



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 43rd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. OUDOVENKO (Ukrainian Soviet
Socialist Republic)

CONTENTS

- AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 82: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued)
- (a) TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT (continued)
 - (b) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SUBSTANTIAL NEW PROGRAMME OF ACTION FOR THE 1980s FOR THE LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)
 - (d) ECONOMIC AND TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION AMONG DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (continued)
 - (e) ENVIRONMENT
 - (h) SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT: REPORT OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued)

*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

The meeting was called to order at 3.05 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)
(A/C.2/42/L.4, L.32/Rev.1, L.35, L.38/Rev.2, L.39, L.40, L.73 and L.82)

Draft resolution creating an environment that encourages capital formation for growth and development (A/C.2/42/L.35)

1. Mr. SHAABAN (Vice-Chairman) said that it had not been possible to reach agreement in the informal consultations on draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.35. The draft was therefore before the Committee for appropriate action.
2. Mr. DAWSON (United States of America) said that his delegation preferred to withdraw its text and await a more promising atmosphere. It recognized that delegations had the right to hold differing opinions on the economic and financial issues on the Committee's agenda, and had always advocated full and fair debate on those issues. In that spirit, it had submitted resolutions in an attempt to reconcile the positions of various groups of countries. However, issues should be debated in forums which took them seriously. His delegation had hoped that that would be the case in the Second Committee, but, instead of making a real effort to solve economic problems, some countries preferred to engage in political manoeuvres and have the same text voted on again and again year after year. No serious work could take place under those circumstances. The United States preferred to discuss economic issues in more competent and less political forums.

Draft decision on the implementation of section II of the annex to General Assembly resolution 32/197 on the restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system (A/C.2/42/L.73)

3. Mr. GAJENTAAN (Vice-Chairman) introduced draft decision A/C.2/42/L.73, prepared as a result of informal consultations on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.2/42/L.4. He recommended that the Committee should adopt the draft by consensus.
4. Draft decision A/C.2/42/L.73 was adopted by consensus.

Draft decision on the report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of General Assembly resolution 41/201 (A/C.2/42/L.82)

5. Mr. GAJENTAAN (Vice-Chairman) said that it had been decided during the informal consultations to make two minor changes in the draft decision: in the first line of subparagraph (b), "in depth" should be replaced by "further", and in the third line, "progress" should be inserted before "report". With those amendments, he submitted the draft to the Committee for adoption without a vote.
6. Mr. BEN MOUSSA (Morocco) said that there was a contradiction in the draft decision. In subparagraph (a), the Secretary-General was requested to proceed with the implementation of the conclusions and recommendations contained in document

(Mr. Ben Moussa, Morocco)

A/42/657, while in subparagraph (b) the Economic and Social Council was requested to consider the report further. His delegation proposed that subparagraph (a) should be amended to read: "To request the Economic and Social Council to consider the matter at its second regular session of 1988 and also to request the Secretary-General to submit a report on the implementation of this decision to the General Assembly at its forty-third session." That new wording, which would eliminate the contradiction, also took into account the fact that the subject was already included in the agenda for the forty-third session in the light of the biennialization of the programme of work. His delegation could not agree to the implementation of the conclusions and recommendations contained in the report of the Secretary-General issued as document A/42/657 being blocked.

7. After a procedural debate in which the CHAIRMAN, Mr. BEN MOUSSA (Morocco), Mr. GAJENTAAN (Vice-Chairman), Mr. FAABORG-ANDERSEN (Denmark), Mr. RIPERT (Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation), Mr. EL GHAOUTHE (Mauritania), Mr. PAPADATOS (Greece) and Mr. MOHAMMED (Somalia) took part, the CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should postpone consideration of draft decision A/C.2/42/L.82 to enable delegations to continue the informal consultations.

