



Chairman: Mr. Bruce RANKIN (Canada).

*Organization of the Committee's work*

1. The CHAIRMAN recalled that at the preceding meeting the representatives of the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union had requested the presence of representatives of the appropriate Secretariat departments to answer questions concerning the provision of conference facilities. He pointed out that eight main bodies met during the General Assembly and that, as there were only six conference rooms, all had to take their turn. The Second Committee had a good record: of the 322 hours and 20 minutes of meeting time so far lost during the General Assembly, it was responsible for only 20 minutes. Thus, its requests for additional meeting facilities seemed to merit favourable consideration. The Committee had hoped to finish its work by 1 December, but discussions on the environment item had taken longer than expected. He and the Bureau had felt that four meetings on Monday and Tuesday of the current week would be sufficient to complete the agenda, but that had clearly been over-optimistic. He was sure that, had the Committee requested facilities for seven meetings in sufficient time, they would have been made available; unfortunately, the conference rooms had already been booked by the time the need for extra meetings had become apparent.

2. That morning he had spoken with members of the Office of Conference Services and, as a considerable concession, had obtained the use of room 3 for the current meeting. By personal contact with the Chairmen of other Committees, who did not always give the Secretariat sufficient warning of changes in their plans, he had discovered that, owing to the cancellation of a meeting, a conference room would be available on Friday morning. It could be seen that the problem of conference facilities was not merely physical and was also not necessarily directly attributable to the Office of Conference Services.

3. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) pointed out that the Committee was being faced with successive night meetings after successive days in which it had been denied meeting services. No doubt the delegations themselves were largely responsible for the congestion at the end of the session. They had insisted on a general debate, which had had to be extended because of the usual belated rush of speakers at the end of the allotted time. There had then been a second general debate on another item. Had the members of the Committee produced concrete proposals and, where appropriate,

draft resolutions earlier in the session, they would now be in a rather better plight. As it was, draft resolutions had been produced halfway through the discussion of items and contact groups had been initiated too late, in one case deliberately so. Those factors had led to a waste of time and money. Night meetings should, perhaps, have begun as soon as the Committee had fallen behind schedule. However, as the Chairman had said, the Committee would not have accepted such a proposal.

4. The Chairman had also said that the General Committee had been over-optimistic. Because the Committee had met promptly and used most of its time properly, its need for additional facilities had not been foreseen, so that the rooms had already been allocated by the time the request had been made.

5. Nevertheless the Committee could legitimately ask whether it had been fairly treated by those who managed its physical affairs. On all but one occasion, it had met on time. In addition, it had almost always occupied its scheduled time and, except in the early days of the general debate, when there had not been enough speakers, had scarcely ever adjourned early. All that contrasted commendably and very sharply indeed with every other body, including the plenary Assembly, during the session. It was common knowledge that during the current week, in which the Committee had been denied the day meetings it needed, other Committees had held two meetings on successive days, but had adjourned both early instead of telescoping them into one. Furthermore, other bodies had cancelled meetings, but had not informed the Secretariat of their decision until it was too late for rooms to be reallocated. The Second Committee did not seem to have been given any credit for its better performance.

6. Perhaps the General Committee of the General Assembly should meet daily in order to prevent such confusion. But delegations were ephemeral and dependent on the experience and professionalism of the Secretariat. Had any effort been made by the Secretariat, on the basis of its experience of earlier sessions, to institute better practices? Had anyone in the Secretariat said, for example, that facilities should be offered to Committees on the basis of a current assessment of their workload and speakers' list rather than of some automatic partition of available services?

7. He understood the problem was more often one of the availability of rooms than of services. Why, then, did the Economic and Social Council Chamber, a splendid white elephant, remain inadequately equipped for the Council, let alone a Committee of the

Assembly? He well appreciated the need for economy and his Government had throughout supported the Secretary-General's efforts made in that direction, but the cost of re-equipping that Chamber should be weighed against the cost of the overtime rightly payable to Secretariat personnel for extended day and night meetings. Had anyone considered that aspect of the problem? If so, what was being done? If not, why not?

8. What would be the effect on the Assembly as a whole if the current situation was repeated? A higher proportion of the Second Committee's recommendations required action by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) and the Fifth Committee than was the case with some other Committees. How could ACABQ and the Fifth Committee be expected to perform satisfactorily and in anything like humanly tolerable conditions within the time-span of the General Assembly if the Second Committee could not submit its proposals to them until mid-December because of a lack of meeting time?

9. His delegation fully recognized the extensive and basic responsibility of delegations in the matter under discussion. However, he hoped the Secretariat would reply to the points he had raised which fell within its competence rather than that of delegations. He wished particularly to ask why there had been no evidence of flexibility over the past 10 days in favour of the Second Committee when it had been perfectly well known that some other Committees had been taking life more leisurely.

10. Mr. CHURLIN (Director, Interpretation and Meeting Service) said that his department was faced every year with the difficulties in arranging meetings mentioned by the Chairman. All Committees started their work slowly, but as the end of the General Assembly approached, the pressure of work increased and it became difficult to allocate the available time.

11. He recalled that the Second Committee had originally intended to complete its work on 1 December. His department, which drew up its schedules not on a day-to-day but on a weekly basis, had planned the meetings of the Committee with that date in mind. His department had been successful in accommodating the Committee's requests for extra meeting facilities on Monday and Tuesday of the current week; on other occasions, conference rooms had already been allocated to other bodies.

12. The General Assembly involved a total of eight main bodies, but only six conference rooms were available. As the Second Committee had been unable to complete its work by the scheduled date, his department had sought ways of fitting in its meetings. Facilities had been found for the proposed meeting on Friday morning and efforts would be made to find time for additional meetings if that were necessary. He assured the Committee that near the end of the General Assembly there was no conference room which was not fully utilized.

13. His department took as serious an attitude to the work of the Second Committee as it did to that of all the other Committees. The staff of the Office of Conference Services had a particularly high opinion of the Second Committee, which, unlike others, including the plenary Assembly itself, began its meetings promptly and did not waste valuable time.

14. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thanked Mr. Churlin for his explanation of the difficulties faced by the Office of Conference Services (OCS). He understood the problems that could arise in the complicated circumstances of the General Assembly, approved of the system of planning meetings employed by OCS and was satisfied with the efforts made by OCS to provide meeting space at such a difficult period. The members of the Committee must share the blame with the Chairman for not giving OCS adequate warning of changes in their plans.

15. The CHAIRMAN again acknowledged his own responsibility in the matter. He and the Bureau of the Assembly's General Committee should have recognized that the debate on the environment item would overrun its allotted time and made arrangements accordingly.

16. However, he still felt that the record of the Second Committee warranted a favourable attitude to its requests for additional meeting facilities. He would take up that point, together with some of those raised by the representative of the United Kingdom, at his forthcoming meeting with the Secretary-General and the President of the General Assembly. There was also room for increased liaison between the chairmen of all the Main Committees in order to determine in advance what problems would arise and what facilities would be available.

17. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) said that, while the Secretariat might have been surprised by the extent to which he and the Chairman had admitted the responsibility of delegations for the current difficulties, he had given clear and adequate warning that he wished a representative of the Office of the Controller to be present at the meeting. Many of the questions he had raised did not fall exclusively within the competence of the Office of Conference Services and, much as he appreciated Mr. Churlin's courtesy in appearing before the Committee, not one of his specific points had been dealt with. At some stage, his delegation would want specific answers to his questions concerning the failure to make use of the Economic and Social Council Chamber, the automatic allocation of conference rooms without due consideration being given to the workload of the Committee concerned and the need for flexibility in the arrangements for meetings. That would enable the chairmen of Committees at subsequent sessions of the General Assembly to deal with the difficulties which would inevitably arise in a flexible manner, rather than on the basis of plans made one week in advance, a luxury in which delegations could not indulge.

18. The CHAIRMAN said that he would personally assume responsibility for providing the answers to those questions the following day.

## AGENDA ITEM 12

**Report of the Economic and Social Council [chapters III to XI, XII (sections A to G) and XVII to XIX] (concluded) (A/8703)****UNITED NATIONS FUND FOR POPULATION ACTIVITIES (concluded)**

19. Mr. ARVESEN (Norway), speaking in explanation of vote, said his delegation had opposed all the amendments to draft resolution A/C.2/L.1283/Rev.1 and particularly those submitted by certain Latin American countries, because of the way and spirit in which they had been introduced. The Argentine amendment to insert a new third operative paragraph would have destroyed the entire draft resolution. The Brazilian amendment to operative paragraph 6 was most inappropriate and impertinent because it implied some ulterior and sinister motives on the part of the sponsors of the draft. United Nations activities with regard to population problems must be undertaken in accordance with the relevant provisions of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade (General Assembly resolution 2626 (XXV)), to which his Government felt morally and politically committed. Paragraph 65 of the Strategy stated that the developed countries would provide family planning assistance "upon request"; it thus remained within the sovereign rights of national Governments to seek such assistance or not, as they wished. Norway had made substantial contributions to the United Nations Fund for Population Activities but, in view of the delicate nature of the question of family planning and of the amended wording of paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1283/Rev.1, he stressed that those contributions had been kept entirely separate from and were additional to Norway's voluntary contributions to UNDP and in favour of the least developed countries.

20. His country supported the draft resolution as a whole, as amended. Action on the lines suggested by the Secretary-General was urgently required since the population question was possibly the most pressing of the development problems. United Nations efforts to build peace through economic and social development would not be complete unless the Organization was able to provide essential and meaningful assistance in the population field.

21. Mr. TREVIÑO (Mexico) stated that his delegation had received instructions concerning draft resolution A/C.2/L.1283/Rev.1 only after the amendments had been put to the vote. It would express its position on the resolution as a whole by its vote in the General Assembly.

22. Mr. MORENO (Cuba) said that his delegation's position on the draft resolution had been explained before the vote and made clear by the amendments formulated during the discussion. His delegation had abstained from voting, despite the fact that most of the amendments had been adopted, because the draft had been submitted to the Committee without due consultation. In addition, the criteria for the activities of the UNDP Governing Council and the Economic and Social Council referred to in the operative part of the

draft had not been adequately defined. There was a danger that, if the Governing Council was put in charge of population activities, it would be unable to concentrate on its own terms of reference. The association of UNFPA with the Governing Council would constitute tacit acceptance of a link between family planning and development activities, something his delegation found totally unacceptable.

23. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had abstained although the adoption of the amendments had made the draft resolution better suited to meeting the increased need for international co-operation in population activities. The resolution dealt with matters of great importance for economic and social development and his country felt that the prime responsibility for the formulation of demographic policies within the United Nations system lay with the Economic and Social Council as the main organ for economic affairs. His delegation's attitude had also been based on its position of principle with regard to demographic matters, particularly its non-participation in UNFPA.

24. Mr. DELPRÉE CRESPO (Guatemala) said that assistance to developing countries in population activities should be provided independently of their population policies. His delegation did not believe that the population explosion was a basic problem of development in all developing countries. More important were such matters as the tightness of world trade markets and the low prices obtained by developing countries for their primary commodities, and appropriate measures must be taken to remedy the low income levels resulting from such factors. International organizations should not make it a prerequisite for the provision of assistance that developing countries must adopt policies to slow down their rate of population increase.

25. His delegation had nevertheless voted for the draft resolution because it recognized that population problems were extremely serious in some parts of the world and that the countries concerned required additional assistance. Its support had been given on the understanding that the resources of the Fund would continue to consist of extraordinary and additional contributions.

26. Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America) said that, as a sponsor, his delegation had supported the draft resolution even though some amendments to which it was opposed had been adopted. Despite those changes, the basic purpose of the draft, that of providing for urgent action which had been requested by the Secretary-General to place the Fund under the authority of the General Assembly, to convert its financing practice from the full funding to an annual funding system, and to establish the Governing Council as its governing body, would be achieved. In particular, his delegation had opposed the amendment to operative paragraph 6; it would oppose the concept of "additionality" of resources in whatever form it appeared and in relation to whatever funds, since his Government, while respecting the right of recipient countries to determine the priorities in their own development

programmes under the country-programming system, also wished to retain its right to assess its priorities and make voluntary contributions in accordance with them. His delegation therefore took strong exception to the language which had been added to paragraph 6. Countries which had no interest in availing themselves of the Fund's resources, which were supplied only on request, had no right to stand in the way of more effective institutional and management arrangements for the Fund. There had been nothing in the language of the draft resolution to suggest that management of the Fund by UNDP would in any way affect the level of assistance given in other areas. The introduction of obstacles to the establishment of a more orderly and effective system for the operations of the Fund not only risked harming the programmes it carried out, but might also have repercussions on United Nations management of multilateral funds in general. If Governments were to be encouraged to contribute generously to multilateral financing, they must be assured of the effective performance of the organs to which they were contributing. His Government provided approximately 50 per cent of the contributions to the Fund and therefore considered it extremely important that the Fund, as well as other organs such as UNDP, should operate effectively.

27. Mr. AL-EBRAHIM (Kuwait) said that his delegation had opposed the ruling by the Chairman that the Committee should not take the separate vote requested by the representative of Sweden in relation to paragraph 2, since it believed that the effect of complying with her request would have been totally different from that of the separate vote he himself had requested.

28. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) said that before the previous night's meeting a number of understandings had been reached, of which his delegation had been aware although it had not been a party to them. He had therefore been surprised at some of the amendments submitted and had doubted the need for them. Their adoption had placed his delegation in some difficulty, but it had nevertheless voted for the draft resolution, in view of the importance of clarifying the situation with regard to the activities conducted by the Fund, and in particular to their financing. Where paragraph 6 was concerned, his delegation maintained its previous position with regard to the over-all aid targets set in the International Development Strategy. It must be perfectly clear that, if the amendment which had been adopted was intended to touch upon that subject, his Government's position on the matter would in no way be affected by it.

29. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole, because the Committee had not had an opportunity to study comments by the Economic and Social Council and the Governing Council on activities for which they were to be responsible. Moreover, his delegation felt that the manner in which the subject had been brought before the Committee at the last minute, on the basis of a note by the Secretary-General (A/8899) also submitted at the last minute, had been inappropriate, and the attempt to

force the Committee to take a decision had been out of place.

30. On the positive side, his delegation had been able to abstain, rather than oppose the draft resolution, because of the incorporation in it of a number of amendments, particularly those which clearly defined the policy role of the Economic and Social Council, and of his own delegation's amendment to paragraph 6. That amendment could scarcely be considered "impertinent" since it had received the support of 56 delegations. In his delegation's view, the amendment considerably improved the text by stressing that development activities in general must not be impaired and that the developing countries themselves must be permitted to decide their priorities for the assistance provided.

31. The CHAIRMAN said that there were a number of outstanding items on which the Committee must act in order to conclude its consideration of the report of the Council.

#### WORLD PLAN OF ACTION FOR THE APPLICATION OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY TO DEVELOPMENT

32. Firstly, the Council had requested its interested subsidiary bodies to review the *World Plan of Action for the Application of Science and Technology to Development*,<sup>1</sup> and had recommended that the General Assembly should consider the Plan at its twenty-eighth session. If he heard no objection, he would assume that the Committee decided to recommend the General Assembly to defer consideration of the World Plan of Action to its twenty-eighth session, at which time it might consider in depth the recommendations made thereon to the Council by its Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development, the Council's comments thereon in conjunction with the first review and appraisal of the Second Development Decade and the report which the Secretary-General was to prepare in response to General Assembly resolution 2658 (XXV) on the role of modern science and technology in development.

*It was so decided.*

#### PROTEIN RESOURCES

33. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the Economic and Social Council's decision to return to the Secretary-General's report on edible protein at its fifty-fifth session. If he heard no objection, he would assume that the Committee agreed to recommend to the General Assembly that it defer consideration of the matter until its twenty-eighth session.

*It was so decided.*

#### APPLICATION OF COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT

34. The CHAIRMAN recalled that, at the suggestion of the Secretary-General, the Council had decided to

<sup>1</sup> United Nations publication, Sales No. E.71.II.A.18.

postpone consideration of the Secretary-General's report on the application of computer technology to development until 1973, and had recommended that the Assembly defer consideration of the matter until its twenty-eighth session. If he heard no objection, he would assume that the Committee agreed to recommend the General Assembly to defer consideration of the question to its twenty-eighth session.

*It was so decided.*

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS/FAO INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE OF THE WORLD FOOD PROGRAMME

35. The CHAIRMAN recalled that at its fifty-third session the Council had taken note with satisfaction of the tenth annual report of the United Nations/FAO Intergovernmental Committee of the World Food Programme (E/5129) and had transmitted it to the General Assembly. Copies of the report had been circulated to members. He suggested that the Committee should recommend the General Assembly to take note of that report.

*It was so decided.*

AGENDA ITEM 43

United Nations Conference on Trade and Development  
(continued) (A/8703/Add.1 (Part III), A/8819, A/8893,  
A/C.2/L.1273/Rev.1, A/C.2/L.1274/Rev.1,  
A/C.2/L.1277, A/C.2/L.1279, A/C.2/L.1284):

- (a) Report of the Conference on its third session (TD/178 and Add.1, TD(III)/Misc.3 and Corr.1);
- (b) Report of the Trade and Development Board (A/8715)

36. Mr. CUBILLOS (Chile), introducing the revised text of the draft resolution on multilateral trade negotiations (A/C.2/L.1273/Rev.1), said that the delegations of Afghanistan, Chad, Jordan, Mauritania, Nigeria, Sudan and Yemen had also become sponsors. All of the sponsors had accepted two additional changes. Operative paragraph 7 should therefore read:

*“Recommends that the negotiations should as a matter of priority secure significant concessions for the primary commodities, including processed and semi-processed products, of the least developed among the developing countries, with a view to substantially improving their export of these products;”*

In operative paragraph 2, the words “access to markets” should be replaced by the phrase “an improvement in the conditions of access for their exports to the markets of the industrialized countries”.

