



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 35th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. AL-ASH'TAL (Democratic Yemen)

CONTENTS

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

(a) TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT (continued)

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

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

(a) OFFICE OF THE UNITED NATIONS DISASTER RELIEF CO-ORDINATOR: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

(b) SPECIAL PROGRAMMES OF ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE: REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (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 Office's 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/L.35
2 December 1986

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.55 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 79: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued)
(A/C.2/41/L.5, L.18, L.19 and L.46/Rev.1)

Draft resolution on urgent measures for reactivation of growth and development in developing countries (A/C.2/41/L.18)

1. Mr. de ROJAS (Venezuela), Vice-Chairman, said that because informal consultations had shown that the positions of delegations remained far apart, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.18 wished to withdraw it.
2. Mr. SEKULIC (Yugoslavia), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, said that they had decided not to press for adoption of the draft resolution in view of the failure to reach agreement on a final text, perhaps for lack of time.
3. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to take no action on draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.18.
4. It was so decided.

Draft resolution on an International Conference on Money and Finance for Development (A/C.2/41/L.19) and draft decision (A/C.2/41/L.46/Rev.1)

5. Mr. de ROJAS (Venezuela), Vice-Chairman, said that because informal consultations had shown there to be no consensus on the draft resolution sponsored by the Group of 77, it had been decided to ask the Committee to take a procedural decision to refer the subject to the forty-second session of the General Assembly.
6. Mr. SEKULIC (Yugoslavia), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, said that despite the failure to reach agreement on draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.19 and the unwillingness of some delegations to continue consultations, its sponsors continued to attach great importance to it and to the need which it expressed for an international monetary and financial system that would support equitable development of the world economy and address the particular needs of developing countries. The initiative for an international conference on the subject was very relevant but, in view of the impossibility of making further headway at the current session, the sponsors of the resolution wished the Committee to defer consideration until the forty-second session of the General Assembly.
7. The draft decision in document A/C.2/41/L.46/Rev.1 simply requested the Secretary-General to prepare a report on the international monetary situation and to provide information on the proposals for convening an international conference on monetary issues that had been made by Governments, prominent persons and organizations. Since there was no reason why the Committee should not accept such a proposal, the sponsors were asking for a decision to be taken on it.

8. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should adopt the following draft decision on document A/C.2/41/L.19:

"The General Assembly decides to defer consideration of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.2/41/L.19 entitled 'International Conference on Money and Finance for Development' to its forty-second session."

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

10. The CHAIRMAN said that a roll-call vote had been requested on the draft decision in document A/C.2/41/L.46/Rev.1 entitled "International conference on money and finance".

11. Viet Nam, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

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

Abstaining: Austria, Finland, Israel, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden.

12. Draft decision A/C.2/41/L.46/Rev.1 was adopted by 104 votes to 17, with 6 abstentions.

13. Mr. FIELD (United Kingdom), speaking in explanation of vote on behalf of the member States of the European Economic Community, regretted that document A/C.2/41/L.46/Rev.1 had been put to the vote because discussions had already shown the absence of any consensus on the need to convene an international conference on monetary issues. Since the views expressed on that subject were already available on record, there was no apparent need to ask the Secretariat to provide the information called for by the draft decision. The delegations on whose behalf he was speaking had therefore voted against it.

14. Mr. NGARYANAN (Chad) said that, had his delegation been present at the time of the vote, it would have voted in favour of draft decision A/C.2/41/L.46/Rev.1.

(a) TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT (continued) (A/C.2/L.5, L.53, L.47 and L.70)

Draft resolution on the seventh session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (A/C.2/41/L.53)

15. Mr. JØNCK (Denmark), Vice-Chairman, said that the informal consultations on the draft resolution had led to a consensus on the draft resolution as submitted by Yugoslavia on behalf of the Group of 77, with a few minor oral amendments. In the third preambular paragraph, the words following "17 December 1985" were deleted. In the fourth preambular paragraph, the words "as adopted" were inserted after "3 October 1986". In operative paragraph 2, the date 8 July 1987 was changed to 9 July 1987. With those amendments, draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.53 was submitted as an agreed text for adoption without a vote.

16. Draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.53, as orally revised, was adopted.

Draft resolutions on commodities (A/C.2/41/L.47, L.70 and L.5)

17. Mr. JØNCK (Denmark), Vice-Chairman, said that, on the basis of the informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.47, he was submitting the draft resolution in document A/C.2/41/L.70 for adoption without a vote. It had also been agreed during the informal consultations to recommend that the draft resolution on commodities (A/C.2/40/L.81) included in the note by the Secretariat on matters deferred to the forty-first session (A/C.2/41/L.5) should be transmitted for consideration to the Assembly at its forty-second session.

18. Draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.70 was adopted.

19. The CHAIRMAN said he took it that, in the light of the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.70, draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.47 was withdrawn by the sponsors.

20. It was so decided.

21. Mr. JØNCK (Denmark), Vice-Chairman, said an understanding had been reached in the informal consultations that provision would be made for an informal paper issued on 6 May 1986 to be made available to delegations for the purposes of future

(Mr. Jönck, Denmark)

discussion. Reference could perhaps be made to the informal paper in a footnote to the draft resolution.

22. Mr. DE LA TORRE (Argentina) asked whether the Chairman of the Group of 77 could confirm that such a request had been made and agreed to.

23. Mr. LAZAREVIC (Yugoslavia) said that the matter had been raised during the informal consultations. A number of developed countries had said they intended to request the inclusion of a reference to the informal paper, but no actual agreement had been reached.

24. Mr. JÖNCK (Denmark), Vice-Chairman, said that according to his notes, there had been an agreement to try to include a reference to the informal paper in some form. If he had misread the feeling of the Group, he would not press the point.

25. Mr. COLLIS (United Kingdom) confirmed that a number of developed countries had made such a suggestion during the informal consultations and that his delegation, acting on behalf of the members of the European Community, had supported it. Their impression had been that the suggestion would be followed through and that the informal paper could be forwarded as the Vice-Chairman had suggested.

26. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Committee) said that copies of the document in question could be provided to interested delegations, but it would be difficult to refer in a formal decision to a paper that had no official existence.

27. Mr. JÖNCK (Denmark), Vice-Chairman, said that there had been no specific request concerning the form in which reference to the informal paper would be made. The impression had been given that there was a precedent for referring to an informal paper in a footnote to a resolution or decision, and the Secretariat had been asked to investigate the precedent and to follow it, if appropriate. The summary record of the current meeting of the Committee could take the place of a reference to the paper in a footnote to the resolution.

28. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should adopt the following draft decision: "The General Assembly decides to defer consideration of the draft resolution entitled 'Commodities' in document A/C.2/41/L.5 to its forty-second session".

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

30. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should adopt the following draft decision concerning reports before the Committee under sub-item 79 (a): "The General Assembly takes note of the reports of the Secretary-General on the Preferential Trade Area for Eastern and Southern African States (A/41/698) and on the particular problems facing Zaïre with regard to transport, transit and access to foreign markets (A/41/734)".

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

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

Draft resolution on the net transfer of resources from developing to developed countries (A/C.2/40/L.20)

32. Mr. JØNCK (Denmark), Vice-Chairman, said it had become clear during the informal consultations that no consensus could be reached on the draft resolution. It was therefore submitted to the Committee for action. The sponsors wished to make a minor change in the text, replacing the word "Reaffirming" in the first preambular paragraph by the word "Recalling".

33. At the request of the representative of the United Kingdom, a vote was taken by roll-call on draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.20, as orally revised.

34. Angola, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Israel, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Belgium, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Japan, Spain, Sweden.

35. Draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.20, as orally revised, was adopted by 107 votes to 10, with 10 abstentions.

36. Mr. COLLIS (United Kingdom) said that the member States of the European Community had been unable to support the draft resolution, although the Community's commitment to the development of the developing countries was unequivocal. It was responsible for over one-third of the world's official development assistance, and its member States were major investors in the developing countries and major traders with them. The developing countries had had a trade surplus of \$25,000 million with the European Community over the last two years, and the Community's member States had adopted a flexible approach to the rescheduling of debt.