8. It was so decided.

Draft resolution on international economic security (A/C.2/42/L.38/Rev.2)

9. Mr. SHAABAN (Egypt), Vice-Chairman, said that agreement had not been reached on draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.38/Rev.2. However, the sponsors of the draft wished to continue the informal consultations.

10. Mr. ZVEZDIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that there was nothing new to report for the time being. The new version of the draft resolution reflected most of the suggestions made by the delegations of both developed and developing countries. The sponsors had even been prepared to make new concessions in order to satisfy those delegations which still had reservations. The latter, unfortunately, had not shown themselves to be equally accommodating. Despite everything, the Soviet Union was resolved to continue its efforts to extend the consensus, which would facilitate co-operation among the developed countries in overcoming many economic problems, including those of the developing countries. The discussion of the Secretary-General's report on a concept of international economic security (A/42/314) and the work on the draft resolution on the subject had unquestionably been useful to all delegations. He would venture to state they were more aware of the need to view that concept in the context of the international community's efforts to strengthen multilateral economic co-operation in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, to improve the mechanisms of the United Nations system in keeping with the requirements of interdependence and to develop through them a universal dialogue aimed at solving economic problems in the interest of all States, particularly the developing countries. Such dialogue would, in fact, facilitate the consolidation of the economic foundations of international security in keeping with the consensus

(Mr. Zvezdin, USSR)

reached at the seventh session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and reflected in the draft resolution.

11. His delegation hoped that the draft would enjoy the same support as Economic and Social Council decision 1986/162 concerning the Secretary-General's report on the concept of international economic security, which had been adopted by consensus. It also hoped that the conclusions referred to in paragraph 6 of the draft would make it possible to conclude the conceptual elaboration of the questions touched upon in the draft resolution so that negotiations on practical measures could be initiated.

12. At the request of the representative of Egypt, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.38/Rev.2.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, France, Israel, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Canada, Chile, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Liberia, Norway, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sweden, Turkey.

13. Draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.38/Rev.2 was adopted by 101 votes to 10, with 19 abstentions.

14. Mr. FAABORG-ANDERSEN (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the 12 States members of the European Community, said that the Twelve had been unable to vote in favour of

(Mr. Faaborg-Andersen, Denmark)

the draft resolution, just as they had been unable to approve General Assembly resolution 41/184. They agreed on the need for a permanent dialogue on international economic issues, provided that the aim was not to produce any radical changes in the principles of the existing international economic system. While recognizing the economic aspect of security, they objected to the use of the concept of international economic security in economic relations. As that concept was itself controversial, the idea of convening a group of eminent persons did not seem appropriate. However, the Twelve remained ready to collaborate with all parties to facilitate common approaches to the promotion of growth and development, in particular of the developing countries.

15. Mr. LU Ruishu (China) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote, just as it had abstained in the votes on General Assembly resolutions 40/173 and 41/184 and on decision 87/162 of the Economic and Social Council, for it had difficulty in accepting the notion of international economic security.

16. Mr. HELO (Colombia) said that his delegation was in favour of the draft resolution but wished to make it clear that the mechanism provided for in operative paragraph 6, namely the establishment of a group of eminent persons, should be used only in special and important cases; it would sometimes be necessary to consult Governments first before using that mechanism.

17. Mr. JOSSE (Nepal) said that if his delegation had been present during the vote, it would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.38/Rev.2.

18. Mr. DE LA TORRE (Argentina) said that his delegation believed it was important that draft resolutions on the concept of international economic security should be consensus texts. Operative paragraph 6 of the draft resolution would help to secure an international consensus on the question.

19. Mr. HARAN (Israel) said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution because it thought that the concept of international economic security was merely another hollow formula which was not even aimed at the necessary promotion of the economic development of the developing countries. The issues taken up in the draft resolution had already been dealt with in the framework of the concept of a new international economic order. There must be an end to the waste of the time and money of the United Nations on the promotion of senseless slogans and the accumulation of pointless declarations and resolutions.

