



Chairman: Mr. Bruce RANKIN (Canada).

**AGENDA ITEM 47**

**United Nations Conference on the Human Environment:**  
report of the Secretary-General (*continued*) (A/8688,  
A/8691, A/8703/Add.1 (Part II), A/8783 and Add.1  
and Add.1/Corr.1; A/CONF.48/14 and Corr.1,  
A/C.2/277, A/C.2/L.1230, A/C.2/L.1231,  
A/C.2/L.1234, A/C.2/L.1235, A/C.2/L.1236/Rev.1,  
A/C.2/L.1237, A/C.2/L.1241, A/C.2/L.1244,  
A/C.2/L.1246, A/C.2/L.1247)

1. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) said that his delegation associated itself with the comments made by the Swedish delegation after the vote on the draft resolution concerning institutional arrangements (A/C.2/L.1228) at the 1479th meeting.
2. Mr. TODOROV (Bulgaria) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolutions A/C.2/L.1227, A/C.2/L.1228, A/C.2/L.1229/Rev.1 and A/C.2/L.1240 because his country had been deprived of the possibility of taking part in the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment at Stockholm and consequently had not been involved in its decisions and recommendations. Furthermore, his Government had not yet completed its study of the recommendations and decisions adopted at Stockholm.
3. Mr. BREITENSTEIN (Finland) recalled that his delegation had earlier expressed the hope that the Committee would be able to adopt the draft resolution on institutional arrangements (A/C.2/L.1228) by a consensus. Unfortunately, that had not proved possible and, if there had been a motion to postpone the vote, his delegation would have supported it. However, it did not consider that the results of the voting on the amendment in A/C.2/L.1243 at the preceding meeting should be considered as final, and hoped that the interval before the question was taken up in the General Assembly could be used for consultations with a view to finding a solution acceptable to all.
4. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1228, but wished to place on record its doubts regarding the constitutionality of the arrangements for the appointment of the Executive Director of the environment secretariat.
5. Mr. BENITES (Ecuador) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1228 after the Chairman had suggested that amendments

might be discussed in the General Assembly rather than in the Second Committee. However, his delegation wished to place on record its astonishment that the Legal Counsel, whose functions were limited to replying to questions raised on legal issues, had taken the initiative of suggesting amendments to a draft resolution, a prerogative belonging exclusively to Member States.

6. Article 101 of the United Nations Charter was not applicable in the case before the Committee because it referred to Secretariat staff only, and the heads of bodies such as the environment secretariat were not classed as Secretariat staff. Furthermore, the over-subtle distinction drawn by the Legal Counsel between "appoint" and "elect" was inapplicable in Spanish, since in that language both terms had exactly the same meaning.

7. Mr. JOSEPH (Australia) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1228, as amended, because it had always regarded equitable geographical distribution in the environmental context as a physical rather than a political concept and believed that, if the problems of the environment were to be tackled successfully on a global scale, a balanced geographical distribution was necessary and more important than the mere representation of political groups. Such a balanced distribution justified an increase in the number of seats for so large and diverse a region as Asia. At the same time, his delegation did not consider that the distribution of seats for the Governing Council for Environmental Programmes constituted a precedent for questioning the membership of the enlarged Economic and Social Council as specified in General Assembly resolution 2847 (XXVI) in which an equitable geographical distribution had been essentially a political concept. His delegation, which had been instrumental in bringing about a compromise at the twenty-sixth session, believed that the formula agreed upon at that time should not be changed.

8. Mr. RUIZ MORALES (Spain) said that his delegation had reservations on operative paragraph 1, but nevertheless had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1228, as amended. A Governing Council for Environmental Programmes composed of 54 members was sufficiently representative and reflected the outcome of arduous negotiations carried out at Stockholm.

9. Mr. CZARKOWSKI (Poland) recalled that, although his country had not participated in the Stockholm Conference, the results of the Conference were under study by the Polish authorities. Poland wished

to stress its interest in environmental problems and had noted with satisfaction the statement made by the Swedish delegation at the previous meeting with regard to operative paragraph 1 of A/C.2/L.1228.

10. Mr. VAN GORKOM (Netherlands) said that his delegation had voted against the amendment submitted by Thailand on behalf of the Asian group (A/C.2/L.1243) for the reasons adduced by the Swedish, United Kingdom and United States delegations. It agreed with the Finnish delegation's view that the question was not yet finalized, and also hoped that further consultations would bring about a generally acceptable solution.