37. However, the issues dealt with in the draft resolution were highly complex. Some elements, such as the effects of changes in the price of commodities, were difficult to assess fully. Others, such as the downstream benefits of investment, were almost impossible to quantify. Still other issues, such as structural adjustment and capital flight, were ignored in the text. The concept of net transfer of resources was in itself flawed. The member States of the European Community hoped that the Secretary-General's report would do justice to the complexity of the issues. In particular, they hoped that he would take duly into account the link between the current account position of capital-importing developing countries on the one hand, and financial resource flows to those countries on the other, including the need to increase non-debt creating flows. Meanwhile, the community stood ready as always to engage in dialogue on that as on other development issues.

38. Mr. LABERGE (Canada) said that his delegation had been attracted by the idea of the draft resolution, and concerned over the apparent inability to find a text that would focus on the need to identify the scope and nature of the problem and to shed more light on an issue that was highly obscure. It had voted against Economic and Social Council resolution 1986/56, and had abstained from voting on the draft just adopted. He hoped that, in future, the Second Committee would have a greater opportunity to make progress on the issue and to focus clearly on the real aim in view.

39. Mr. KAWASHIMA (Japan) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on the draft resolution, just as it had on Economic and Social Council resolution 1986/56, it recognized that the issue they dealt with was an urgent one, but considered that the resolution just adopted contained a number of points needing clarification and further study. In particular, it was still not convinced of the wisdom of introducing the very complex concept of "net transfer of resources from developing to developed countries", and it did not believe in the efficacy and validity of adopting a comprehensive approach to such important but widely differing economic issues as money, finance, debt, resource flows, trade and development.

40. 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 and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, said that the net transfer of resources from developing to developed countries had reached such proportions and was

(Mr. Walter, Czechoslovakia)

increasing at such a pace that concerted action on the part of the international community was required to halt and reverse it. The delegations on whose behalf he spoke had strongly supported both Economic and Social Council resolution 1986/56 and the draft resolution just adopted. There was an urgent need for a comprehensive analytical report, taking due account of the money, finance, debt, resource flows, trade and development, on the net transfer of resources from developing to developed countries, its detrimental impact on the development of developing countries, and the measures that must be taken to deal with it. The growing extent of the net outflow of resources was a logical consequence of the persisting unjust and inequitable international economic order, based on neo-colonial exploitation. The report should encompass all forms of net transfer of resources from developing countries, visible and invisible, financial, material and human. It should include such factors beyond the developing countries' control as unfavourable terms of foreign debt-servicing and repayment, in particular high interest rates; the deterioration of the terms of trade, including the decline of export prices for raw materials; the growth of protectionism; exchange rate fluctuations; intra-firm operations by transnational corporations, especially the use of transfer prices and tax evasion; the brain drain; and the declining volume of official development assistance.

41. Ms. COHEN-ORANTES (Guatemala) said that, had her delegation been present during the voting, it would have voted in favour of the draft resolution.

Draft resolution on indigenous entrepreneurs in economic development
(A/C.2/41/L.28/Rev.2, L.63, and L.65)

42. Mr. JØNCK (Denmark), Vice-Chairman, said that the informal consultations on draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.28/Rev.1 had resulted in a revised text (A/C.2/41/L.28/Rev.2). It had proved possible to incorporate in the preamble paragraphs which met the concerns of the sponsors of the amendments (A/C.2/41/L.63 and L.65). Another proposal for an additional paragraph had not met with complete agreement, and A/C.2/41/L.28/Rev.2 could not therefore be submitted as a text of the Vice-Chairman. He had, however, been told that the sponsors of that proposal would not insist on it. The revised text was therefore uncontested and could be submitted for adoption without a vote.

43. Draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.28/Rev.2 was adopted.

44. 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 the aim of the draft was to encourage enterprise and initiative in all sectors of the economy. Consideration should be given not only to the effectiveness of economic development, but also to the related need to raise the well-being of the whole population. The term "entrepreneur", therefore, did not reflect the sense of the draft resolution quite accurately. Moreover, the draft in no way justified new initiatives by the economic bodies and organizations of the United Nations system, but only asked them to pursue its objective within the framework of existing programmes, as was clear from its paragraph 1 (a).

(Mr. Walter, Czechoslovakia)

45. The delegations on whose behalf he was speaking were grateful for the acceptance of a number of their amendments, but regretted that a reference to the need for the whole population to participate in the development process had not been included. No United Nations activity in the economic field should ignore the social aspects of the development process as envisaged in the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade, and they interpreted the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution as referring to all aspects of that Strategy, including the task of raising the welfare of the whole population as the main aim of development. Lastly, the resolution paid insufficient attention to the external factors that were having an adverse effect on the development of developing and other countries.

46. The delegations on whose behalf he was speaking had found it possible not to object to the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.28/Rev.2 without a vote, but would, for the reasons he had indicated, have voted against it if a vote had been taken.

47. Mr. DJOGLIAF (Algeria) said his delegation had joined in the consensus on the draft resolution. Even though the text unfortunately made no reference to international instruments pertaining to development, it would clearly have to be implemented within the framework for international co-operation for development which the General Assembly had built over the past 30 years. Paragraph 1 in particular must be implemented in a manner consistent with the fundamental principles that had always governed United Nations operational activities for development. Any attempt to use those activities as a means of introducing extraneous objectives into the development objectives of developing countries would not be tolerated. In addition, implementation of the resolution should not accord priority to any sectors other than those traditionally supported by United Nations agencies.

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

48. Mr. JØNCK (Denmark), Vice-Chairman, said that informal consultations on the draft resolution had revealed that the only problem with the text was the actual proclamation of the World Decade for Cultural Development in paragraph 1. Some delegations had explained that they could not support such a proclamation at present and would therefore be unable to join in a consensus on the draft text. However, as there had been no other objections to the draft resolution, he wished to submit it to the Committee for action, with one minor revision. In the fifth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, the phrase "are a principle means of advancing" should be revised to read "are principle vehicles for advancing".

49. Mr. LAZAREVIC (Yugoslavia), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, said that the sponsors of the draft resolution endorsed the oral revision made by the representative of Denmark.

/...

50. At the request of the representative of Algeria, a vote was taken by roll-call on draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.49/Rev.2, as orally revised.

51. Mauritius, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

52. Draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.49/Rev.2, as orally revised, was adopted by 122 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

53. Mr. COLLIS (United Kingdom), speaking in explanation of vote, said his delegation regretted that negotiations on the draft resolution had not led to a text that could have been adopted by consensus. His delegation's abstention did not imply opposition to the idea of a decade for cultural development or to its four main themes. However, its reservations with regard to the unrealistically ambitious draft plan of action for the Decade and to the dirigiste philosophy implied by certain parts of it were well known. Realizing that those views were not shared by all delegations, his own delegation had sought to improve those sections of the text which ought to be of concern to all, particularly in a time of financial crisis. It was unfortunate that it had been impossible to reach full agreement on the co-ordination arrangements for and financial implications of the Decade.

...

54. Mr. PAYTON (New Zealand) said that the willingness of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.49 to accommodate many delegations' concerns regarding the original text had enabled his delegation to vote in favour of the revised text. Nevertheless, it believed that the activities of the World Decade for Cultural Development should not detract from existing programmes of the United Nations, UNESCO or the other specialized agencies. The resources of the specialized agencies should be used in accordance with the priorities defined by their governing bodies; the request for voluntary contributions in paragraph 3 of the draft resolution had been a major factor in obtaining his delegation's support.

55. Over-use of the concept of United Nations-sponsored decades should be avoided, and periodic assessments of the Decade should be conducted to ensure that the spirit and the letter of the resolution just adopted were respected.