AGENDA ITEM 82: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued)
(A/C.2/42/L.51 and L.75, L.61, L.62 and L.71)

(a) TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT (continued) (A/C.2/42/L.5, L.6 and L.7, L.54/Rev.1;
L.63, L.66 and L.76, L.57, L.69)

(b) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SUBSTANTIAL NEW PROGRAMME OF ACTION FOR THE 1980s FOR
THE LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)
(A/C.2/42/L.65)

- (d) ECONOMIC AND TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION AMONG DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (continued) (A/C.2/42/L.21 and L.72, L.53 and L.74, L.55)
- (e) ENVIRONMENT (continued) (A/C.2/42/L.19, L.79, L.80 and L.81, L.34 and L.48, L.42, L.78 and L.49, L.44 and L.77)
- (h) SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT: REPORT OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued) (A/C.2/42/L.31, L.43 and L.70)

Draft resolution on the preparation of the new international development strategy for the fourth United Nations development decade (A/C.2/42/L.75)

20. Mr. SHAABAN (Egypt, Vice-Chairman of the Committee) said that the draft resolution was a consensus text and he submitted it to the Committee for adoption.

21. Draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.75 was adopted by consensus.

22. Draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.51 was therefore withdrawn.

Draft resolution on the Raúl Prebisch Foundation (A/C.2/42/L.71)

23. Mr. SHAABAN (Egypt, Vice-Chairman of the Committee) said that the draft resolution reflected a consensus. At the request of several delegations, he wished to draw the Committee's attention to the fact that the words "and the Caribbean" had been omitted from the first preambular paragraph simply because at the time when Mr. Raúl Prebisch was Executive Secretary of the Commission it was not yet called ECLAC.

24. Draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.71 was adopted by consensus.

Draft resolutions on commodities (A/C.2/42/L.5), on protectionism and structural adjustment (A/C.2/42/L.6) and on an International Conference on Money and Finance for Development (A/C.2/42/L.7)

25. Mr. SHAABAN (Egypt, Vice-Chairman of the Committee) said that the three draft resolutions had not been taken up during the informal consultations.

26. Mr. ANDRADE-DIAZ-DURAN (Guatemala), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, proposed that consideration of draft resolutions A/C.2/42/L.5 and L.6 should be deferred to the forty-third session of the General Assembly. Draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.7 no longer required a decision since it had been replaced by draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.52.

27. Mr. DAWSON (United States of America) said that draft resolutions A/C.2/42/L.5 and L.6 had not been considered by the Committee for several years and they were out of date. He wondered whether it was sensible to keep such draft resolutions before the Committee.

28. Mr. ANDRADE-DIAZ-CURAN (Guatemala) said that the Group of 77 urged that the two draft resolutions should be deferred to the forty-third session of the General Assembly.
29. Mr. DAWSON (United States of America) said that he merely wished it to be known that his delegation had serious reservations about the need to take decisions on such draft resolutions.
30. The CHAIRMAN said that he took it that the Committee wished to defer draft resolutions L.5 and L.6 to the forty-third session of the General Assembly and did not wish to take a decision on draft resolution L.7.
31. It was so decided.

Draft resolution on specific action related to the particular needs and problems of land-locked developing countries (A/C.2/42/L.54/Rev.1)

32. Mr. SHAABAN (Egypt), Vice-Chairman, said that, despite lengthy informal consultations, it had not been possible to reach an agreement on paragraph 1 of the draft resolution; he was therefore submitting it to the Committee for its decision.
33. Mr. DASGUPTA (India) said that his delegation would abstain in the vote on paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, because it made no mention of the sovereign territorial rights of transit States and of the need in that regard for bilateral agreements between land-locked countries and transit countries.
34. Mr. UMER (Pakistan) said that his delegation would also abstain in the vote on paragraph 1 for the same reasons.
35. A separate vote was taken on paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.54/Rev.1.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda,

Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Angola, Belgium, Benin, Burma, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Egypt, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, India, Japan, Kenya, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mozambique, Oman, Pakistan, Romania, Somalia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

36. Paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.54/Rev.1 was adopted by 110 votes to 1, with 21 abstentions.

37. At the request of the United States representative, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.54/Rev.1 as a whole.

