



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) pointed out that at the 1480th meeting he had said that the draft resolutions relating to the Action Plan for the Human Environment (A/CONF.48/14 and Corr.1, chap. II) should be transmitted as they stood to the Governing Council for Environmental Programmes rather than be voted on in the Second Committee. He thought that it would be wrong to try to steam-roller the Committee and that it would be better to give other delegations an opportunity to express their opinions. Some delegations had declared themselves in favour of adopting immediate measures, while others, such as the Indian and Swedish delegations, had asserted that it would be preferable to transmit those draft resolutions to the Governing Council. Without wishing to prejudge the opinion of the majority of the members of the Committee, he thought that it would clear up the question if it were made the subject of a formal proposal and he would if useful be prepared to submit a proposal to that effect.
2. Draft resolution A/C.2/L.1230 raised the questions both of the human environment and, at least equally important, of development. In practice and in fact, it would be essential to take account of development priorities, the importance of which was in any event emphasized within the framework of environmental activities. Development priorities were for a country itself to establish in its country programme. Accordingly, his delegation was of the opinion that, before telling IBRD what it should do in a global context, the Committee should ask itself whether countries did not have the first responsibility to get their priorities right. It should also remember that the President of the Bank, in his statement before the Economic and Social Council on 18 October 1972 (1841st meeting), had said that development efforts should aim at ensuring a better income distribution in countries where that proved necessary. He had added that to ignore that problem would be to vitiate much development effort. If it did not take those factors into account, the Committee ran the risk of prescribing a specific and global approach which ignored the requirements of development in a given country. In the context of income distribution, it should perhaps be pointed out that some developing countries which were currently grappling with serious housing problems also had a relatively high *per capita* income. It would be noted that in some of those countries there was a fairly considerable number of rich persons living side by side with much poorer classes which represented a high percentage of the population. That might raise the question of domestic fiscal reform rather than priority for external aid funds. His delegation did not seek to minimize the importance of housing and human settlements, but it wished to underline the fact that it was unsound to recommend the adoption of a global sectoral approach when it was the responsibility of countries themselves to look to their own remedies first.
3. Correspondingly the problem raised in draft resolution A/C.2/L.1230 fell into two parts which could be alternatives between one country and another. There were grounds for wondering, first, to what extent the Bank might provide technical advisory assistance, particularly in the fields of construction, income distribution and tax reform; or, alternatively, whether, as stated in operative paragraph 1, the Bank should in addition give "high priority" to requests for financial as well as technical assistance for housing as such. His delegation thought that, viewed from that angle, operative paragraph 1 was the wrong way to approach the problem. He pointed out that his Government agreed with the general tenor of operative paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 in so far as they dealt with the terms of financial aid; that was evident from the fact that it granted over 80 per cent of its aid in the form of grants and of loans on soft terms. In any event, he wished to point out once again that it was for countries, and countries alone, to decide which sectors should be given priority and that the General Assembly should not impose its views collectively in that matter. Accordingly, if draft resolution A/C.2/L.1230 was put to the vote, his delegation would not be able to vote in favour of its adoption; the same, for those reasons as well as others, applied to draft resolution A/C.2/L.1231.
4. He repeated that if the Committee moved towards voting on the draft resolution at the current meeting, instead of transmitting it in draft to the Governing Council for Environmental Programmes, his delegation would be ready to present a formal proposal asking that the resolutions relating to the Action Plan be transmitted, in draft form, to the Governing Council at its first meeting.

5. Mr. BONNICK (Jamaica) asked the Chairman to rule on the question of the proposal referred to by the United Kingdom representative. He had thought that the Committee was about to vote on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1230 submitted by his delegation, and he therefore believed that the proposal was contrary to the procedure on which the members of the Committee had agreed.

6. The CHAIRMAN observed that the Committee had before it a formal proposal on which it should take a vote. He pointed out that he had never said that the voting had begun.

7. Mr. BONNICK (Jamaica) said he had thought that the roll-call vote had begun and pointed out that the name of Chile had even been drawn by lot by the Chairman. There was no doubt that the voting had begun.

8. The CHAIRMAN explained that he had acted as he had done in order to try to gain time. He observed that he had merely announced that a roll-call vote had been requested, but that he had never said that the voting had begun.

9. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) pointed out that as long as the voting had not begun, delegations could propose amendments to the draft resolution. He expressed surprise that the representative of Jamaica should insist that the Committee proceed to a vote without further delay. In his view, it would be better to allow each delegation an opportunity to express its opinion before proceeding to a vote.

10. The CHAIRMAN repeated that at the previous meeting he had merely asked delegations to comment on the vote. He now intended to put the United Kingdom proposal to the vote. If the Committee was to be able to proceed to a vote on the draft resolution, the latter should be submitted formally and delegations should have an opportunity to reply to the various comments which might be made. He asked representatives to show goodwill in order to avoid wasting time on a procedural question.

11. Mr. SADEK (Egypt) supported the oral amendment introduced by Tunisia at the 1480th meeting to draft resolution A/C.2/L.1230. He proposed that in operative paragraph 1 the word "also" should be inserted before the words "give high priority".

12. Mr. FRANCO-HOLGUIN (International Bank for Reconstruction and Development) said that the Bank had for some time recognized the importance and complexity of the problems raised by urbanization in the developing countries. It had recently established an urbanization projects department and had launched a programme of project activities, directed specifically to urbanization for the period 1972-1976, which involved some 30 urban centres and the sum of about \$700 million. In considering housing investment requirements, it was important to bear in mind that substantial sums were involved and that they did not have a built-in repayment potential in the way of import

savings. For most developing countries, to incur a foreign debt in order to meet a considerable portion of their housing investment requirements would result in a rapid aggravation of their already serious foreign debt-servicing problems. Furthermore, if those requirements were to be financed from external sources, the volume of foreign capital required would be substantially beyond current capital flows. In view of all those constraints, the Bank had sought to concentrate on low-cost, labour-intensive solutions involving mobilization of local resources. Direct financing of housing programmes was not excluded and might even be possible when more experience of the problem had been gained. The Bank's new approach had made it possible to build housing which met the minimum standards at about one fifth of the cost of the usual low-cost housing programmes. On the other hand, the Bank Group also recognized that the absence of financing institutions to collect savings and extend loans for housing construction often presented a major problem. The Group believed that it might be able to make indirect loans through local financial outlets and, in fact, was prepared to make the necessary "seed capital loans".

13. With regard to the question of the priority to be given to housing and human settlement projects, the Bank fully recognized the importance of urban problems in the developing countries. In that regard, any request for financial assistance in any sector must be considered within the context of the particular country's investment priorities. The determination of those priorities was to be made by the Government concerned in the light of the various investment opportunities that presented themselves to the country. Therefore, the Bank could not, *a priori*, give housing, or indeed any other sector, the highest priority. The Group also endeavoured to adapt the terms of its lending to the special circumstances of the projects it financed and that would be the case for housing and related investments as suggested in draft resolution A/C.2/L.1230. In appraising projects, it also took into account the socio-economic factors mentioned in operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution. As to the terms "priority" and "high priority", he agreed with the view already expressed on the subject that those concepts must be interpreted in the light of each country's over-all investment programmes and priorities. As to the terms and conditions of loans, loans were made at a uniform rate of interest whatever the sector and whatever the project. However, flexibility was possible regarding repayment schedules and periods of grace. The particular characteristics of housing and human settlement projects would, of course, be taken into account. Mention had also been made of IDA soft funds. The use of IDA funds was determined not by the sector being financed, but only by the relative ability of the country concerned to service external debt. The Bank would of course give full consideration to the decision adopted by the General Assembly on those questions.

14. Mr. BONNICK (Jamaica) recalled that at the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment all countries had supported the recommendation



under consideration. There now appeared to be some lack of co-ordination among them. Moreover, the arguments advanced by the representative of IBRD concerning draft resolution A/C.2/L.1230 were valid from an economic standpoint, but it was difficult to accept them from a moral standpoint. Although all the developing countries had supported the establishment of an Environment Fund, the developed countries now objected to its being used for housing and human settlements. The developing countries were now trying to win world public opinion to their side in order to bring about the establishment of a multilateral financing organ to help them. The developed countries were opposing the developing countries' efforts to that end; consequently, there was reason to question the morality of the arguments advanced. According to the representative of the Bank, the draft resolution under consideration was most important, both in terms of its content and in the timing of its introduction.

