

veloping countries, but he reminded those of the land-locked countries that might feel frustrated that UNCTAD had recognized the right of all land-locked States to free access to the sea. The Committee could not brush aside the principle thus established.

102. Mr. LOHANI (Nepal) said he fully shared the view expressed by the representative of India; he too considered that the draft resolution would remain a dead letter if it was not supported by a large number of transit countries. His country was deeply grateful for all the facilities granted to it by India, and he expressed the hope that the right of free access to the sea would be recognized by all countries.

103. Mr. SIDDIQ (Afghanistan), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution, requested the Committee to defer further consideration of it to a subsequent meeting in order to enable the sponsors to study the proposals made by various representatives.

104. The CHAIRMAN said that, in the absence of any objection, he would take it that the Committee decided to defer further consideration of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1310 to the next meeting.

It was so decided.

Organization of the Committee's work

105. Mr. GONZALEZ ARIAS (Paraguay) reported on the progress made in the informal consultations held on the draft resolutions relating to agenda item 51 on which the Committee had not yet taken a decision. Agreement had been reached on a text relating to multi-national trade negotiations that might be adopted by consensus. On the other hand, the consultations on the draft resolution relating to reform of the international monetary system were proving laborious, and he therefore appealed to all delegations to take part in them and help to ensure their successful outcome.

106. Mr. QUARTIN SANTOS (Portugal), speaking in exercise of his right of reply, referred to the statement by the representative of Upper Volta and reaffirmed that Portugal had always applied the principles of the good neighbour policy to neighbouring countries without access to the sea. He made it clear that France was not one of those countries, since it was not a State adjacent to Portugal.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.

1572nd meeting

Thursday, 29 November 1973, at 3.30 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Zewde GABRE-SELLASSIE (Ethiopia).

A/C.2/SR.1572

AGENDA ITEM 50

United Nations Environment Programme (concluded)
(A/9003 and Corr.1, chap. XIII; A/C.2/L.1317/Rev.2):

- (a) **Report of the Governing Council (A/9025);**
(b) **Criteria governing multilateral financing of housing and human settlements: report of the Secretary-General (A/9163, A/9238)**

1. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said his delegation was prepared to vote for draft resolution A/C.2/L.1317. However, as there were now two revisions of that draft resolution containing basic changes, such as the mention of principle 7 of the Declaration of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment,¹ adopted at Stockholm, and a new paragraph 6 emphasizing the importance of the task of the Conference on the Law of the Sea to be held at Caracas, taking into account the Action Plan for the Human Environment² adopted at the Stockholm Conference, his delegation could not vote for the revised draft resolution. The USSR had not participated in the Stockholm Conference and could not therefore accept responsibility for the decisions taken at it. It also felt that the General Assembly should not prejudge decisions which might be adopted during the forthcoming Conference on the Law of the Sea. For those reasons, his delega-

tion had decided to abstain on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1317/Rev.2.

2. Mr. SCHRAM (Iceland) felt it would be useful to recapitulate the proposed amendments to the initial draft resolution contained in the second revision. First, mention was now made in the second preambular paragraph of General Assembly resolutions 3067 (XXVIII) and 2750 C (XXV). The sponsors had also added a new preambular paragraph—the third in the second revised version—mentioning principle 7 of the Stockholm Declaration.

3. In operative paragraph 3, the phrase “in certain areas of the world's seas and oceans” had been added; at the beginning of paragraph 4, the words “Governing Council of the” had been inserted before “United Nations Environment Programme”, to meet the objections raised by some delegations; in paragraphs 4 and 5, the words “seas and” had been added before the word “oceans”; paragraph 6 had been redrafted and now merely emphasized the importance of the task of the Conference on the Law of the Sea in relation to the preservation of the marine environment, without insisting on the priority which should be given to that task. That change met the wishes of some delegations. He proposed that in paragraph 6 the word “as” should be added after the words “Action Plan” and the phrase “and by the General Assembly at its twenty-seventh session” be deleted.

4. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that in operative paragraph 3 of the Russian

¹ See A/CONF.48/14/Rev.1, chap. I.