37. It was extremely important to the developing countries that the General Assembly should adopt the draft resolution which was intended to provide guidelines for the conduct of the countries participating in the multilateral trade negotiations in 1973. It was very possible that the industrialized market-economy countries would receive benefits from those negotia-

tions and that the trade, and hence the economic development, of the developing countries would be adversely affected if their interests were not taken sufficiently into account in the negotiations. So far the Contracting Parties to GATT had considered only the consequences of their actions for the developed market-economy countries, and only at the twenty-eighth session of GATT had the needs of the developing countries been briefly mentioned. The draft resolution accordingly stated the basic goals of the developing countries by enumerating in paragraph 4 the principles adopted at the instance of the Group of 77 in UNCTAD resolution 82 (III) (see TD(III)/Misc.3 and Corr.1). The new text of paragraph 7 was designed to reflect the special interests of the least developed among the developing countries, which stood to lose even more in terms of participation in world trade than did the developing countries as a whole if the result of the negotiations proved to be an increase in trade among developed countries. He hoped that the delegations of the industrialized market-economy countries, even if they intended to oppose or abstain on the draft resolution as a whole, would support paragraph 7, since it was of primary importance that the General Assembly should recommend that the Contracting Parties to GATT and the other participants in the negotiations should take full account of the interests of the least developed countries, which would otherwise be harmed by negotiations in which they were unable to participate.

38. The trade of the least developed countries was insignificant in real terms and often conducted at the regional level. Accordingly, the economic and financial compensations for any loss incurred by developing countries, referred to in paragraph 6, must also take the least developed countries into account; the Contracting Parties to GATT and the participants in the negotiations must seek means of ensuring that compensation was proportional to the extent to which the least developed countries were unable to participate in world trade.

39. Paragraph 8 stressed that the trade negotiations should contribute to the liberalization of both tariff and non-tariff barriers. That liberalization should extend to all developing countries, whether or not Contracting Parties to GATT; since GATT had announced measures which would allow non-members to participate in the negotiations, the General Assembly should give specific instructions that equal consideration should be given to members and non-members. Where paragraph 9 was concerned, it was important that the Secretary-General of UNCTAD should make intensive efforts to assist developing countries in preparing for the negotiations and in the negotiations themselves, and that in so doing he should co-operate fully with UNDP and with the secretariat of GATT.

40. His delegation hoped that the draft resolution, which was aimed essentially at securing benefits for the developing countries, would be adopted.

41. The developed countries might have other criteria for assessing the success of the negotiations, but if they were sincere in their desire to see the developing

countries participate, they should ensure that the Contracting Parties to GATT were provided with guidelines which would enable them to do so.

42. Mr. GERLEIN (Colombia) noted that the representative of Chile had announced important revisions involving substantial changes in the revised text of the draft resolution. In principle, his delegation supported the main objectives of the draft; during the general debate in the Committee (1455th meeting), it had outlined its hopes with regard to the outcome of the forthcoming multilateral trade negotiations, which largely coincided with the aspirations of the Group of 77 as a whole. Accordingly, his delegation had submitted an amendment (A/C.2/L.1284) reflecting a basic premise of the International Development Strategy, namely, that the developing countries which had not yet succeeded in achieving their development goals should not receive advantages over others, so as to avoid situations of confrontation between developing countries. True development assistance must benefit the least developed without harming those countries which were still striving to develop further. The idea underlying his amendment had been unanimously recognized in decisions of the United Nations, the Group of 77 and the Latin American group; the wording was taken almost word for word from paragraph 1 of UNCTAD resolution 62 (III) (see TD(III)/Misc.3 and Corr.1) and similar ideas had been expressed in the Declaration and Principles of the Action Programme of Lima<sup>2</sup> and in resolutions adopted by ECLA at its thirteenth and fourteenth sessions. He therefore appealed to the sponsors of the draft to accept the amendment in the interests of equitable international trade and of solidarity.

43. The amendment in no way changed the text of the draft resolution, being merely an addition. It had originally been proposed as an additional operative paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1273; since the revised draft had 10 paragraphs, it should now become operative paragraph 11. The amendment was not fortuitous, but embraced a principle which was basic to the whole philosophy of development: there must be a common front, and measures must be general in scope and not detrimental to any developing country. It was not directed against the interests of any sector; his delegation had always supported the adoption of special measures in favour of the least developed among the developing countries. The fact that the sponsors had omitted to reflect the content of his delegation's amendment in the revised draft resolution might be due to an oversight, since both the Declaration of Lima and UNCTAD resolution 62 (III) had been adopted unanimously. Accordingly, he hoped that they would not object to its incorporation and that the Committee as a whole would vote in favour of it.

*Mr. Pataki (Hungary), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.*

Mr. VAN GORKOM (Netherlands), speaking on behalf of EEC, said it had been generally recognized

during the debate in the Committee that two of the most important decisions taken by UNCTAD were resolution 82 (III) on multilateral trade negotiations and resolution 84 (III) on the international monetary situation. EEC had strongly promoted the adoption of the first of those resolutions. The two resolutions recognized and established the interdependence between trade, monetary reform and development, as well as the right of developing countries to participate fully in the decision-making process in trade and monetary reform.

45. The resolutions had quickly received the necessary follow-up. The Committee of Twenty of IMF had begun its deliberations. In October, the Trade and Development Board, in agreed conclusion 92 (XII) (see A/8715, Part One, annex I), had reaffirmed and elaborated upon resolution 82 (III), and in November the Contracting Parties to GATT had set the stage for the multilateral negotiations and further defined the roles and objectives of the developing countries in them. The summing-up by the Chairman of the Contracting Parties on 14 November 1972, at the twenty-eighth session of GATT, which had proved acceptable to the great majority of developing countries, had stated *inter alia* that the multilateral trade negotiations should aim to secure additional benefits for the international trade of the developing countries so as to achieve a substantial increase in their foreign-exchange earnings, diversification of their exports and an acceleration of the rate and growth of their trade taking into account their development needs. The GATT secretariat was already assisting many developing countries, including a number of non-member countries, in the preparation for the forthcoming negotiations. At the "European summit conference" held in Paris on 19 and 20 October 1972, the Heads of State or of Government of the Countries of the enlarged European Economic Community had solemnly reaffirmed the Community's readiness to participate in the multilateral negotiations on trade and monetary reform in order to achieve stable and balanced economic relations in which the interests of the developing countries would be taken fully into account. Those developments constituted undeniable progress towards a new economic and monetary order, the benefits of which should be shared equally by all countries.

