the subject was not controversial, he hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted without a vote.

Draft decision A/C.2/41/L.14 and draft resolutions A/C.2/41/24, L.26 and L.50

7. Mr. ICK (Denmark), reporting on the results of the informal consultations on the draft decision and draft resolutions under consideration, said it had been agreed that a decision on draft decision A/C.2/41/L.14, on protection against products harmful to health and the environment, should be deferred until the Committee's next meeting.

8. Agreement had been reached on a revised text (A/C.2/41/L.42) of draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.24 on locust infestation in Africa, Belgium, Burkina Faso, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Lesotho, Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Rwanda, Senegal, Spain, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Zaire had previously joined in sponsoring. He hoped that the Committee would adopt the revised text by consensus.

9. He wished to propose the following draft decision in respect of draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.26:

"The General Assembly endorses Economic and Social Council resolution 1986/65 of 23 July 1986 and notes that the comments made at the second regular session of 1986 of the Council and at the forty-first session of the Assembly on the question of the effective mobilization and integration of women in development focused on both the impact of development processes on women and the implications of women's socio-economic status for development, in the light of the implementation of the Nairobi Forward-looking Strategies for the Advancement of Women."

10. With regard to draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.50 on the United Nations Financing System for Science and Technology for Development, it had been decided to amend paragraph 6 to read "Invites Governments and the United Nations Development Programme Governing Council to give greater emphasis to science and technology for development". He hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted without a vote.

11. The CHAIRMAN said that if he heard no objection he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.42, replacing draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.24.

12. It was so decided.

13. Mr. DUN (United Kingdom), on behalf of the European Economic Community, said that climatic conditions in Africa had favoured the spread of locust infestation. To combat that infestation successfully, there was need for adequate information on its location and extent of supplies of pesticides, appropriate means for their cheap and safe application, and an organizational machinery equipped to operate across political boundaries. Although much had been achieved, a great deal more still remained to be done. The European Economic Community had committed \$27 million to that effort in 1986 and would continue to work closely with Governments and organizations involved in the fight against locust and grasshopper infestation in Africa.

14. The CHAIRMAN said that if he heard no objection he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft decision proposed by the Vice-Chairman in connection with draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.26.

15. It was so decided.

16. The CHAIRMAN said that, in the light of the adoption of the draft decision, he would take it that draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.26 was withdrawn by the sponsors.

17. It was so decided.

18. The CHAIRMAN said that if he heard no objection he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.50, as orally revised.

19. It was so decided.

20. Mr. LAZAREVIĆ (Yugoslavia), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, said that certain clarifications had been given by the Associate Director of UNDP concerning the transfer of the resources and responsibilities of the United Nations Financing System for Science and Technology for Development to the United Nations Fund for Science and Technology, which was to be established as a trust fund within UNDP. He hoped that those clarifications would be upheld as they were reflected in the official records of UNDP.

Draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.25

21. Mr. de ROJAS (Venezuela), reporting on the results of the informal consultations on draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.25 said that agreement had been reached on the current text of draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.25 on the inclusion of Kiribati, Mauritania and Tuvalu in the list of the least developed countries.

22. The CHAIRMAN said that Madagascar had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution. If he heard no objection, he would take it that draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.25 was adopted.

23. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 81: TRAINING AND RESEARCH (continued)

(a) **UNITED NATIONS INSTITUTE FOR TRAINING AND RESEARCH (continued)** (A/C.2/41/L.36 and L.48)

Draft resolution on a restructuring plan for the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (A/C.2/41/L.36 and L.48)

24. The CHAIRMAN said that the programme-budget implications of draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.36 were contained in document A/C.2/41/L.48.

25. Mr. de ROJAS (Venezuela), Vice Chairman, said it had become clear during informal consultations that the future of UNITAR was a controversial subject. Consequently, a small working group had been established to draft a text that would be acceptable to all. The result of the group's efforts was draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.36, on which consensus had been reached. He added that, in paragraph 3 of the English text of the draft resolution, the word "parameters" should be inserted after the word "following".

26. Mr. SILVA (Budget Division) said that, if the Committee adopted the draft resolution, the restructuring of UNITAR, described in paragraph 4, would be carried out with a view to retaining as many of the Institute's programmes as possible. The Secretary-General would then report on the restructuring and submit a comprehensive assessment of the experience to the General Assembly at its forty-second session. However, if the necessary financing for the restructuring was not ensured, the Secretary-General would, as noted in paragraph 5, phase out the activities of UNITAR in the most cost-effective manner possible and submit to the General Assembly at its forty-second session a detailed proposal on the reallocation of those activities within the United Nations system. No additional resources from the regular budget would be required for the preparation of either the report called for in paragraph 4 or the detailed proposal called for in paragraph 5.