² *Ibid.*, chap. II.

text, the English word "overfishing" had not been very well translated. It would have been better to say something like "excessive fishing" in Russian. He hoped that the Secretariat would take due note of his comment.

5. Mr. CABEZAS (Ecuador) said his delegation would abstain from voting on the draft resolution although it was convinced of the need to conserve living marine resources. It did not consider the draft resolution as it now stood to be well drafted and objected in particular to operative paragraph 3. His delegation would reserve its position on the matter until the Conference on the Law of the Sea.

6. Mr. O'RIORDAN (Ireland) said that his delegation, like that of Iceland, was very interested in the draft resolution, which sought to reduce marine pollution and to control the exploitation of the living resources of the seas and oceans. He pointed out in that respect that some countries devoted considerable sums to the conservation of, for example, salmon stocks.

7. With regard to marine pollution, he said that the argument invoked by the representative of the USSR in opposition to the mention in the draft resolution of principle 7 of the Stockholm Declaration, namely, the fact that the USSR had not participated in the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, did not seem to be entirely valid.

8. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said his impression was that delegations were supposed to explain their vote and not to pass judgement on other delegations' motives. Since the representative of Ireland had said that he had not fully understood why the Soviet delegation would abstain from voting on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1317/Rev.2, he wished to state the following: for reasons known to all, the socialist countries had been unable to participate in the Stockholm Conference and they had warned that, as a result, the decisions of the Conference would necessarily reflect its lack of universality. The position adopted at the outset by the socialist countries with regard to environmental matters had been justified by subsequent events. The current undesirable conditions resulted from the short-term policies of certain countries. He assured the representative of Ireland that the position of the USSR had not changed and that, now as in the past, it was based on entirely valid principles. In fact, the Soviet Government was interested in bilateral and multilateral co-operation in marine matters and was convinced of the need to increase living marine resources, including salmon stocks.

9. Mr. HEMANS (United Kingdom) supported the draft resolution, but expressed the hope that the resultant measures, particularly the survey mentioned in paragraph 4, would not duplicate the activities of FAO.

10. His delegation would support operative paragraph 6, but that did not mean there had been a change in its position on recommendation 92 of the Stockholm Action Plan.

11. Mr. GRANQVIST (Sweden) said his delegation supported the revised draft resolution. It thanked the sponsors for accepting an amendment which indicated clearly that the matter would be placed before the Governing Council of UNEP at its third session. Among questions which the Governing Council could study

were, for example, the distribution of responsibility between FAO and UNEP with regard to the sea, but it wondered whether the Council would be able to take up the matter at its third session; accordingly, it would like the phrase "if possible" to be inserted before the phrase "to the third session" in paragraph 4.

12. Mr. RASAPUTRAM (Sri Lanka) supported the draft resolution, but felt that its provisions should not prejudice the results of the Conference on the Law of the Sea.

13. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines) supported the draft resolution and emphasized its importance for countries like his own. He wondered, however, if it would not be advisable to invert the positions of operative paragraphs 5 and 6 since it would be more appropriate if reference to the report by the Governing Council of UNEP to the General Assembly was made in the final paragraph. The word "thereon" should be deleted in the new final paragraph and the phrase "on the implementation of this resolution" inserted before the words "to the General Assembly at its twenty-ninth session". That was because the report should cover the whole of the resolution and not, as the present text might seem to indicate, merely the implementation of paragraph 5.

14. Mr. CAVAGLIERI (Italy) supported the draft resolution, but stated that his delegation's approval of paragraph 6 could in no way be construed as prejudging the position his Government would take in the Conference on the Law of the Sea.

15. Mr. VALDES (Bolivia) said that, although Bolivia was a land-locked country, his delegation shared the view of those countries whose economies depended on the exploitation of living marine resources. His delegation, therefore, supported draft resolution A/C.2/L.1317/Rev.2 and considered that it would be for the Conference on the Law of the Sea to establish rules in that field.

16. Mr. OGISO (Japan) supported the draft resolution, but felt the word "conserving" in paragraph 1 should be interpreted as meaning the rational use of marine resources. That interpretation should not cause any problem, for it was one of the meanings generally attributed to the word "conserving" in many international conventions. Operative paragraph 6 should not be considered as prejudging the results of the Conference on the Law of the Sea.