11. Mr. LACKO (Czechoslovakia) said that since his country had not participated in the Conference it could not assume any responsibility for the decisions taken on that occasion. His delegation hoped that it would soon be possible for his country and any others which wished to participate in international co-operation on environmental matters to do so on the basis of the principle of universal participation.

12. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines) said that, although his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1228, it continued to have reservations on operative paragraph 5. It hoped that the paragraph could be amended in order to place the Executive Director of the environment secretariat on the same footing as the heads of such bodies as UNCTAD and UNIDO.

13. Mr. MORENO (Cuba) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on A/C.2/L.1228 because his country had not participated in the Conference. Moreover it felt that the points raised by the Swedish delegation at the previous meeting were highly pertinent.

14. Mr. PATAKI (Hungary) said that his country had not participated in the Conference and his delegation had therefore abstained in the voting on the previous day. Moreover, the competent Hungarian authorities were still in the process of evaluating the results of the Conference.

15. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom), speaking on a point of order, said that while his delegation felt that the Legal Counsel was justified in raising the question of a possible conflict between operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1228 and Article 101 of the Charter, it considered that the matter should have been raised with the Committee at a much earlier stage and that a Secretariat representative should have been delegated to discuss the matter with the Committee.

16. The CHAIRMAN said that a representative of the Secretariat would be invited to be present if any similar case arose in future.

17. He requested the representative of Kenya to introduce draft resolution A/C.2/L.1246.

18. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya) said that the inadequate participation of the third world in the activities of the United Nations had caused much concern in recent years and could be attributed to the limitations imposed on developing countries by the great Powers. The Declaration adopted by the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Georgetown from 8 to 12 August 1972, stated that the Great Powers tended to monopolize or influence important global decisions and bypass the United Nations in dealing with problems of vital importance, and that action must be initiated for the widest possible participation of Member States, on the principle of equitable and more broad-based geographical representation, in the principal organs of the United Nations and its specialized agencies as well as in the secretariats, particularly at the policy-making levels.

19. It had been suggested that the environment secretariat should be situated in a place where a nucleus of United Nations bodies already existed, with which technical and economic co-operation would be possible; however, in the past, decisions on the siting of agencies had been taken on purely political rather than technical and economic grounds and the developing countries wished the General Assembly to exercise political judgement alone in selecting the site of the environment secretariat. It had also been argued that, since the new secretariat would be small, it should be situated within one of the existing United Nations offices; the developing countries were ready to accommodate the new secretariat however small it might be. It had also been suggested that the secretariat would be dealing with matters not immediately relevant to the needs of the third world, but the developing countries categorically rejected that argument because the environment was the common concern of all peoples and all countries.

20. In 1967, when UNIDO had been set up, the developing countries had been told that they did not possess the necessary facilities for hosting the secretariat and for ensuring its effective operation. They had also been told that the United Nations could not incur additional expenditure to develop facilities in the third world. If facilities did not exist in the third world, it was the responsibility of the United Nations to ensure that decisions were taken to create them. The United Nations was a global body, and it was unfair that its agencies should be confined to North America and Western Europe. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1246 rejected any move to postpone a decision on the site of the environment secretariat and urged that as a matter of equity it should be sited in a developing country. Moreover, the siting of that secretariat in a developing country would enhance relations among the developing countries themselves.

21. In conclusion, he announced that the delegations of Iraq, Niger and the Syrian Arab Republic had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

22. Mr. JOSEPH (Australia), speaking on a point of order, felt that it would be useful to define the term



“developing country” in the sense used in draft resolution A/C.2/L.1246.

23. Mr. MARMARA (Malta) said that although Malta, as a developing country, supported the objective of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1246, it had a number of misgivings concerning the document. There was a danger that it would have the undesirable effect of accentuating the polarization of the Members of the United Nations into developing and developed countries and of introducing such polarization formally into the records and resolutions of the Organization. Moreover, it was counterproductive to enunciate the principle of equitable geographical distribution as applying to the sites of secretariats of United Nations bodies merely in order to prepare the way for a decision on the site of the environment secretariat. Accordingly, for reasons of principle his delegation would have preferred the draft resolution not to have been introduced at all.