15. His delegation also welcomed the timeliness of the recommendations contained in the draft resolution. Some representatives had stated that the General Assembly could not address recommendations to the World Bank or other specialized agencies. That was not the case, as a glance at Articles 63 and 64 of the United Nations Charter sufficed to prove. Drawing attention to the Bank's World Plan of Action, in which the question of housing and human settlements was examined in detail, he said that, although the Bank had clearly defined its role in that field, it had not done much in practice and had not given a sufficiently clear indication of what it planned to do in the future. It was now necessary to insist that it should take action and to request the General Assembly to indicate what course it should follow. That was why the draft resolution had been submitted and why the Committee should proceed to a vote without delay.

16. With regard to the remarks made by the United Kingdom representative it should be borne in mind that gross national product was not the sole yardstick of development, for it did not take into account crucial factors such as unemployment and mass poverty. Greater attention should therefore be accorded in the future to the human factor. The Bank recognized that henceforth international assistance in the field of housing and urbanization must take on new perspectives. His delegation hoped that the Stockholm recommendations would consolidate the action undertaken in sectors which had been neglected the most.

17. He supported the amendments to the draft resolution submitted orally by Egypt and Tunisia, but was opposed to the Australian amendment.

18. Mr. HARDY (Canada) said that his delegation was unable to support the United Kingdom proposal to transmit resolutions relating to the Action Plan in draft to the Governing Council for Environmental Programmes. Draft resolution A/C.2/L.1235 had been submitted to give force to the recommendations of the Stockholm Conference. It had already been acknowledged that substantial preparations would be required to organize a conference on human settlements. The

adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1235 would give the green light to measures to be taken to that end and would impart a juridical basis to the planning work to be undertaken outside the United Nations system. Its adoption would also make it possible to draw up a detailed plan including a cost estimate, for submission to the Governing Council. His delegation recognized the force of the arguments advanced at the previous meeting concerning the Action Plan elaborated at Stockholm. Although it was aware that it was necessary to proceed with the greatest care, it also wished to emphasize the urgency of the situation; that was why it had decided to submit draft resolution A/C.2/L.1235. He was afraid that there might be a delay of six months or even longer if the Committee waited until the Governing Council was able to take a position on the matter; that would be most unfortunate, since the proposed Conference/Demonstration on Experimental Human Settlements was scheduled for 1975. Moreover, since Canada would be the host country, the Conference/Demonstration budget must be submitted to the Canadian Parliament early in 1973, as it would obviously wish to be apprised of all the details of the project. His delegation fully recognized the need to maintain the momentum of Stockholm; that was its purpose in submitting draft resolution A/C.2/L.1235. It therefore urged the Committee to take a decision on the matter without further delay.

19. Mr. HASSAN (Sudan) said that, if he had understood correctly, the intention of the United Kingdom proposal was to classify the resolutions by categories, according to the recommendations to which they related. He would like the United Kingdom representative to indicate more specifically which resolutions he had in mind, so that the Committee would not lose any time.

20. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) wished to know under which specific rule of the rules of procedure the United Kingdom representative had made his proposal.

21. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had felt from the outset that two types of resolutions resulting from the decisions taken at Stockholm were before the Committee. The first category covered the Stockholm recommendations concerning the machinery to be established. The second covered action recommendations which should in his delegation's view be transmitted in draft form to the Governing Council for Environmental Programmes. In his view, it would be preferable for the Governing Council to examine the Action Plan as a whole; it would therefore be wrong for the Committee to attempt to predetermine the balance between its various components. Accordingly, all the resolutions mentioned by the Chairman could be included in the second category. However, views might differ between one and another. For example, it was known that Iceland was content to have draft resolution A/C.2/L.1241 transmitted in draft to the Governing Council, whereas the nature of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1237 was not such that the Committee need fear creating prejudice by adopting it now.

22. Mr. KRISHNAN (India) pointed out that at the previous meeting he had supported the United Kingdom representative's procedural proposal. However, he hoped he had not given the impression that his delegation intended to promote a division of views in the Committee. Having heard the views of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1230 and of other delegations, he had concluded that several representatives still wanted to give effect to that draft, and that it would be useless to ask them to change their minds. He therefore appealed to the United Kingdom representative to withdraw his proposal.

23. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) observed that in presenting his proposal he had been trying to help the Committee to take a decision, not to divide it. He believed that his proposal was the best way of reaching a rapid decision.

24. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines) said that his delegation could not accept the proposal of the United Kingdom representative, since as a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1231 it believed that that draft resolution in particular should not be submitted for consideration to the Governing Council for Environmental Programmes.