17. Mr. GARCIA BELAUNDE (Peru) said that he would vote in favour of the draft resolution under consideration, because he approved of its objectives and underlying principles. He pointed out, however, that in the fifth preambular paragraph, reference was made to conventions which his Government did not support entirely, even though it approved of their aims. For that reason, his delegation had not been able to sponsor the draft resolution, but that did not mean that it attached no importance to studies on the protection of living marine resources.

18. Mr. SPITERI (Malta) said that the international machinery to be devised by the Conference on the Law of the Sea should have a major role to play. However, as the situation of living marine resources was currently very precarious, immediate measures should be taken without waiting until that Conference was convened.

His delegation would therefore vote in favour of the draft resolution.

19. Mr. CHIRILA (Romania) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution; his vote in no way prejudged the position that Romania would adopt at the Conference on the Law of the Sea.

20. Mr. HAIDAR (Lebanon) supported the draft resolution and the Philippine proposal to invert paragraphs 5 and 6 of the draft.

21. Mr. SCHRAM (Iceland), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, thanked the members of the Committee for the welcome they had given the revised draft resolution. As for the fears expressed by certain delegations that measures which would be taken as a result of the draft resolution might conflict with decisions of the Conference on the Law of the Sea, he wished to point out that the Conference would approach the problem from the legal point of view, while the sponsors of the draft resolution approached it from the environmental and biological points of view. UNEP and FAO must tackle the problem without delay, for it was impossible, given the urgency of the situation, to wait until the Conference on the Law of the Sea was held. That was why he had some difficulty in accepting the Swedish amendment to add the words "if possible" in paragraph 4.

22. As to the amendment proposed by the representative of the Philippines, he hoped that it could be changed slightly: he proposed that, if the Philippine delegation had no objection, the word "thereon" should be retained in paragraph 5, with the addition of the phrase "on the implementation of the present resolution" preceded by the words "as well as", so that it read: "and to report thereon, as well as on the implementation of the present resolution, to the General Assembly at its twenty-ninth session".

23. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines) agreed to modify his amendment in the way suggested by the representative of Iceland.

24. Mr. AL-KHUDHAIRY (Iraq) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution because it approved of its basic principles. However, the expression "seas and oceans" must also apply to semi-closed seas. He felt that paragraph 6 of the draft resolution must in no way prejudice the decisions of the Conference on the Law of the Sea.

Draft resolution A/C.2/L.1317/Rev.2, as orally amended, was adopted by 116 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.

25. Mr. MÜEZZINOĞLU (Turkey) said he had voted in favour of the draft resolution, on the understanding that it did not prejudice the outcome of the Conference on the Law of the Sea, as stated by the representative of Iceland.

26. Mr. FASLA (Algeria) explained that he had voted for draft resolution A/C.2/L.1317/Rev.2; however, it must be understood that the draft did not prejudice the results of the Conference on the Law of the Sea.

27. Mr. KLEIN (United States of America) said he had voted for the draft resolution because he supported the general idea underlying it. However, he had reservations in respect of paragraph 4. He doubted the usefulness of carrying out the survey requested, which would absorb already limited resources and might in-

volve duplication with other studies undertaken by FAO. His delegation would return to that matter in the Governing Council of UNEP.

28. Moreover, his delegation would have preferred that the words "recommendation 92 of" in paragraph 6 be deleted, since there was no call to cite one particular recommendation of the Action Plan rather than another.

29. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had completed its consideration of agenda item 50.

AGENDA ITEM 12

Report of the Economic and Social Council [chapters II to IV, V (sections A, C and D), VI to XX, XXI (section B), XXV and XXVII to XXIX] (continued) (A/9003 and Corr.1, A/C.2/285)

30. Mr. HOSNY (Egypt) asked the Committee whether it would agree to postpone until the evening of Monday, 3 December the time-limit for the submission of draft resolutions concerning item 12 of the agenda. A draft resolution on that item was in fact being prepared and it would be ready only after consultations among the delegations of the Arab countries, the African countries and, in general, the countries of the Group of 77.

31. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) and Mr. SEARWAR (Guyana) supported the proposal of the representative of Egypt.

32. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to the request of the representative of Egypt.

It was so decided.

SPECIAL MEASURES RELATED TO THE PARTICULAR NEEDS OF THE LAND-LOCKED DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (continued) (A/C.2/L.1310/REV.2)

33. Mr. SIDDIQ (Afghanistan) introduced a new revised version of the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors. In a spirit of co-operation and compromise, they had agreed to incorporate the amendments proposed to the second preambular paragraph and to operative paragraph 2.

34. However, the amendments to paragraph 1 had not been accepted, since the right of free access to and from the sea was recognized by international law. It was a logical extension of the freedom of the high seas: if access to the sea was forbidden, the freedom of the high seas was denied.

35. Again, in the Kabul Declaration on Asian Economic Co-operation and Development adopted at the fourth session of the Council of Ministers for Asian Economic Co-operation (16-19 December 1970), the right of free access to and from the sea had been recognized. He pointed out in that respect that India and Pakistan had taken part in that session and endorsed the above-mentioned Declaration. The fundamental right was also recognized in the first principle of the Convention on Transit Trade of Land-Locked States.³ In a resolution on the particular needs of the land-locked countries,⁴ the Conference of Heads of State or

³ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 597 (1967), p. 3.

⁴ See A/9330, p. 77.

Government of Non-Aligned Countries, which met at Algiers from 5 to 9 September, had recommended the adoption of special measures to ensure the right of free access to and from the sea for those countries. It was clear, therefore, that the right of free access was recognized by the international community.

36. So far international law had favoured the interests of the developed countries; the United Nations should now help to draw up a more equitable body of law to assist the less privileged countries in their struggle for development. The right of access to and from the sea was an important element in that struggle; the land-locked countries could not remain at the mercy of the transit States which, in that case, could control their development. Consequently, the sponsors, despite their goodwill and desire to co-operate, could not in any way amend paragraph 1 of the draft resolution.

37. Speaking on behalf of Afghanistan alone, he wished to reply to the comments made by the representative of Pakistan. It was true that there were bilateral agreements between the two countries, but it had often happened that, as a result of political tension, Pakistan closed the transit routes, thus creating serious difficulties for Afghanistan. The land-locked countries should not be subject to the whims of the coastal States. Bilateral agreements were certainly important, but they could not be a substitute for the recognition of the cardinal principle of freedom of access to and from the sea.

38. Mr. NDUNG'U (Kenya) thanked the sponsors for having accommodated his delegation's views in the revised text of the second preambular paragraph; that change would enable his delegation to vote for the paragraph.

39. The word "free" in paragraph 1 might lead to confusion, since it might be construed as referring to access free of any charge; in that case, supposing, for instance, that there was no access route to the sea through a transit country, that country would then be obliged to build a road in order to provide the neighbouring land-locked country with an outlet to the sea, without the latter bearing any part of the construction costs. In actual fact, it appeared that the sponsors had in mind only freedom of movement. They should not, therefore, object to the replacement of the words "free access" by the words "freedom of access".

40. Mr. KUMI (Ghana) said that, as the representative of Afghanistan had emphasized, it was the right of access to the "high seas" that was recognized in international law. Logically, therefore, paragraph 1 should refer to the right of access to the high seas and not to the right of access to the sea. In any event, his delegation, which had always supported the efforts of the land-locked countries, would vote in favour of paragraph 1.

41. Mr. SCHUPPUIS (Togo) said that, in his view, the right of access to the sea should be defined in bilateral agreements between the countries concerned.

42. Mr. BONAÛ (Ivory Coast) thanked the sponsors for having agreed to acknowledge that transit countries often endeavoured to facilitate access to the sea by land-locked countries. However, his delegation was concerned by the expression "right of free access to the sea" and could not accept even the amendment proposed by Kenya on that point. That expression was capable of two interpretations: it implied either com-

plete freedom of movement in the transit State—in which case that State forfeited its sovereignty over its own territory—or a right of gratuitous passage, which was equally unacceptable.