46. The members of the Community would not object to the General Assembly endorsing the relevant decisions of UNCTAD and urging Member States to carry them out and pursue the preparatory work of GATT. Had that been the main thrust of the draft resolution, they would have welcomed it. However, their considered view was that the General Assembly should not go beyond what had so far been mutually agreed upon. It would be undesirable at the present stage to introduce new and perhaps controversial elements which would interfere with the process already set in motion. Delicate and perhaps difficult preparatory work would have to be undertaken. It would not be wise for the General Assembly to make new demands which would inevitably increase the complexity of the preparatory work and of the negotiations themselves. It could hardly be expected that the preparations would be

<sup>2</sup> See A/C.2/270 and Corr.1.

adequate and effective if the basis on which the Contracting Parties had reached agreement only three weeks previously was to be radically changed. The Community was ready to participate actively in the forthcoming negotiations and would, in so doing, as had been reaffirmed by the October summit conference, take the interests of the developing world fully into account. The members of the Community appealed to the sponsors not to press the draft resolution to a vote.

47. Mr. ARLÍA (Argentina) expressed Argentina's continuing interest in trade negotiations. During the general debate at the fifty-third session of the Economic and Social Council, his delegation had said that the Committee should orient the activities of the international community with regard to economic co-operation. Two events of historic importance were now taking place: the revision of the international monetary system and the GATT multilateral trade negotiations, which, if they were successfully concluded in co-operation with the third world, would strengthen international peace and security. At the outset of the vital multilateral trade negotiations, it was important that the General Assembly should express its opinion and direct them so that they served the primary objective of a better international division of labour.

48. An important question was raised in paragraph 1 of the draft resolution. None of the negotiating stages had yet actually begun. The first stage was to set the over-all objectives of the negotiations, which must be clearly defined and take into account the particular interests of the developing countries. As stated in paragraph 2, it was GATT's duty to determine the objectives, but the General Assembly must state the political will of the Contracting Parties to attain them. Once they had been established, discussion of techniques and procedures of negotiation must begin. The draft resolution enumerated a series of principles designed to serve as guidelines for the negotiations and tried to discharge the General Assembly's responsibility by indicating what their political orientation should be. The process was already in motion and could not be interrupted and the General Assembly must guide all international activity in that respect.

49. He took exception to some of the prejudices expressed in the statement made by the representative of the Netherlands of behalf of EEC. He was also unable to accept the Colombian amendment because, whereas the draft resolution clearly outlined the procedure for negotiations, the amendment directed the attention of the Contracting Parties to GATT to matters which they were not competent to decide. They were only competent to establish the objectives, whereas the techniques and procedures must be decided upon by all countries, whether or not Parties to GATT.

50. He appealed to the developed countries not to be prejudiced against the draft resolution but to support it without questioning whether it contravened the jurisdiction of any specific body.

*Mr. Rankin (Canada) resumed the Chair.*

51. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that it had completed the debate on the UNCTAD report (TD/178 and Add.1) and that any further statements must refer directly to the draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1273/Rev.1).

52. Mr. BREITENSTEIN (Finland) said that, if the draft resolution was put to the vote, he would be obliged to vote against it. The great interest in the forthcoming multilateral trade talks and the expectations associated with them bore witness to their importance to both developed and developing countries. However, the discussions on the issue at the third session of UNCTAD, the twelfth session of the Trade and Development Board and the twenty-eighth session of GATT also bore witness to the problems involved. The discussions in those three bodies had all resulted in carefully balanced compromises which were acceptable to a very large majority—if not all—of the Governments concerned. Compromises could obviously not satisfy everyone, but the fact that they had been subscribed to by such a large majority showed that they were the basis upon which the negotiations must be conducted. The General Assembly should do whatever possible to facilitate the negotiation process and avoid any action which might endanger it. The draft resolution appeared to introduce additional difficulties rather than make a constructive contribution to preparations for negotiation. Its acceptance would upset the balance established a few weeks earlier by the representatives of the Governments of a large majority of delegations represented on the Committee and his delegation would therefore be obliged to vote against it.

53. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines) said that, in view of the progress already made in the preparatory work for the negotiations, as indicated by the adoption of UNCTAD resolution 82 (III), the agreed conclusions of the Trade and Development Board at its twelfth session, the deliberations of the Contracting Parties to GATT at its twenty-eighth session and certain paragraphs of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1274/Rev.1, he doubted whether the climate for the negotiations would be enhanced by the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1273/Rev.1. Nevertheless, as the representative of a developing country, he would support it, however reluctantly.

54. He urged the sponsors to accept the Colombian amendment (A/C.2/L.1284) in the interests of consistency and equity: it reiterated principles set forth in UNCTAD resolution 62 (III), which had been adopted unanimously.

55. Mr. DE RIVERO (Peru) said that the time had come for the United Nations to adopt a resolution on the effects of the forthcoming GATT negotiations on the international community. As a Party to GATT, Peru recognized that the General Agreement had been a valuable instrument in the expansion of world trade, particularly trade involving market-economy countries. Until 1966, the norms governing GATT negotiations had essentially been the principles of the

most-favoured-nation, equality of treatment and absolute non-discrimination. It was only at the end of the Kennedy Round that the principle of non-reciprocity had been accepted, although merely as a guideline rather than a juridical component of the General Agreement.

56. It was imperative that GATT should take into account the current trend towards increased international trade irrespective of ideological and military blocs and that its negotiations should reflect such United Nations blueprints as the International Development Strategy. The draft resolution was therefore most relevant and timely. He drew particular attention to paragraphs 3 and 4. The general and specific preferences enjoyed by the developing countries must not be disregarded in the forthcoming negotiations. Moreover, the interests of the developing countries, and the fact that they were at different stages of development, must be taken into account in the negotiations and permanently thereafter, in the conduct of international trade itself.