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

28. Mr. SHAABAN (Egypt), speaking as chairman of the working group referred to by the Vice Chairman, said that the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus represented a landmark in the work of the Committee. In the context of the current "crisis of confidence" in the United Nations, calls for the rationalization and streamlining of the Organization's work had become the order of the day. However, a prerequisite for any reform was the elimination of all malpractices, and delegations had a duty to trace and deal with all causes of deterioration or deviation. That was what they had attempted to do in the case of UNITAR.

(Mr. Shaaban, Egypt)

29. In proposing the establishment of the working group to consider the future of UNITAR, his delegation had sought not only to persuade the Committee that UNITAR must be saved, but to prevent a further weakening of the Organization. Adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.36 indicated that all delegations were in agreement with that desire. It was now incumbent upon the Secretary-General to implement the specific measures set out in the resolution while maintaining contact with Member States in order to ensure that their aspirations for the Institute and its role as spelt out in its mandate were fulfilled.

30. Mr. ZVEZDIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had not objected to the adoption of the draft resolution without a vote. However, the leadership of UNITAR must take immediate measures to keep expenditures under control and ensure that the Institute staff was selected on the basis of equitable geographical distribution. In addition, his delegation opposed any attempt to use UNITAR as a tool to promote the introduction of private capital into developing countries, since such activities contravened the Institute's mandate.

31. Mr. LABERGE (Canada) said that, although his delegation had gone along with the consensus on the draft resolution, Canada's decision not to contribute to UNITAR remained unchanged. He was pleased to note that implementation of the resolution would not require funds from the regular budget.

32. Mr. DOO KINGUE (Executive Director, United Nations Institute for Training and Research) welcomed the consensus which had been reached on the future of UNITAR and pledged that the Board of Trustees and he would ensure that the resolution just adopted was implemented faithfully. In fact, many of the funding measures specified in the draft resolution were already being implemented. Better use of the UNITAR building would also result in a substantial increase in rental income in 1987, and other related measures including the acquisition of the land on which the building stood, were currently under consideration.

33. However, the draft resolution referred to two sensitive issues which might make its implementation somewhat difficult. The first issue regarded the trimming of staff costs in relation to operational costs. It should be noted that, with the exception of staff involved in administration and finance, all UNITAR staff were involved in programme activities; operational costs could thus be said to include staff costs. Any reduction in staff would mean cutting the UNITAR programme itself. Moreover, staff costs accounted for 53 per cent of the Institute's General Fund, a much lower percentage than in other United Nations research institutes.

34. The second issue concerned the grading of UNITAR staff. With the exception of the Executive Director, whose grade was specified in the UNITAR Statute, all UNITAR staff members were assigned grades consistent with their job descriptions by the Classification Unit of the United Nations Secretariat. It would be difficult for the Secretary-General to overlook that classification; furthermore, the grades currently assigned to UNITAR posts had been confirmed by the recent classification exercises undertaken by the United Nations Secretariat.

(Mr. Doo Lingue)

35. Efforts were being made to establish a UNITAR Reserve Fund, in keeping with the recommendation made by the Secretary-General at the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly. As of 1987, the Reserve Fund would receive nearly \$500,000 per year from non-governmental sources. It was therefore to be hoped that Member States would be encouraged to provide more generous financial support to the Institute with a view to eliminating its financial difficulties once and for all.

(c) UNIFIED APPROACH TO DEVELOPMENT ANALYSIS AND PLANNING: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/C.2/41/L.17/Rev.1)

36. Mr. de ROJAS (Venezuela), reporting on the outcome of the informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.17/Rev.1, said that agreement had been reached on the wording as it stood.

37. Mr. LABERGE (Canada) said that his delegation had not participated in discussions on the subject dealt with in the draft resolution, which was of peripheral concern to the Second Committee and did not further its work. Since it had not participated in the elaboration of the draft resolution, Canada would not feel constrained by its provisions.

38. Draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.17/Rev.1 was adopted.

39. Mr. WALTER (Czechoslovakia), speaking also on behalf of the delegations of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, said that the adoption of the draft resolution provided ample evidence that questions of social and economic development analysis and planning received adequate attention from all countries, irrespective of their socio-economic system or the level of their economic, social or cultural development. In view of the usefulness of integrating the economic and social components in national and international policies and programmes, he welcomed the decision to pursue the activities of the United Nations in promoting a unified approach to development analysis and planning.

40. Mr. MAQUIFRIA (Chile) said that his delegation had supported the draft resolution on the understanding that the implementation of paragraph 4 would not affect the Secretariat's preparation of the reports mentioned in that paragraph.

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

(b) SPECIAL PROGRAMMES OF ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE (continued) (A/C.2/41/L.8 and L.39, L.23, L.27/Rev.1, L.38, L.40 and L.41)

Draft resolution on assistance to Uganda (A/C.2/41/L.38)

41. Mr. MUSOKE (Uganda), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, said that the National Resistance Movement Government which had taken over the administration of Uganda had inherited a war-shattered economy. Infrastructure and productive capacity had been destroyed in several areas of the country and thousands of Ugandans had been displaced. The Emergency Relief and

/...

(Mr. Musoke, Uganda)

Rehabilitation Programme, which was just a first step towards the resuscitation of the economy, was aimed at the resettlement of displaced persons, the restoration of services and the provision of emergency inputs for the production of essential commodities and services.

Draft resolution on assistance for the reconstruction and development of Lebanon
(A/C.2/41/L.40)

42. Mr. BITAR (Lebanon), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, said that the economic situation in Lebanon had continued to deteriorate owing to the devaluation of Lebanese currency. In a country which relied heavily on imports, that factor alone had precipitated increased hardship for the Lebanese people. Nevertheless, the Lebanese Government had continued to implement its reconstruction programme. However, the Lebanese Government could not finance that huge effort on its own. Foreign assistance was needed more than ever, and the presence in the field of the United Nations Co-ordinator of Assistance for the Reconstruction and Development of Lebanon, together with senior staff of other agencies, was urgently required. His delegation expressed the hope that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

Draft resolution on assistance to Mozambique (A/C.2/41/L.41)

43. Mr. NAMFUA (United Republic of Tanzania), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of its sponsors, said that Mozambique badly needed special economic assistance. The South African decision to expel over 50,000 Mozambican workers had had dire consequences for Mozambique's economy. He therefore appealed to the international community to continue to provide adequate assistance to Mozambique.

Draft resolutions on special economic assistance programmes (A/C.2/41/L.8 and A/C.2/41/L.39)

44. Mr. de ROJAS (Venezuela), Vice-Chairman, said that informal consultations on draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.8 had led to the submission of a revised text, contained in document A/C.2/41/L.39, on which a consensus had subsequently been reached.

45. Draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.39 was adopted.

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

46. Mr. de ROJAS (Venezuela), Vice-Chairman, said that consensus had been reached on the draft resolution during informal consultations.

47. The CHAIRMAN announced that Canada had become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

48. Draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.23 was adopted.

49. Mr. SAEMALA (Solomon Islands) welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution. His Government was deeply grateful for the assistance received thus far to help with the reconstruction and rehabilitation programme being undertaken in Solomon Islands, and particularly appreciated the work done by UNDP in connection with the programme.

AGENDA ITEM 79: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued)
(A/C.2/41/L.6 and L.46)

Draft resolution on mobilization of financial resources for industrial development
(A/C.2/41/L.6)

50. Mr. JØNCK (Denmark), Vice-Chairman, said it had been agreed during informal consultations that the draft resolution contained in document A/C.2/41/L.6 should be transmitted to the United Nations Industrial Development Organization for consideration.

51. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee might therefore wish to adopt the following draft decision: "The General Assembly decides to transmit to the United Nations Industrial Development Organization the draft resolution entitled 'Mobilization of financial resources for industrial development'."

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

Draft decision on an international conference on money and finance (A/C.2/41/L.46)

53. Mr. SEKULIĆ (Yugoslavia), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, said that the text of the draft decision was self-explanatory, and that it should be adopted by consensus.

(a) TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT (continued) (A/C.2/41/L.12 and L.31, L.29 (and amendments A/C.2/41/L.43, L.30, L.37, L.44, L.45 and L.47)

Draft resolution on restrictive business practices (A/C.2/41/L.44)

54. Mr. SEKULIĆ (Yugoslavia), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, recalled the relevant background information provided in the report of the Secretary-General of UNCTAD (A/41/598), and recommended the draft resolution to the Committee for unanimous approval.