43. His delegation would agree to the inclusion of a reference to the right of access to the sea, provided that the source of that right—namely, bilateral agreements—was mentioned; it could not, however, agree that that right should be regarded as the corollary of freedom of the high seas. He appealed for co-operation and moderation; he believed it was necessary to facilitate free access to the sea, but it was inadmissible to speak of a "right" of free access to the sea through the territory of another State.

44. Mr. MOHAMMED (Nigeria) agreed with the representative of Afghanistan that the resolution adopted by the non-aligned countries at their meeting in Algiers did refer to the right of free access. However, that freedom could not be regarded as absolute, since if it was, coastal States would be deemed to have no rights in the matter, which had surely not been the intention of the non-aligned countries; for that reason, his delegation supported the Kenyan representative's amendment, proposing that the expression "freedom of access" be used.

45. Mr. YONG (Malaysia) suggested that, in order to avoid the ambiguity of the word "free", the expression "exercise of unimpeded right of access" should be used.

46. Mr. NDUNG'U (Kenya) withdrew his own suggestion in favour of the suggestion made by the representative of Malaysia, which was more satisfactory.

47. Mr. DELPRÉE CRESPO (Guatemala) said he was aware of the special difficulties confronting the land-locked countries; he agreed that their right of free access to the sea was recognized by the international community. While there were other categories of countries that needed special assistance in solving their problems, he did not wish to minimize the difficulties peculiar to the land-locked countries and would vote in favour of the draft resolution if it was put to the vote, although he hoped that it would be adopted by consensus.

48. Mr. MVOGO (Cameroon) said that, in his view, the key provision in the draft resolution was to be found in paragraph 2, relating to the establishment of a special fund. It was therefore disturbing to note that the sponsors, as if taking the shadow for the substance, were more concerned with paragraph 1.

49. Mr. HAIDAR (Lebanon) proposed that the words "within the framework of appropriate agreements" should be added after the words "in facilitating" in paragraph 1.

50. Mr. SIDDIQ (Afghanistan) observed that the expression employed in paragraph 1 had already been used on several occasions, in particular at Algiers; the representative of Kenya had accepted it at that time.

51. Mr. NDUNG'U (Kenya) recalled that his delegation had submitted a similar amendment at Algiers before joining the consensus.

52. Mr. SCHUPPUIS (Togo) agreed that the situation of the land-locked countries gave cause for concern and that some of the provisions of the draft resolution under consideration were warranted. However, the provi-

sions of paragraph 1 would transform what was merely a right into a binding obligation. In the view of his delegation, the right of access to the sea should be defined in bilateral agreements. He could not, therefore, accept paragraph 1 and would request a separate vote on that paragraph.

53. It was regrettable to note that the fund which it was proposed to establish under paragraph 2 was not also aimed at assisting coastal countries to strengthen their road and port infrastructure. His delegation would therefore abstain in the vote on that paragraph.

54. Mr. KANÉ (Mauritania) appealed to the sponsors of the draft resolution to accept the amendment involving the addition of the words "within the framework of appropriate agreements" between the words "facilitating" and "the exercise" in paragraph 1; that would in no way restrict the scope of the paragraph.

55. Mr. ARVESEN (Norway), supported by Mr. KANDÉ (Senegal), said it would be regrettable if paragraph 1 gave rise to a confrontation and had to be put to the vote. He therefore suggested that the sponsors of the draft resolution and those delegations which wished to submit amendments should consult each other before the Committee took a decision.

56. Mr. DE MEDEIROS (Dahomey) said it was unfortunate that the Norwegian representative's suggestion related only to paragraph 1 and that the amendments proposed by his own and other delegations with regard to paragraph 1 and to the addition of a new paragraph relating to coastal transit countries (see 1571st meeting, para. 100) had not been accepted. In view of those difficulties, and the sponsors' lack of co-operation, his delegation could not endorse the draft resolution. It would therefore request a separate vote on paragraph 1 and a roll-call vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

57. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the sponsors should hold consultations while the Committee continued its consideration of the other draft resolutions on the agenda.