56. Mr. NORRIS (United States of America) said he had voted against the draft resolution because he believed that any activity to be undertaken by the United Nations should be fully and precisely defined. However, the plan of action for the World Decade for Cultural Development had few concrete goals, and no budget estimates had been submitted for it. Moreover, the concept of cultural development was not consistently interpreted. Given the current financial crisis, the time was inappropriate for the launching of a new decade based on a vague concept. However, his delegation's opposition to the draft resolution should not be interpreted as implying criticism of any United Nations organization that might choose to participate in the Decade.

57. Mr. WALTER (Czechoslovakia), speaking also on behalf of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, said that their votes in favour of the draft resolution as orally revised had been based on their approach to the cultural activities of the United Nations in general and of UNESCO in particular. Their position also derived from their support for recommendation No. 27 of the World Conference on Cultural Policies, held at Mexico City in 1982, for relevant resolutions adopted by UNESCO at its twenty-second and twenty-third sessions and for Economic and Social Council resolution 1986/69. The World Decade would provide ample opportunity for activities that would contribute to the implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade.

58. Mr. LAZAREVIC (Yugoslavia), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, said that the observance of the World Decade for Cultural Development during the period 1988-1997 was of major importance for all countries. Proclamation of the Decade had been inspired by a desire to promote culture and raise educational standards, and its main objectives were the acknowledgement of the cultural dimension of development, the affirmation and enrichment of cultural identities, a broadening of participation in culture and the promotion of international cultural co-operation. The launching of the Decade was an expression of the common desire of all nations and peoples, and required the active support of all countries.

/...

(Mr. Lazarevic, Yugoslavia)

59. He regretted that it had been necessary to put the draft resolution to a vote, as the drafters had worked carefully to make the text acceptable to all. It was to be hoped none the less that those countries which had opposed the draft resolution or abstained in the vote would be able to participate in Decade activities and contribute to the Decade's success.

60. Ms. COHEN-ORANTES (Guatemala) and Mr. CHARALA (Zambia) said that their delegations had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

61. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should adopt the following draft decision concerning reports before the Committee under agenda item 12 on which no proposals had been submitted:

"The General Assembly takes note of the following documents:

(a) Report of the Secretary-General on the follow-up to General Assembly resolution 39/228 on the International Conference on Population (A/41/179-E/1986/18);

(b) Report of the Secretary-General on confidence-building in international economic relations (A/41/320 and Add.1-E/1986/73 and Add.1);

(c) Report of the Secretary-General on economic development projects in the occupied Palestinian territories (A/41/342-E/1986/88);

(d) Report of the Secretary-General on co-operation between the United Nations and the Agency for Cultural and Technical Co-operation (A/41/344-E/1986/80);

(e) Report of the Secretary-General on the Transport and Communications Decade in Africa (A/41/382-E/1986/99);

(f) Note by the Secretary-General on Israeli economic practices in the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories (A/41/410-E/1986/97);

(g) Report of the Secretary-General on the living conditions of the Palestinian people in the occupied Palestinian territories (A/41/415-E/1986/104);

(h) Report of the Secretary-General on the review of information exchange schemes within the United Nations system (A/41/588);

(i) Oral report of the Secretary-General made by the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation on co-ordination in the United Nations and the United Nations system at the 21st meeting on 24 October 1986, in pursuance of General Assembly resolution 40/177."

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

/...

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

(a) OFFICE OF THE UNITED NATIONS DISASTER RELIEF CO-ORDINATOR: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

Draft resolutions on the Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator (A/C.2/41/L.22 and L.69)

63. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Equatorial Guinea and Guatemala had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.22.

64. Mr. de ROJAS (Venezuela), Vice-Chairman, introduced draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.69, which had been submitted on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.22. Much negotiating had been required, but the flexibility of all delegations and a spirit of co-operation had ultimately resulted in a consensus text which he was pleased to submit to the Committee for action.

65. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Committee) pointed out that, according to the Committee's biennial programme of work, questions pertaining to the Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator (UNDRO) should not be taken up again until the forty-third session of the General Assembly, yet paragraph 14 of draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.69 requested the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly on that matter at its forty-second session.