57. The call for co-ordination between GATT and UNCTAD was particularly important; GATT itself had recognized the necessity for such co-operation in order to expand the trade of the developing countries. The draft resolution was the first United Nations resolution designed to lay down the principles for trade negotiations on a universal basis. It was intended not only to protect the interests of the developing countries, but also to establish a climate for co-operation in accordance with the United Nations Charter.

58. Mr. CUBILLOS (Chile) said that, as UNCTAD resolution 62 (III) was mentioned in the first preambular paragraph, the sponsors felt that the Colombian amendment was unnecessary and that its inclusion might elicit objections from the least developed countries.

59. Mr. VALDÉS (Bolivia) said that the Strategy contained specific references to the need to protect the interests of land-locked developing countries. Hypothetically, it was possible that a coastal developing country might adopt restrictive trade measures which might threaten the interests of a land-locked developing country. Accordingly, he proposed that the words "particularly land-locked developing countries" should be inserted after the words "developing countries" in the first sentence of paragraph 4 (a) and in paragraph 5 (a).

60. Mr. YOKOTA (Japan) recalled that Japan had declared its intention to initiate and actively support multilateral trade negotiations within the framework of GATT. The Japanese-United States Joint Declaration and the Japanese-EEC Joint Declaration stated that special attention should be given to the problems of the developing countries. UNCTAD resolution 82 (III) stated that all developing countries should be given the opportunity to participate fully, effectively and continuously in the negotiations, and provided for preparatory arrangements by GATT, UNCTAD and UNDP. That resolution also drew attention to a number of

principles put forward by the developing countries for the negotiations. Follow-up action had been taken by the Director-General of GATT and at the twenty-eighth session of GATT to arrange for the participation of developing countries, whether or not Contracting Parties to the General Agreement, in the preparatory work and in the negotiations themselves, and the Secretary-General of UNCTAD had taken measures in co-operation with GATT and UNDP.

61. Against that background, his delegation believed that another resolution calling for preparations for the negotiations was unnecessary. The draft resolution before the Committee duplicated some of the provisions of UNCTAD resolution 82 (III) and the more appropriate provisions relating to the negotiations in the omnibus draft resolution in document A/C.2/L.1274/Rev.1. It went too far into the details of the negotiations, contained a number of highly objectionable and unrealistic principles and proposals and even prejudged the results of the negotiations. GATT was the appropriate forum for considering the principles and procedures of the negotiations. The adoption of the draft resolution would adversely affect the smooth preparations which were in progress. Accordingly, he appealed to the sponsors not to press draft resolution A/C.2/L.1273/Rev.1 to the vote; if a vote was taken, his delegation would vote against it. For the same reasons, it would be unable to support the Colombian amendment.

62. Mr. SINGER (Uruguay) said that the draft resolution very appropriately reiterated the keen interest of the developing countries in the forthcoming multilateral trade negotiations and their desire to ensure that the United Nations laid down basic guidelines in order to ensure that their needs were taken into account.

63. Although he agreed with the representative of Chile that the substance of the Colombian amendment was covered by the reference to UNCTAD resolution 62 (III) in the first preambular paragraph, he would have no objection to the inclusion of the amendment.

64. Mr. MOLINA DUARTE (Venezuela) expressed appreciation for the Chilean representative's clarification regarding his interpretation of the nature of developing countries' participation in the trade negotiations. His delegation fully supported the draft resolution and proposed two amendments which would make it absolutely clear that developing countries not Parties to GATT should be involved in all phases of the preparatory work for the negotiations and in the negotiations themselves. First, a phrase should be inserted at the end of paragraph 4 (j) to the effect that the developing countries should not be required to join GATT in order to benefit from the concessions. Secondly, a new paragraph 5 (d) should be added, to read "Measures to ensure the full participation of all developing countries whether or not Contracting Parties to GATT".

65. Mr. DENOT MEDEIROS (Brazil) said that Brazil had always been deeply interested in the forthcoming multilateral trade negotiations and that its final decision



regarding its participation in the negotiations would be influenced significantly by the degree of acceptance by the developed countries of the principles laid down in UNCTAD resolution 82 (III). Nevertheless, Brazil envisaged the preparations for the negotiations as an on-going process in the course of which the nature of the developing countries' participation in the negotiations would be further clarified. Paragraphs 4 and 5 of the summing-up by the Chairman of the Contracting Parties to GATT represented one step in that process. Nothing should be done to restrict the work of the Contracting Parties. The principles and objectives regarding the developing countries' participation should be taken into account in order to ensure that the negotiations would have a decisive impact on those countries. Since his delegation supported the objectives of those countries, it would also support the draft resolution and trusted that it would not jeopardize the continuation of the preparatory process in GATT.

66. He suggested that the words "in accordance with the principles laid down in UNCTAD resolution 62 (III)" should be inserted at the end of paragraph 7 as orally revised by the Chilean representative on behalf of the sponsors. It was true that that resolution was mentioned in the preamble; however, since paragraph 7 departed from the principles laid down by UNCTAD, it would only be logical to include the words he had suggested. If the sponsors accepted the Colombian amendment, he would not press his suggestion.

67. Mr. DIAW (Mali) moved the closure of the debate.

68. The CHAIRMAN read out rule 119 of the rules of procedure under which two statements opposing the motion could be made.

69. Mr. GERLEIN (Colombia) said that he was deeply dismayed that the representative of Mali had moved the closure of the debate; there was no precedent at the current session for denying a delegation the right to respond to criticism of an amendment it had introduced. The amendment in document A/C.2/L.1284 was fully in accordance with UNCTAD resolutions 62 (III) and 82 (III). Hasty action was entirely inappropriate, given the importance of the issue at hand which required careful thought and rational and logical judgement.

70. Mr. BOYESEN (Norway) opposed the motion because he represented a country which felt the need to explain its position on the important draft resolution and hoped that, by doing so in the Committee, its explanation would reach a wide audience, including people in Norway itself.

71. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the motion to close the debate on the item.

*The motion was adopted by 42 votes to 22, with 41 abstentions.*

72. The CHAIRMAN read out rule 130 of the rules of procedure and said that he would limit the explanations of vote to five minutes.

73. Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America) said that he was not surprised that several delegations felt unable to support the draft resolution, which might adversely affect not only negotiations between individual countries such as those the United States was conducting with Japan and EEC but also the delicate nature of the preparations for the multilateral negotiations in GATT which were particularly important to the developing countries. He agreed with many comments made by the representatives of Japan, the Netherlands and the Philippines. His delegation had particular difficulty in accepting paragraph 2, which, only a few weeks after the meeting of the GATT Contracting Parties, went well beyond the agreement reached at that time. Paragraph 4 departed from the principles set forth in UNCTAD resolution 82 (III), which had been so carefully balanced that it had been adopted without dissent. Any advance definition of an important aspect of the GATT negotiations might jeopardize those highly delicate discussions, with adverse consequences for developed and developing countries alike.

74. If the paragraphs of the draft resolution were voted on separately, his delegation could vote in favour of paragraphs 3, 4 and 5, but would vote against the draft resolution as a whole.

75. Mr. HAMID (Sudan) regretted that some developing countries were not yet convinced that the least developed among them did not constitute a danger to their interests and that they wished to insert safeguard clauses. He always wondered why delegations referred only to the operative part of UNCTAD resolution 62 (III) which should be considered in its entirety. Since paragraphs 1 and 2 of the UNCTAD resolution contained the necessary safeguards and the resolution was referred to in the preamble to the draft resolution, the Colombian amendment was redundant and unnecessary.

76. Mr. TEMBOURY (Spain) considered that the proper place to discuss any matter concerned with the multilateral trade negotiations of 1973 was GATT. It would only create unnecessary difficulties if other bodies, including the General Assembly, tried to adopt a position on those negotiations. In its preparatory work at its twenty-eighth session, GATT had already established guidelines for those negotiations, which were contained in the Chairman's summing-up. Spain had voted in favour of them because they reflected a compromise between the various points of view and provided certain indispensable guarantees.

77. Some countries had been in favour of amending paragraph 5 of the Chairman's summing-up, which said that the negotiations should ensure additional benefits for the developing countries with regard to higher prices for their exports, diversification, the acceleration of their growth rate and other matters of great importance to them. A number of countries had been firmly opposed to that amendment, which had not been adopted. Spain which, though not a member of the Group of 77, was in fact a developing country had, like the majority of them, been satisfied with the Chair-

man's summing-up and had not supported the amendment. His delegation would be unable to vote in favour of the draft resolution because it introduced elements which had already been rejected at the GATT meeting. The very reasonable amendments proposed by Colombia and Bolivia and the statement by the representative of the Philippines showed that it did not cover several legitimate interests.

78. Mr. BOYESEN (Norway) said that, had the debate on the item not been closed, he would have had some constructive comments to make. His delegation would vote against the draft resolution.

79. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) welcomed the progress made in the multilateral trade negotiations, which was partly the fruit of negotiation and partly based on the principles set out in UNCTAD resolution 82 (III), section A, which had been accepted by the developed countries at the twelfth session of the Trade and Development Board and at the twenty-eighth session of GATT. He would vote in favour of the draft resolution because he agreed with its contents, but he shared some of the concern expressed at the way in which it had been handled. Matters of such primary importance deserved more careful consideration. He sincerely hoped that the negotiations in the relevant forums would not be adversely affected.

80. With regard to the Colombian amendment, it was right that the draft resolution should refer to measures in favour of the least developed among the developing countries. He was pleased that the additional paragraph proposed by the representative of Brazil had been accepted by the sponsors, as any matters which might lead to controversy among the developing countries must be avoided at all costs.

81. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) regretted that he had been unable to participate fully in the discussion owing to the closure of the debate, which he considered unfair to the sponsors. He would vote against the draft resolution unless separate votes were taken on paragraphs 2, 3, 4 and 5, in which case he would vote against them and abstain on the draft resolution as a whole.

82. With regard to the Colombian amendment, no one disputed the rights of the least developed among the developing countries. The question was, by what criteria were developing countries judged. He believed that some countries did not grant preferences to all countries that asked for them. In judging which countries belonged to the category of developing countries, all factors should be taken into account. The representative of Argentina had said that a number of developing countries fully participated in all discussions on monetary and trade matters. It would be unfortunate if the GATT negotiations were jeopardized and he questioned the right of the General Assembly to give instructions to GATT. If it was adopted, the draft resolution would obviously be counter-productive and the delicate balance so far achieved would be jeopardized.

83. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in explanation of vote, said his country under-

stood the reasons which had prompted the developing countries to submit the draft resolution and would vote in favour of it.

84. The Soviet Union, although not a Party to GATT, felt that the forthcoming multilateral trade negotiations should take up all aspects of international trade relations. Particular attention should be paid to UNCTAD resolution 53 (III) concerning trade between countries with differing social and economic systems, a point which should be adequately reflected in the draft resolution. He stressed that the forthcoming negotiations should contribute to the normalization of the entire system of international economic relations, the expansion of international trade and the removal of all trade barriers. He would have serious doubts about the value of such negotiations if there was no simultaneous agreement concerning primary commodities and manufactures and semi-manufactures. The new operative paragraph 7 proposed by the representative of Chile drew attention to that highly important point.

85. The UNCTAD secretariat should help the developing countries at all stages of their preparations for the negotiations within the bounds of UNCTAD's existing programme and budget. The Trade and Development Board, in accordance with UNCTAD resolution 82 (III), should review those negotiations regularly and help to enhance the effectiveness of UNCTAD's role therein in the interests of all the participants and of international trade as a whole. The very adoption of resolution 82 (III) by UNCTAD showed that UNCTAD had become more representative in its efforts to strengthen and normalize trade relations between all States. That fact also should be appropriately reflected in the draft resolution.

86. Mr. ARLÍA (Argentina) said his delegation was unable to accept the Venezuelan amendments, since they did not coincide with the content and the intent of the draft resolution. The basic assumption of the draft was that two stages were involved in preparing for the negotiations: determination of their objectives and definition of the techniques and procedures to be applied in pursuing those objectives. It had already been decided that participation in the second stage would be open to countries which were not Parties to GATT and it was therefore superfluous to specify that they too should enjoy the benefits resulting from the negotiations.