MEASURES TO IMPROVE THE ORGANIZATION OF THE WORK OF THE COUNCIL (A/C.2/280)

58. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that his delegation was one of the sponsors of the draft resolution and that, in its view, the measures envisaged in that document would help to improve the organization of the work of the Council. However, in 1972 and 1973 the Economic and Social Council had taken a whole series of decisions aimed at improving its working methods and structure; the Council would therefore require a certain amount of time to assess the effectiveness of those measures. Moreover, since its fifty-fifth session, the Council had had a membership of 54. In view of those new factors, his delegation proposed that the Committee should defer consideration of the draft resolution and the amendments thereto, which were also reproduced in document A/C.2/280, until the twenty-ninth session.

59. Mr. HACHANI (Tunisia), Mr. BRITO (Brazil) and Mr. HAMID (Sudan) supported the proposal made by the Soviet representative.

60. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines), supported by Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta), concurred with the

Soviet proposal but recalled that, at the twenty-seventh session, the Committee had decided to defer consideration of the draft resolution until the twenty-eighth session. The measures concerned were important, and consideration of them could not be postponed indefinitely; he proposed that, in the chapter of the report relating to consideration of agenda item 12, it should be clearly indicated that the Committee had deferred consideration of the draft resolution recommended by the Economic and Social Council in its resolution 1622 (LI) with a view to taking a final decision at the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly.

61. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objections, he would take it that the Committee agreed to the proposal made by the representative of the USSR.

It was so decided.

REPORTS ON PROTEIN (A/C.2/L.1325, DRAFT DECISION I)

62. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft decision without a vote.

It was so decided.

63. Mr. ABHYANKAR (India) stressed the importance of the second part of the text which had just been approved.

OUTFLOW OF TRAINED PERSONNEL FROM DEVELOPING COUNTRIES TO DEVELOPED COUNTRIES (A/C.2/L.1325, DRAFT DECISION II)

64. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft decision without a vote.

It was so decided.

INTERNATIONAL YEARS AND ANNIVERSARIES (A/C.2/L.1326)

65. Mr. GATES (New Zealand), introducing the draft resolution, said that it dealt with a problem of co-ordination that had been of concern to the Economic and Social Council for a number of years. The Council considered that the proliferation of "international years" tended to reduce the effectiveness of the activities undertaken on those occasions, and in its resolution 1800 (LV) had asked its subsidiary organs to exercise moderation in that connexion, and to propose instead commemorations of briefer duration. Since some subsidiary organs of the General Assembly were sometimes required to take decisions on that question, the Economic and Social Council, with a view to co-ordination, had thought it desirable that the Assembly should adopt a draft resolution parallel to the Council resolution. He hoped that draft resolution A/C.2/L.1326 would be adopted by consensus, like Council resolution 1800 (LV).

66. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) supported the draft resolution introduced by New Zealand. The Soviet delegation had always adopted a cautious attitude to the proliferation of international years, and shared the view that it would be appropriate to propose commemorations of briefer duration, as was

in fact the practice in the Soviet Union. Experience showed that the effectiveness of such observances was not proportionate to the length of period involved; quite the contrary.

67. The CHAIRMAN asked whether the Committee wished to approve the draft resolution without a vote.

It was so decided.

SPECIAL MEASURES RELATED TO THE PARTICULAR NEEDS OF THE LAND-LOCKED DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (*continued*) (A/C.2/L.1310/REV.2)

68. Mr. SIDDIQ (Afghanistan) said that after consultation the sponsors had decided, in a spirit of compromise, to revise paragraph 1 of their text by replacing the word "free" by the words "freedom of" in the last line of the paragraph.

69. Mr. NDUNG'U (Kenya) said that, in the same spirit of compromise, his delegation would accept the amendment proposed by the sponsors and withdraw its own amendment.