24. The principle of equitable geographical distribution was accepted for purposes of election to various bodies and committees of the United Nations, and the written and unwritten rules which had accumulated on the subject over the years could hardly be applied when choosing a site for the headquarters of United Nations agencies. Accordingly, his delegation proposed in document A/C.2/L.1247 to amend the fifth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution by replacing the words “equitable geographical distribution” by the words “the desirability of achieving a wider geographical distribution”.

25. The sponsors might also wish to consider deleting the word “activities” in the same paragraph, since it might be interpreted—contrary to what had probably been their intention—as meaning that the field activities of such United Nations agencies as FAO, UNIDO and UNCTAD, all of which had their headquarters in developed countries, were primarily, if not solely, conducted within the host countries.

26. Furthermore, it was unnecessary and discourteous to refer in the fourth preambular paragraph to any specific region. Since the operative part called for situating the secretariat in a developing country, it would have been more appropriate merely to mention “developed States” in the fourth preambular paragraph. Otherwise, it would be preferable to specify the States concerned.

27. He hoped that, since his amendment referred solely to the preamble of the draft resolution, the sponsors would be able to view it in the constructive spirit in which it has been submitted and accept it. If they did so, his delegation would be able to support the draft resolution.

28. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Committee) said that the Secretary-General wished to inform the Committee that the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1246 would have financial implications that would not necessarily correspond to those outlined in document A/C.2/L.1232. The revised financial implica-

tions could be presented only after a specific site was suggested for the environment secretariat.

29. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom), supported by Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America), said that it would distort the pattern reached at Stockholm if the Committee took a vote on the draft resolutions which referred to specific points in the Action Plan for the Human Environment (A/CONF.48/14 and Corr.1, chap. II). Accordingly, those draft resolutions should simply be transmitted to the Governing Council for Environmental Programmes for consideration.

30. Mr. KRÖYER (Iceland) said that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1241, which included his own delegation, agreed to transmit the document to the Governing Council.

31. Mr. KARUNATILLEKE (Sri Lanka) said that it was the duty of the Committee to make clear what kind of proposals should be adopted; it was not enough merely to transmit the draft resolutions to the Governing Council which, moreover, was not so broadly representative as the General Assembly. Moreover, there appeared to be an impression in the Committee that the decisions adopted at Stockholm were final, whereas the Second Committee, as well as Governments, should have the opportunity to review them.

32. Mr. CHANG HSIEN-WU (China) said that his delegation supported the desire of other developing countries to improve human settlements that was reflected in draft resolution A/C.2/L.1230. However, that document referred to documents of IBRD, which so far had failed to expel the so-called “representative” of the Chiang Kai-shek clique in compliance with General Assembly resolution 2758 (XXVI) on the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. His delegation would therefore not participate in the vote on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1230.

33. Mr. MORENO (Cuba) said that although his delegation considered draft resolution A/C.2/L.1230 praiseworthy it would abstain in the vote for two reasons. First, it had not participated in the Stockholm Conference. Secondly, IBRD was called upon to carry out many activities in implementation of the draft resolution. He recalled his delegation's statement of 23 October 1972 concerning IBRD at the resumed fifty-third session of the Economic and Social Council (1842nd meeting) and said that the Bank was not the appropriate body to offer assistance to the developing countries, as was indicated by the fact that it had denied credits to Chile simply because that country had sought to assert its national sovereignty.

34. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) proposed that the words “in agreement with requesting Governments” should be inserted at the end of operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1230. If the sponsors accepted that amendment, his delegation would be pleased to co-sponsor the draft resolution.

35. Mr. JOSEPH (Australia) said that he wished to make a number of suggestions concerning draft resolu-

tion A/C.2/L.1230 in the hope that they would be favourably received by the sponsors, thereby enabling his delegation and others to support it. First, the last preambular paragraph should begin with the word "Recalling", since a number of delegations, including his own, had been unable to support recommendation 17 of the Action Plan at Stockholm. Delegations wishing to reiterate their support for that recommendation could do so by voting in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1231.

36. Secondly, as Governments themselves set their own priorities under the system applied by UNDP and IBRD, the recommendations in draft resolution A/C.2/L.1230 should be addressed to Governments. The sponsors might wish to consider inserting the words "in the light of the countries' investment priorities" at the end of operative paragraph 1. He also supported the amendment just proposed by the representative of Tunisia.