66. Mr. KRAMER (Canada) said that the information requested of the Secretary-General in paragraph 14 of draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.69 related to the broader question of emergency assistance, which was discussed annually, and not merely to the work of UNDRO. It was therefore entirely appropriate for the Committee to consider the Secretary-General's report at the forty-second session.

67. Canada attached highest priority to ensuring that the United Nations system was able to provide and co-ordinate emergency and disaster assistance to the best of its ability. His delegation consequently looked forward to the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus for three reasons. First, as the focal point for co-ordination in disaster-relief efforts, UNDRO merited the full support of all delegations. Secondly, the mandate of UNDRO was reaffirmed in the draft resolution without prejudice to any reforms which might take place following consideration of the report of the Group of High-level Intergovernmental Experts to Review the Efficiency of the Administrative and Financial Functioning of the United Nations. Finally, his delegation supported the call for a comprehensive review of the existing mechanisms and arrangements for disaster and emergency assistance and co-ordination and hoped to learn in the near future how that review was to be carried out.

68. Mr. DIECKMANN (Federal Republic of Germany) fully supported the remarks made by the representative of Canada. His delegation had joined in the consensus on the draft resolution on the understanding that it would not prejudice any efforts to enhance the effectiveness of the Organization on the basis of the report of the Group of 18.

/...

69. Ms. DANIELSEN (Norway), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries, said that they had participated actively in the negotiations on the draft resolution because of their long and continuing support for UNDRO and their belief in the importance of maintaining the capacity of the United Nations system to provide emergency and disaster relief assistance in a speedy and effective manner. At the same time, they had sought to ensure that the draft resolution did not prejudice the current review by the General Assembly of the efficiency of the administrative and financial functioning of the United Nations. The issues reflected in the draft resolution were not limited to UNDRO, but concerned the United Nations system's overall capacity to meet emergency and disaster assistance needs. She looked forward to the implementation of paragraph 14 of the draft resolution and expressed confidence that the Secretary-General's review and assessment would be thorough and objective and contain specific recommendations for improving and strengthening the system's relief capacity.

70. Finally, the Nordic countries believed that deliberations like the recent negotiations on the draft resolution before the Committee should be based on an objective exchange of views among delegations, with the Secretariat providing support when appropriate and as requested.

71. Draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.69 was adopted.

72. Mr. RIPERT (Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation) said he had taken note of the observations made prior to the adoption of the draft resolution and assured the Committee that, in preparing the report that had been requested, the Secretary-General would do his utmost to accommodate the desires expressed then. He noted that the Secretary-General would also be called upon by the Group of 18 to prepare a similar report; however, he would endeavour to make the two reports as complementary as possible.

73. Mr. PAYTON (New Zealand) endorsed the remarks made by the representatives of Canada, the Federal Republic of Germany and Norway.

74. Mr. MULLER (Australia) said his delegation had been pleased to join in the consensus on the draft resolution because it believed that the United Nations had an important role to play in emergency and disaster relief assistance. He welcomed in particular the provisions of the fourth preambular paragraph and paragraph 14.

75. Mr. BEN MOUSSA (Morocco) withdrew draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.22 on behalf of the sponsors, who had willingly joined in a consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.69. He urged the Chairman of the Committee to inform both the General Committee and the Secretary-General that the adoption of the draft resolution should be construed as indicating the positions of all Member States vis-à-vis UNDRO when the relevant portions of the report of the Group of 18 were considered. While the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.69 did not prejudice any decisions the General Assembly might take in the context of that report, it served to underscore the vast superiority of multilateral over bilateral humanitarian assistance in the area of disaster relief. UNDRO had never lost sight of the complexity of the problems posed by disaster relief, and thus merited the support of all delegations.

/...

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

76. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should adopt the following draft decision: "The General Assembly takes note of the reports of the Secretary-General on international relief to Mexico (A/41/369 and Corr.1) and on assistance to Bangladesh (A/41/396) respectively".

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

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.