70. Mr. SCHUPPUS (Togo) said that his delegation was still not satisfied, and asked for a separate vote on paragraph 1.

71. Mr. DE MEDEIROS (Dahomey) said that his delegation wanted to propose the addition of a new operative paragraph, once the problem of paragraph 1 had been solved. The new paragraph would come between paragraphs 1 and 2 of the present text and would read:

"2. *Draws the attention* of the international community to the difficulties experienced by developing transit countries with respect to their infrastructure in the areas of transportation, storage and port facilities, and the need to obtain international assistance in order to solve this problem".

72. His delegation also proposed that paragraph 2 of the existing text should be amended by adding the words "and transit" between the words "land-locked" and "developing countries".

73. Mr. BONAO (Ivory Coast) said that his delegation was still dissatisfied with paragraph 1. It wished to propose the following amendment to the paragraph: the replacement of the words "the exercise of their right of free" by the phrase "within the framework of appropriate agreements" before the word "access". If the sponsors did not accept that amendment, his delegation would ask for a roll-call vote on all the operative paragraphs.

74. Mr. SIDDIQ (Afghanistan) asked whether, at the stage the discussion had reached, it was still possible to submit amendments.

75. The CHAIRMAN said that under rule 122 of the rules of procedure he could permit the discussion and consideration of amendments, even though they had not been circulated, or had been circulated only on the same day.

76. Mr. YONG (Malaysia) said that it was rule 130 that should be invoked, since explanations of vote had already begun. Under that rule, amendments could not be submitted once voting had begun.

77. Mr. KUMI (Ghana) said that in any case there had been a decision by consensus to hold consultations.

78. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines) proposed that the debate on the item under consideration should be closed in accordance with rule 119 of the rules of procedure, and that the Committee should proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1310/Rev.2, as revised by the sponsors. If the amendments proposed by Dahomey were formal amendments, they should also be put to the vote.

79. Mr. KANÉ (Mauritania) supported the proposal of the representative of the Philippines. He reminded the representative of Dahomey that the draft resolution under consideration concerned the land-locked developing countries, and it was inappropriate to include any specific reference to the case of transit countries. He also appealed to the sponsors of the draft resolution to accept the amendment he had proposed (see para. 54 above) which would not make any basic change in the substance of paragraph 1.

80. Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta) said that he opposed the proposal by the representative of the Philippines, because he considered that it was rule 133 and not rule 119 that should be applied in the circumstances.

81. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the proposal by the representative of the Philippines for closure of the debate under rule 119 of the rules of procedure.

The proposal of the representative of the Philippines was adopted by 52 votes to 5, with 61 abstentions.

82. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Committee) read out the amendments submitted to draft resolution A/C.2/L.1310/Rev.2.

83. The CHAIRMAN said that rule 132 of the rules of procedure provided that when two or more amendments were moved to a proposal, the Committee should first vote on the amendment furthest removed from the original proposal; the Committee would accordingly begin by voting on the first oral amendment submitted by Dahomey (see para. 71 above) to the effect that a new operative paragraph should be inserted between operative paragraphs 1 and 2 of the draft resolution.

The first amendment submitted by Dahomey was rejected by 33 votes to 8, with 78 abstentions.

84. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the second amendment by Dahomey, which related to operative paragraph 2.

The second amendment by Dahomey was rejected by 32 votes to 6, with 80 abstentions.

85. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the amendment relating to operative paragraph 1 submitted by the Ivory Coast (see para. 73 above).

The amendment by the Ivory Coast was adopted by 39 votes to 25, with 53 abstentions.

86. After a procedural debate, in which Mr. SCHUPPUS (Togo), Mr. FASLA (Algeria) and Mr. AKÉ (Ivory Coast) took part, Mr. GONZALEZ ARIAS (Paraguay) proposed that the amendment by the Ivory Coast should be reconsidered, since there appeared to have been a misunderstanding about the text just adopted. He said that in accordance with rule 125 of the rules of procedure, any decision to reconsider a proposal must be taken by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting.

87. Mr. GARCIA BELAUNDE (Peru) supported the proposal by the representative of Paraguay.

88. Mr. JAIN (India), supported by Mr. HAQ (Pakistan), opposed the proposal by Paraguay that a vote requiring a two-thirds majority should be taken on whether the Committee should reconsider the amendment submitted by the Ivory Coast. However, he would not object to a second vote on that amendment if that made the Committee's work easier.