25. He then read out recommendation 17 of the Action Plan for the Human Environment, which was the basis for the draft resolution under consideration. That was an extremely important recommendation of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, and it was for the Second Committee of the General Assembly to take a final decision on the matter, not for the Governing Council, which would have only 58 members. His delegation believed that the decision proposed by the United Kingdom representative might have been acceptable if the several draft resolutions had been taken on a case-to-case basis on their merits.

26. Mr. O'RIORDAN (Ireland) supported the proposal made by the representative of the United Kingdom. He believed that some of the draft resolutions could be adopted by consensus.

*At the request of the representative of Barbados, a recorded vote was taken on the United Kingdom proposal.*

*In favour:* Australia, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Laos, Malta, Norway, South Africa, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*Against:* Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Barbados, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nether-

lands, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

*Abstaining:* Bhutan, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, India, Madagascar, Malawi, Mongolia, Nepal, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

*The United Kingdom proposal was rejected by 76 votes to 18, with 19 abstentions.*

27. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) requested a separate vote on the words "all development assistance agencies such as the United Nations Development Programme and" in operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1230. He would vote against those words and would abstain on operative paragraph 1 as a whole.

28. After a procedural discussion in which Mr. ODERO-JOWI (Kenya), Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) and Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) took part, the CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the words "all development assistance agencies such as the United Nations Development Programme and".

*The words were adopted by 75 votes to 4, with 36 abstentions.*

*At the request of the representative of Jamaica, a vote was taken by roll call on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1230, as amended.*

*Chile, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Cameroon, Chad.

*Against:* None.

*Abstaining:* Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy,



Japan, Khmer Republic, Luxembourg, Malawi, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada.

*The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 81 votes to none, with 34 abstentions.*

29. Mr. AL-EBRAHIM (Kuwait) explained that he had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1230 because he felt it necessary that the developing countries should receive adequate financial and technical assistance.

30. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to examine draft resolution A/C.2/L.1231.

31. Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America) said he could not accept draft resolution A/C.2/L.1231 because it was based on recommendation 17 of the Action Plan, which the United States delegation to the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment had refused to approve. Moreover, he believed that the draft resolution should be considered by the Governing Council for Environmental Programmes, which would not be possible since the proposal made by the United Kingdom delegation had been rejected.

32. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) thought that if draft resolution A/C.2/L.1231 was approved, it must be made clear that the views referred to in operative paragraph 2 had supported the principle of additionality.

33. Mr. JOSEPH (Australia) endorsed the comments made by the United States representative.

34. Mr. MORENO (Cuba) said he was not opposed to the contents of the draft resolution, but would abstain on any vote since his country had not taken part in the Stockholm Conference. Moreover, he had some reservations concerning operative paragraph 3.

35. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) said he had the same objections to operative paragraph 2 as the representative of the United States.

36. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) said he believed that the General Assembly at its twenty-seventh session had not given sufficient consideration to the substance of the problem. He therefore proposed to amend operative paragraph 2 by replacing the words "at the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly" by the words "after obtaining the views of the Governing Council for Environmental Programmes", and "twenty-eighth session" by "twenty-ninth session".

37. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines) said he had not had time to consult the co-sponsors of the draft resolution under consideration. However, he thought that the first Tunisian amendment departed unduly from the original paragraph and that its adoption would delay

the preparation of the study which the Secretary-General was requested to prepare. He considered it essential that the report be submitted as promptly as possible, and felt the amendment to be unnecessary in that in any event the report would come before the Governing Council, which would then refer it to the General Assembly.

38. Mr. AL-HADAD (Yemen) asked the Tunisian delegation not to insist on a vote on its amendment.

39. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) stressed that his amendment did not relate to the substance of the question; nevertheless in his view the question had serious implications and should be considered by the Governing Council for Environmental Programmes.

40. Mr. OUEÐRAOGO (Upper Volta) said there was every justification for trying to obtain the opinion of the Governing Council. On the other hand, he thought that it would be irregular not to take into account the opinions expressed by delegations at the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly. He therefore requested the Tunisian representative to redraft his amendment so that the opinions of both the General Assembly and Governing Council could be taken into account.

41. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) agreed to the request of the representative of Upper Volta.