37. Thirdly, the General Assembly should, wherever possible, avoid instructing the governing bodies of other institutions concerning the policies which they should pursue. Accordingly, the draft resolution should be amended so that it was clear that the General Assembly was inviting those bodies to consider the recommendations in the draft.

38. Mr. ROUGÉ (France) hoped that draft resolution A/C.2/L.1230 would be withdrawn. If it was not, his delegation would abstain in the vote. It was for the newly established Governing Council for Environmental Programmes to consider the recommendations in the draft resolution. The draft would also have the General Assembly give directives to IBRD concerning its day-to-day operations, a task which properly belonged to the Bank's governing bodies. Moreover, the draft resolution implied that one of the best uses to which external aid could be put was the improvement of human settlements. That was not true in all cases. Local resources and unemployed manpower should be mobilized to that end. The Committee for Development Planning had emphasized that vast housing construction programmes should be established to combat unemployment. Moreover, the UNDP country programming system ensured that each country's particular priorities would be taken into account. Draft resolution A/C.2/L.1230 was an ill-considered intrusion on the planning process instituted in countries in co-operation with the competent bodies of the United Nations system. The Tunisian oral amendment called attention to the need for Governments to establish priorities; however, if it was accepted, the draft resolution would lose virtually all its meaning.

39. Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya) said that draft resolution A/C.2/L.1230 was only a partial step towards the implementation of recommendation 17 of the Action Plan, which called for the establishment of an international fund or a financial institution to assist the developing countries in improving human settlements. The Governing Council for Environmental Programmes would have to consider the matter further with a view to implementing recommendation 17.

40. If the Tunisian amendment was acceptable to the sponsors, his own delegation would support and co-sponsor the draft resolution.

41. Mr. KRISHNAN (India) said that, while his delegation could readily support the contents of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1230 as well as some of the other drafts before the Committee, it concurred in the view that the General Assembly should not be called upon to act on specifics and that it would be better for the initiative to be taken by the Governing Council. Action at the current stage seemed unnecessary and premature. If possible the Committee should agree to refer the draft resolutions before it to the Governing Council for that body's most careful consideration and appropriate action. If, however, a vote was taken, his delegation would support draft resolution A/C.2/L.1230.

42. Mr. CZARKOWSKI (Poland) said that his delegation would abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1230 for the same reasons that had prompted it to abstain on other draft resolutions before the Committee. His delegation supported United Nations programmes for housing, building and planning.

43. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) said that while it might be logical to send the draft resolutions under discussion to the Governing Council, the General Assembly, as the supreme organ of the United Nations, was entitled to act on and set priorities for the crucial question of human settlements which so vitally affected the developing countries. Accordingly his delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1230.

44. He expressed surprise at the statement that the General Assembly could not appropriately make recommendations to IBRD and to UNDP. It was his delegation's view that the General Assembly had the right and indeed the obligation to make general recommendations which neither implied mandatory action nor in any way limited the field of action of those agencies.

45. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) said that the Governing Council would clearly give careful consideration to the Action Plan and prepare a balanced programme. He agreed with the representative of Chile that the General Assembly might wish to establish some priorities and, in that context, considered draft resolution A/C.2/L.1230 a very appropriate one, which his delegation would support.

46. It was reasonable that the wishes of recipient countries should be respected in granting assistance in housing and human settlements and that available domestic resources must be supplemented by external financing. The concept of the additionality of resources did not seem clear in the text of the draft resolution but, although explicit clarification would have been desirable, his delegation would not propose any specific amendment at the current late stage of the Committee's work.

47. Mr. GRANQVIST (Sweden) supported the Indian representative's plea that the sponsors of draft



resolution A/C.2/L.1230 which related to one specific part of the Action Plan should agree to have their proposal referred to the Governing Council. If, however, the Committee was called upon to vote, his delegation would abstain because in its opinion a vote would prejudice the position of the Governing Council.

48. Mr. HARDY (Canada) reserved the right of his delegation to speak on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1235 at an appropriate time.

49. Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America) concurred in the Swedish delegation's statement that the proposals relating to the Action Plan should be referred to the Governing Council for careful deliberation. Proposals put forward in the Committee and referred to the Governing Council would have to be taken into consideration by the environment secretariat as priority items for the first meeting of the Governing Council, along with others considered to be of high priority. He could not, however, agree with the representative of Chile that the General Assembly could appropriately make recommendations in any form it wished. It should not take action to interfere with the rights of the developing countries to establish priorities in their development programmes, nor with the proper functioning of other bodies in the United Nations system. While he could agree with the Chilean representative that the General Assembly recommendations would not be binding, he felt that such recommendations might go too far in directing the lending activities and the policy-making functions of the Bank. In that connexion he agreed with the points raised by the representatives of France and Australia.

50. The matter of the additionality of resources raised by the representative of Brazil only underlined the fact that resources were limited and must inevitably be allocated on a priority basis. While the United States delegation had no difficulty in supporting the idea of appropriate forms of assistance in favour of housing, it considered it unwise for countries to pile up excessive foreign exchange debts for that. Moreover, he felt it would have been desirable to distinguish more clearly between grant and loan activities in the draft resolution.

51. He regretted that the United States was unable to support draft resolution A/C.2/L.1230.

52. Mr. MUELLER (Austria) said that his delegation was in a position to support most of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1230, but requested a separate vote on the last preambular paragraph.

53. Mr. GATES (New Zealand) requested the sponsors to consider deferring the vote on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1230 and referring it to the Governing Council.

54. He requested clarification of the words "terms and conditions" in operative paragraphs 2 and 3 in order to ascertain whether the Bank had different terms and conditions in different sectors. He also requested information on "seed capital loans" referred to in operative paragraph 4.

55. Mr. KARUNATILLEKE (Sri Lanka) felt that draft resolution A/C.2/L.1230 was timely and appropriate. If the Governing Council was not to be concerned with human settlements, it would deal only with pollution and would disregard the fact that poor housing in the developing countries was a primary source of pollution. Adequate financing had been a perennial problem in achieving progress in human settlements.

56. He noted that operative paragraph 1 related not only to IBRD but also to UNDP and other agencies. Adoption of the resolution would represent an endorsement of the recent change in Bank policy and would encourage UNDP to divert increasing resources to housing. Assistance in housing would help to solve the important problem of unemployment and improve living levels in the under-developed countries.

57. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said, in explanation of his vote, that draft resolution A/C.2/L.1230 made numerous references to the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment in which the USSR had not participated for reasons well known to the Committee. Moreover, the draft made reference to IBRD, an agency which in his delegation's view hampered rather than promoted the advancement of the developing countries and had not eliminated exploitation and misuse of their natural resources. Accordingly, the USSR would abstain in the vote on that draft resolution.

58. Mr. ALI (Pakistan), referring to the lending policies of the Bank, recalled his statement of 20 October, at the 1841st meeting of the Economic and Social Council, in connexion with the Bank's report. Initially, the Bank had not granted any soft loans but, with the passage of time, softer loans had been found desirable and possible. The draft resolution under discussion requested greater financing of softer loans and drew the Bank's attention to the need for making provision for such loans.

59. His delegation attached great importance to co-ordination and hoped that the various agencies involved would co-ordinate effectively in order to avoid overlapping.

60. Mr. DE RIVERO (Peru) said that his delegation would support draft resolution A/C.2/L.1230 which was very important for the developing countries. The recommendations to the Bank were already matters of priority, as evidenced by the Bank's report.

61. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines) could not agree that the Committee and the General Assembly should take no action regarding the results of the Stockholm Conference. Moreover, the suggestion that draft resolution A/C.2/L.1230 should be referred to the Governing Council was unacceptable to his delegation. He saw no contradiction between that draft resolution, which was general in nature, and A/C.2/L.1231 which referred to recommendation 17 of the Action Plan adopted by the Conference.

62. Mr. LEKONGA (Zaire) said that his delegation would vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1230

which contained a recommendation drawing the attention of the Bank to the need for considering socioeconomic factors in connexion with housing and human settlements.

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

63. Mr. ISAKSEN (Denmark) said that, if a vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1230, his delegation would abstain since, in its view, the matter dealt with

in the text should be discussed by the Governing Council before being brought to the General Assembly. His delegation would follow that same procedure in connexion with other draft resolutions before the Committee.

64. He concurred in the statement of the representatives of India and Sweden that the resolution should not be put to a vote.

*The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.*