87. His delegation was also unable to accept the Colombian amendment. Paragraph 7, as revised, did nothing more than request concessions with regard to certain products, which could originate in the least developed or in any other countries, including even developed countries. It was not countries, but products, which would benefit from the concessions, and accordingly the paragraph as it stood was the very least which could be recommended to reflect the interests of the least developed countries. Moreover, the amendment would be completely out of place in a paragraph addressed to the Contracting Parties to GATT; the measures it referred to should be decided upon by the countries participating in the negotiations, rather

than by the relatively small number of Contracting Parties.

88. Mr. GALLARDO MORENO (Mexico) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution and the amendments proposed by the representatives of Bolivia, Colombia and Venezuela. The delegation of Sudan had expressed the concern of all the representatives of the least developed among the developing countries. He reminded the Committee, however, that the question of giving those countries special preference had been studied at the third session of UNCTAD. Mexico, whose process of development, initiated long before assistance was provided by the rich countries, had been long and arduous, itself gave financial and technical aid to the least developed countries, but considered it to be in the interests of all that development should be general throughout the world.

89. Mr. SINGER (Uruguay) said he had been particularly distressed by the remarks of the representative of Greece and therefore wished to point out very clearly that he had voted against the motion for closure of the debate moved by the representative of Mali.

90. Mr. GEBRU (Ethiopia) announced that his delegation would vote against the Colombian amendment because it destroyed carefully balanced paragraphs of the draft resolution. The developing countries should be able to accept general principles which were applicable to them all. Amendments such as that proposed by Colombia would only cause discord within the Group of 77.

91. Mr. CABEZAS (Ecuador) said he would vote for the draft resolution, as also the amendments submitted by the representatives of Colombia and Venezuela, since they clearly and specifically supported the substance of the resolution and were thus important for the forthcoming multilateral trade negotiations. The Colombian amendment, if adopted, would have the effect of safeguarding the interests of not only the least developed but of all developing countries.

92. Mr. ABHYANKAR (India) said that his delegation's vote on the draft resolution would be self-explanatory.

93. Meanwhile he would appreciate clarification of two points. First, the exact status of the Colombian amendment to the draft was in doubt, since two sponsors of the draft resolution seemed to have accepted it. Was it then binding on all the sponsors? He shared the view that, as the Committee was discussing multilateral trade negotiations, the claims of other countries outside the scope of the draft resolution should not intrude. There was no need for an unproductive discussion within the group of developing countries since, whatever its merits, the Colombian amendment did not come within the scope of the matter under discussion. Secondly, the situation would be greatly simplified if the sponsors of the draft resolution were to indicate whether they accepted the oral amendment to the revised paragraph 7 put forward by the represen-

tative of Brazil. The text of that paragraph in the draft referred specifically to UNCTAD resolution 62 (III), whereas the version suggested by the representative of Brazil did not. He wondered whether that was an inadvertent or a deliberate omission.

94. The CHAIRMAN announced that the representative of the Netherlands had requested a recorded vote on all the amendments and on the draft resolution itself.

*A recorded vote was taken on the Colombian amendment (A/C.2/L.1284).*

*In favour:* Bahrain, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Cameroon, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Greece, Honduras, Indonesia, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Malta, Mexico, Philippines, Portugal, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Turkey, Uruguay, Venezuela.

*Against:* Afghanistan, Algeria, Belgium, Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Dahomey, Ethiopia, France, Gabon, Ghana, Laos, Lesotho, Liberia, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Nepal, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Swaziland, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia.

*Abstaining:* Argentina, Austria, Barbados, Botswana, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, El Salvador, Finland, Guatemala, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kuwait, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sweden, Togo, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire, Zambia.

*The amendment was adopted by 32 votes to 27, with 49 abstentions.*

*A recorded vote was taken on the Bolivian oral amendment to paragraphs 4 (a) and 5 (a).*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Barbados, Bolivia, Botswana, Burundi, Central African Republic, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Dahomey, Ivory Coast, Laos, Lesotho, Malawi, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, Portugal, Rwanda, Singapore, South Africa, Togo, Uganda, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zambia.

*Against:* Algeria, Chad, Chile, Cuba, Jamaica, Mauritania, Morocco, Pakistan, Sudan, Swaziland, Trinidad and Tobago, Yemen.

*Abstaining:* Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India,

Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

*The amendment was adopted by 27 votes to 12, with 66 abstentions.*

*A recorded vote was taken on the Venezuelan oral amendment to paragraph 4 (j).*

*In favour:* Bolivia, Burma, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Jordan, Kenya, Laos, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Republic, Malta, Mexico, Philippines, Syrian Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zambia.

*Against:* Algeria, Chad, Chile, Nigeria, Sudan, Swaziland.

*Abstaining:* Afghanistan, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kuwait, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Zaire.

*The amendment was adopted by 24 votes to 6, with 67 abstentions.*

*A recorded vote was taken on the new paragraph 5 (d) proposed by the representative of Venezuela.*

*In favour:* Bolivia, Botswana, Burma, Burundi, Central African Republic, Colombia, Costa Rica, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Laos, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Republic, Malawi, Malaysia, Malta, Mexico, Nepal, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Rwanda, Singapore, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

*Against:* Algeria, Argentina, Chad, Chile, Nigeria, Pakistan.

*Abstaining:* Afghanistan, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Finland, France, Gabon, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Liberia, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Senegal, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Sweden, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Yemen.

*Paragraph 5 (d) was adopted by 46 votes to 6, with 50 abstentions.*

95. Mr. DENOT MEDEIROS (Brazil) said that, since the Colombian amendment had been adopted, his delegation would withdraw its amendment to paragraph 7, as revised.

*A recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution as a whole, as amended.*

*In favour:* Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Barbados, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

*Against:* Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*Abstaining:* Afghanistan, Jamaica, Liberia, Malawi, Malta, Sweden.

*Draft resolution A/C.2/L.1273/Rev.1 as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 83 votes to 20, with 6 abstentions.*

*The meeting rose on Saturday, 8 December, at 12.45 a.m.*