42. Miss LIM (Malaysia) supported the view of the Philippine representative that in no event should the preparation of the contemplated study be delayed; if the Tunisian amendment were adopted, the Secretary-General would be unable to undertake the study before obtaining the views of the Governing Council, which had not yet been set up. That proposal was therefore unacceptable.

43. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) said he favoured the idea that consideration should be given to the opinions expressed by the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly and by the Governing Council. It was moreover questionable, whether the amendment was adopted or not, whether the Secretary-General would have time to prepare the report at a sufficiently early date so that it could be considered by the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly.

44. Mr. ANANICHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that the Soviet Union was in favour of the aspirations of the developing countries for increased international co-operation in the field of housing. His delegation would nevertheless abstain in the vote on the draft resolution contained in draft resolution A/C.2/L.1231, because it had not participated in the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment and was not responsible for the adoption of recommendation 17 of the Action Plan. Moreover, as his delegation had already stated, the question of the construction of housing, while extremely important, was only distantly related to the problem of the environment and should preferably be the responsibility of a committee such as the Committee for Housing, Building and Planning.

45. Mr. DEBRAH (Ghana) considered that the Tunisian representative's second amendment was justified in view of the delays which might occur in the establishment of the Governing Council and at its first session. As a compromise, the Tunisian representative might withdraw his first amendment and the sponsors might accept the second.

46. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines) noted that the Secretary-General had not indicated whether or not it would be possible, before the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly, to prepare the study contemplated in operative paragraph 2. As a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1231 he was prepared to accept the compromise solution suggested by the representative of Ghana.

47. Mr. ARUEDE (Nigeria) said he saw no reason for postponing submission of the report contemplated in operative paragraph 2 to the twenty-ninth session if the Secretary-General considered it possible to submit it to the twenty-eighth session.

48. Mr. STRONG (Representative of the Secretary-General) said that the Secretariat would give the appropriate priority to that question, but could not guarantee that the study submitted to the twenty-eighth session would be complete.

49. Mr. KANE (Mauritania) requested that the Tunisian representative withdraw his first amendment in view of the spirit of conciliation shown by the Philippine delegation.

50. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) acceded to the appeals made to him and said he would not insist on the retention of his first amendment if the second, to substitute the words "twenty-ninth session" for the words "twenty-eighth session" in operative paragraph 2, was accepted and if it was clearly understood that the Governing Council on Environmental Programmes would consider the report and not merely transmit it to the General Assembly.

*At the request of the Philippine representative, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1231, as orally amended.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

*Against:* Belgium, France, Ireland, Italy, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*Abstaining:* Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

*Draft resolution A/C.2/L.1231, as orally amended, was adopted by 82 votes to 6, with 27 abstentions.*

51. Mr. ROUGÉ (France) said that his Government attached great importance to the problem of housing; however, his delegation had voted against the draft resolution because it considered that the methods proposed therein were unsatisfactory.

52. Mr. CAVAGLIERI (Italy) said he endorsed the goals pursued by the draft resolution; nevertheless, he had voted against it because experience had taught him that the establishment of a special fund was not the appropriate method of achieving those goals.

53. The CHAIRMAN noted that draft resolution A/C.2/L.1234 had no financial implications.

54. Mr. LISOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had not participated in the Stockholm Conference and therefore was not responsible for recommendations that had been adopted there. Since the draft resolution referred to one of those recommendations, his delegation would abstain in the vote.

*At the request of the representative of Sudan, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1234.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cyprus, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

*Against:* None.



*Abstaining:* Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, Hungary, Ireland, Mongolia, Norway, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

*Draft resolution A/C.2/L.1234 was adopted by 103 votes to none, with 13 abstentions.*

55. Mr. MORENO (Cuba) said that his delegation supported the measures proposed in the draft resolution as a whole, but that it had abstained because Cuba had not taken part in the Stockholm Conference.

56. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) said he had voted for the draft resolution, but he had certain reservations. His delegation had earlier stated reservations on some aspects of the World Plan of Action for the Application of Science and Technology to Development. It also thought better to ascertain what recommendations were in fact made by the Committee on Science and Technology for Development before resolving to pursue them.

57. Mr. HASSAN (Sudan) said that all developing countries welcomed the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1234.

58. The CHAIRMAN said that, in consultation with the sponsors, it had been decided to change the title of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1235 to read "United Nations Conference-Exposition on Human Settlements".

59. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) said that his delegation appreciated the efforts made by the Canadian Government to help developing countries and that it would vote for draft resolution A/C.2/L.1235.

60. Mr. DE AZEVEDO BRITO (Brazil) thought that the Governing Council for Environmental Programmes should be able to express its opinion on the Conference-Exposition on Human Settlements and that it should in particular be able to take into account the opinions of other organs dealing with housing and human settlements before making plans for the conference.

61. Mr. GALLARDO MORENO (Mexico) unreservedly supported the idea of convening a Conference-Exposition on Human Settlements. He proposed that the following paragraph on procedure should be added to the draft resolution:

*"Requests the Conference-Exposition to submit to the Governing Council for Environmental Programmes a report on the debates, in order that the Governing Council should in turn submit this report, together with its own observations, to the second Conference on the Human Environment, at the same time that other reports by competent bodies are submitted."*

62. He would not, however, press for the adoption of that amendment if it was not considered acceptable.

63. Mr. ROUGÉ (France) said that his delegation had not sufficient information to enable it to reach a decision. For example, he wished to know whether the Conference-Exposition would be the only one of its kind or the first of a series. Furthermore, it seemed odd to decide to hold the Conference in paragraph 1 and then to consider the costs of the conference in paragraph 3. Before coming to a decision, his delegation would like to be assured that the costs would be relatively low.

64. Mr. MORENO (Cuba) fully approved of the idea of holding a Conference-Exposition. However, since his country had not participated in the Stockholm Conference, his delegation would abstain from voting and would reserve its right to take part or not to take part in the Conference-Exposition.

65. Mr. HARDY (Canada), replying to the Brazilian representative, explained that the Governing Council would have every opportunity to examine the Canadian proposals on the holding of the conference and to coordinate the views of the various bodies concerned.

66. His delegation could not accept the Mexican amendment, which prejudged the question of the convening of a second United Nations Conference on the Human Environment dealt with in operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1229/Rev.1.

67. He wished to point out to the French representative that his country was ready to make a generous contribution to defray the cost of organizing the Conference-Exposition and that Canada would take upon itself all additional costs incurred as a result of holding the conference away from Headquarters. Only one conference would be held, so it would not be the first of a series.

68. Mr. GALLARDO MORENO (Mexico) noted that, though the date of the second Conference on the Human Environment was not known, the holding of the Conference had nevertheless been approved in principle. However, he would not press for the adoption of his amendment and would vote for draft resolution A/C.2/L.1235.

69. Mr. AL JABER (Jordan) fully supported draft resolution A/C.2/L.1235. The name of the Conference should be changed not only in the title of the draft resolution, but every time it appeared in the text.

70. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Committee) said that the adoption of operative paragraphs 1 and 2 of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1235 would involve considerable costs, which could not be estimated at present. However, an estimate would be given in the report to be drawn up by the Secretary-General in accordance with operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution. The adoption of that paragraph would have no financial implications for 1973.

*Draft resolution A/C.2/L.1235 was adopted by 102 votes to none, with 16 abstentions.*

71. Mr. ZAGORIN (United States of America) said that his delegation had been obliged to abstain from

voting for the same reasons as in the vote on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1230: it considered that the Governing Council for Environmental Programmes should have considered the draft resolution before the General Assembly.

72. His delegation also considered that the Second Committee should have tried to gain a more exact idea of the financial implications before taking a decision. It had supported the proposal to hold a Conference-Exposition at the Stockholm Conference, but it failed to see why the Committee chose to implement certain recommendations before others.

73. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said he realized that the expenditure would be incurred only in 1974 and not in 1973 but thought none the less that the Secretariat should have provided some indication of the cost of the Conference.

74. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Committee) pointed out that draft resolution A/C.2/L.1235 pro-

vided that the Secretary-General would prepare a report containing a plan for and anticipated costs of the Conference. Thus, the Secretariat could at present only give some indication of the cost of the preparation of the report, which would in fact have no financial implications.

75. Mr. McCARTHY (United Kingdom) supported the proposal for a conference and expressed appreciation of the generous offer made by the Canadian Government. However, he agreed with the representative of the United States that the draft resolution should have been submitted to the Governing Council for Environmental Programmes before being considered by the Second Committee. The case for that haste had not been made out. Furthermore, there had not been an adequate statement of financial implications. Therefore his delegation had abstained.

*The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.*