89. Mr. GONZALEZ ARIAS (Paraguay) said that he would not insist on a vote on his proposal, provided the Committee did in fact vote again on the amendment by the Ivory Coast.

It was decided, after a procedural discussion, to vote on the proposal by the representative of Paraguay to reconsider, in accordance with rule 125 of the rules of procedure, the amendment submitted by the Ivory Coast.

The proposal of the representative of Paraguay was adopted by 67 votes to 23, with 19 abstentions.

90. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Committee) said that the amendment submitted by the Ivory Coast was to replace the words "in facilitating the exercise of their right of free access to and from the sea" in paragraph 1 by the words "in facilitating, within the framework of appropriate agreements, their access to and from the sea".

The amendment by the Ivory Coast was rejected by 29 votes to 25, with 62 abstentions.

91. After a procedural debate in which Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta), Mr. MOHAMMED (Nigeria), Mr. AKE (Ivory Coast), and Mr. HAMID (Sudan) participated, the CHAIRMAN said that if there were no objections he would consider that the amendment by Mauritania to operative paragraph 1 (see para. 54 above) was adopted without a vote.

It was so decided.

92. Mr. SCHUPPUS (Togo) said that he would request, not a roll-call vote on paragraph 1, but a separate vote on the words "the exercise of their right of freedom of access".

93. Mr. AKÉ (Ivory Coast) supported that proposal.

94. After a procedural discussion in which Mr. GONZALEZ ARIAS (Paraguay), Mr. PAQUI (Dahomey), Mr. SIDDIQ (Afghanistan) and Mr. TAYLOR (Sierra Leone) took part, it was decided to take a separate vote on those words.

At the request of the representative of Bolivia a recorded vote was taken on those words.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lesotho, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America,

Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Cameroon, Congo, Dahomey, India, Ivory Coast, Nigeria, Pakistan.

Abstaining: Barbados, Bulgaria, Burma, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany (Federal Republic of), Ghana, Iran, Italy, Kenya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Oman, Romania, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Togo, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania.

The words "the exercise of their right of freedom of access" were retained by 70 votes to 7, with 33 abstentions.

95. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on paragraph 1, as a whole, as revised.

At the request of the representative of the Ivory Coast a recorded vote was taken on paragraph 1 as a whole.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Congo.

Abstaining: Barbados, Burma, Canada, Dahomey, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany (Federal Republic of), India, Iran, Italy, Ivory Coast, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Togo, Tunisia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania.

Paragraph 1 as a whole was adopted by 92 votes to 1, with 24 abstentions.

At the request of the representative of the Ivory Coast, a recorded vote was taken on paragraph 2.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, German Democratic Republic, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana,

Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Austria, Barbados, Canada, Congo, Dahomey, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Ghana, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Paragraph 2 was adopted by 91 votes to none, with 23 abstentions.

At the request of the representative of the Ivory Coast, a recorded vote was taken on paragraph 3.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, United

States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Barbados, Canada, Congo, Dahomey, Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Morocco, Netherlands, Pakistan, Sweden, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Paragraph 3 was adopted by 98 votes to none, with 18 abstentions.

At the request of the representative of Pakistan, a recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution as a whole.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Barbados, Canada, Congo, Dahomey, Denmark, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany (Federal Republic of), Italy, Ivory Coast, Netherlands, Pakistan, Sweden, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 101 votes to none, with 16 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 7.40 p.m.

1573rd meeting

Friday, 30 November 1973, at 10.45 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Zewde GABRE-SELLASSIE (Ethiopia).

A/C.2/SR.1573

AGENDA ITEM 12

Report of the Economic and Social Council [chapters II to IV, V (sections A, C and D), VI to XX, XXI (section B), XXV and XXVII to XXIX] (*continued*) (A/9003 and Corr.1, A/C.2/285)

SPECIAL MEASURES RELATED TO THE PARTICULAR NEEDS OF THE LAND-LOCKED DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (*concluded*)

1. Mr. ARVESEN (Norway), explaining his vote on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1310/Rev.2, as orally revised