Draft decision on the United Nations Convention on Conditions for Registration of Ships (A/C.2/41/L.45)

55. Mr. SEKULIĆ (Yugoslavia) introduced the draft decision on behalf of the Group of 77, and hoped that the Committee would approve it unanimously.

Draft resolution on the seventh session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (A/C.2/41/L.47)

56. Mr. SEKULIĆ (Yugoslavia), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, said that the purpose of the resolution was to give full support to the substantive preparation for the seventh session of UNCTAD. The positive consensus on the provisional

(Mr. Sekulić, Yugoslavia)

agenda had marked a new beginning in the efforts to reactivate multilateral economic diplomacy and strengthen the relevance of UNCTAD as the main international forum for negotiations on development, growth and international trade. The seriousness of the current world economic situation required concrete measures for revitalizing development and growth in a more predictable and supportive environment through multilateral co-operation, and the seventh session of UNCTAD would provide an opportunity to begin that process.

Draft resolution on commodities (A/C.2/41/L.5)

57. Mr. LAZAREVIĆ (Yugoslavia) said that in 1985 the Committee had failed to reach agreement on draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.81, now reissued as document A/C.2/41/L.5, since it had considered that the draft resolution should be more procedural than substantive in nature. However, the draft resolution would be submitted to the Assembly at its forty-second session so that a decision could be taken in the light of the seventh session of UNCTAD.

Draft resolutions on specific measures in favour of island developing countries (A/C.2/41/L.12 and L.31)

58. Mr. JØNCK (Denmark), Vice-Chairman, said that informal consultations on draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.12 had led to its replacement by a revised text contained in document A/C.2/41/L.31.

59. Draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.31 was adopted.

60. Mr. PAYTON (New Zealand) said that his delegation had been pleased to join in the consensus on the draft resolution, but shared the disappointment felt by many that the in-depth assessment of the problems and needs facing island developing countries called for in General Assembly resolution 39/212 had not been addressed during the current session. Accordingly, it supported the call for a thorough assessment of that issue at the forty-third session. It was vital that the Secretary-General's report to the Assembly at its forty-third session should contain the necessary analytical work together with specific action oriented recommendations needed for a thorough review.

61. In his delegation's view, which was supported by many others, it was appropriate for the General Assembly to look at the specific needs of island developing countries. That should not be construed, however, as a desire to see them treated as a special category for development assistance, like the least developed countries; the specific nature of the latter category must be protected to ensure that the resources available to the most needy were not dissipated.

Draft resolution on the trade embargo against Nicaragua (A/C.2/41/L.29) and amendments thereto (A/C.2/41/L.43)

62. Mr. NORRIS (United States of America), introducing the amendments contained in document A/C.2/41/L.43, said that the Second Committee, by rejecting his delegation's request to refer the issue to the plenary Assembly for a full and fair discussion under agenda item 42, "The situation in Central America", had decided that it was willing and able to consider that question in all its aspects, including its political aspects.

(Mr. Norris, United States)

63. The United States had taken measures to sever its trading relations with Nicaragua only after a lengthy public discussion of many factors involving questions of security, human rights considerations and the problems of interference in the affairs of neighbouring States. Trade embargoes were not new, nor were they uncommon. The majority of nations refused to trade with one country or another for reasons of security or other political considerations. In no other case had the United Nations been asked to pronounce upon the decisions taken.

64. Since it would be impossible to discuss the trade embargo without full consideration of the factors which had led to the United States decision to impose it, his delegation had put forward the amendments, which included explicit references to the goals of the Contadora process, the GATT procedures which Nicaragua had taken against the United States, the question of human rights violations in Nicaragua and the need for the Sandinista régime to begin a true dialogue with its internal opposition. Since those questions were admittedly political, his delegation would have preferred not to introduce them in a forum dealing with development, but the Committee's earlier decision left it no choice.

65. His delegation requested a paragraph-by-paragraph consideration of the amendments and a recorded vote on any action taken on them and any other issues regarding the United States trade embargo against Nicaragua.

66. The CHAIRMAN announced that Angola and Burkina Faso had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.29.

67. Mr. JØNCK (Denmark), Vice-Chairman, reporting on the results of the informal consultations, said that the United States amendments, which were the only amendments proposed to draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.29, had not been discussed in the informal consultations since the sponsors of the draft resolution had said that they were unacceptable. As it had been impossible to reach a consensus, the sponsors had requested that the draft resolution should be submitted to the Committee.

68. Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) said that the sponsors, in informal consultations, had not said that the United States proposals were unacceptable, but that they were incompatible with the draft resolution. Their submission was clearly motivated by the failure of the repeated efforts of the United States of America to avoid consideration of the trade embargo against Nicaragua in United Nations forums. He used the term "proposals" since the contents of document A/C.2/41/L.43 constituted a new proposal, which could in no way be considered as "amendments".

69. The first of the proposed new paragraphs contained in paragraph 1 of document A/C.2/41/SR.43, was inaccurate: the appeal referred to had been made not in General Assembly resolution 39/4, but in resolution 530 (1983) of the Security Council. In resolution 39/4, the General Assembly had urged all States to respect fully the purposes and principles of the Contadora Act and the commitments undertaken by virtue of their accession to its Additional Protocol. The second proposed new paragraph, referring to the sovereign right of each country to choose

(Mr. Marin Bosch, Mexico)

its own trading policies and partners, did not take into account the work of the United Nations in the field of international economic co-operation, the efforts made by the European Economic Community in Central America, or the fact that the draft resolution referred to two countries which maintained diplomatic relations and were supposedly acting in accordance with international law and the spirit and letter of the document of objectives approved in 1983 by the Contadora Group and the five Central American countries.

70. The first new paragraph proposed in paragraph 2 of document A/C.2/41/L.43 had no connection whatsoever with the central issue: a trade embargo. Other aspects of the situation might well also be mentioned, such as the activities of counter-revolutionaries and the outside assistance they received. With regard to the reference in the second proposed new paragraph to article 21 of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, it was not clear which "essential security interests" were at stake. In that regard, article 11 of GATT referred to the general elimination of quantitative trade restrictions between the Contracting Parties. Moreover, the two States in question had signed the Charter of the Organization of American States, article 16 of which prohibited the use of coercive economic and political measures. Concerning the third proposed new paragraph, the GATT panel meeting on 6 November 1986 had not reached any conclusion. The matter was still under consideration.

71. The proposal made in paragraph 3 of document A/C.2/41/L.43 seemed frivolous. As for the proposal in paragraph 4, the comments he had made with regard to the Contadora Act also applied directly to it. The United States proposals were an attempt to divert the Committee's attention from the matter under consideration, namely, the trade embargo against Nicaragua.

72. Mr. NORRIS (United States of America) said there was no legal justification for the arguments which had just been put forward. His delegation had proposed a set of amendments to the draft resolution in accordance with rule 90 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

73. Mr. ICAZA GALLARD (Nicaragua), speaking on a point of order, said that in accordance with rule 113 of the rules of procedure, a decision must first of all be taken on whether the Committee considered that the contents of document A/C.2/41/L.43 constituted a new proposal.

74. The CHAIRMAN said that, under rule 113, he was asked to rule on whether the amendments contained in document A/C.2/41/L.43 constituted a new proposal. Since he considered that it was for the Committee to determine its own procedure, he would ask it to decide on that question.

75. Mr. NORRIS (United States of America), speaking on a point of order, said that the Nicaraguan delegation had been out of order in speaking on the substance of the matter when it had risen to a point of order. He therefore asked to continue his statement.

(Mr. Norris, United States)

76. His delegation had proposed a set of amendments to the draft resolution in accordance with rule 90 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, and the sponsors of the draft resolution were attempting to prevent action on its amendments. His delegation was confident that the United Nations Legal Counsel would support its views.

77. Mr. ICAZA GALLARD (Nicaragua) said that his delegation agreed with the Chairman's decision not to rule on whether the United States proposals constituted a new proposal and to have the Committee decide on that issue.

78. Mr. HARAN (Israel), speaking on a point of order, said that, under rule 113, the point of order was to be decided by the Chairman. The fact that the Chairman had not taken a decision meant that the United States proposals were amendments and must be voted on as such. Unless the Chairman made a ruling, there could be no appeal against the ruling and therefore no vote on the appeal.

79. Mr. PAYTON (New Zealand), commenting on the Chairman's decision not to rule on the point of order, said his delegation considered that, even though some delegations considered that the proposed amendments were incompatible with the draft resolution, the Committee could take action on them. His delegation therefore requested that the Committee should move to a paragraph-by-paragraph consideration of document A/C.2/41/L.43, as requested by the United States delegation. His delegation was opposed to any attempt by any delegation to avoid consideration of amendments proposed by another delegation. After a vote on the amendments, the Committee could then proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.29.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.