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

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Nohe.

38. Draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.54/Rev.1 was adopted by 135 votes to 1, with no abstentions.

39. Mr. KUGAMI (Japan) asked whether, in the fifth line of paragraph 2 of the English text of the draft resolution, the last UNCTAD resolution referred to should be resolution 137, and not resolution 37.

40. The CHAIRMAN replied that it was indeed an error and that the resolution referred to was resolution 137.

41. Mrs. DE WHIST (Ecuador) said that she had made a mistake during the voting on paragraph 1: her delegation had not intended to vote in favour, but to abstain.

42. Mr. VALDEZ (Peru) explained that he had voted for paragraph 1 on the understanding that, for the rights referred to in the paragraph to be exercised, the agreements in force between the parties concerned and the rights of transit States must be respected.

43. Mr. ZIARAN (Islamic Republic of Iran) stressed that Iran had signed the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and, in accordance with its article 310, had issued a statement concerning article 125 of the Convention, to the effect that the right of access to and from the sea and freedom of transit were rights deriving from agreements concluded between the States concerned on the basis of the principle of reciprocity.

44. Mr. ALPTUNA (Turkey) said that the fact that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution in no way prejudiced his Government's position on the Convention on the Law of the Sea, which Turkey had not signed.

45. Mr. EL GHAOUTHE (Mauritania) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on paragraph 1 because it felt that the purposes of that paragraph would be better served by bilateral agreements. For example, Mali, the only land-locked country on Mauritania's border, could, under bilateral agreements and as soon as it had the requisite road infrastructure, use Mauritania's ports and maritime facilities on the basis of the two countries' fraternal relations.

46. Mr. DJOGHLAF (Algeria) expressed deep regret that it had been necessary to vote on draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.54/Rev.1. By voting for paragraph 1 and for the draft resolution as a whole, his delegation had intended to reiterate its unswerving support for the need to adopt, as a matter of urgency, a set of specific measures in favour of the land-locked countries most of which were classified as least developed countries. Freedom of transit and the right of access to and from the sea could not be exercised independently of bilateral agreements between the countries concerned. Algeria would keep on working to strengthen its relations of co-operation with the land-locked developing countries.

47. Mr. DAWSON (United States of America) explained that, while his delegation had opposed the draft resolution, that did not mean that it was unaware of the needs and problems of the land-locked countries; it just did not see any need to make a distinction between land-locked developing countries and other developing countries. The United States had been a leader in offering assistance to all developing countries and would continue to do so.

48. Mr. EL-ATRASH (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that his delegation had voted for paragraph 1 and for the draft resolution as a whole on the understanding that, in accordance with article 125 of the Convention on the Law of the Sea, freedom of transit for land-locked countries was exercised by virtue of bilateral agreements between the parties concerned. Libya would continue to promote such co-operation on that basis.

49. Mr. FIELD (United Kingdom), speaking also on behalf of the Federal Republic of Germany, regretted that it had not been possible to produce a version of paragraph 1 acceptable to all members of the international community. Problems as fundamental as those raised in that paragraph should be settled by consensus only. The United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany had therefore been unable to vote for paragraph 1, but had voted for the draft resolution as a whole. They wished, however, to restate their position concerning the land-locked developing countries: specific measures which took into account their level of development and was designed to compensate for their geographical handicap should be taken; and they would continue to render assistance to the land-locked developing countries within a bilateral and multilateral framework.

Draft resolution on the seventh session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (A/C.2/42/L.63)

50. Mr. SHAABAN (Egypt) Vice-Chairman, said that the informal consultations had led to a consensus on the proposed draft resolution, subject to some minor amendments in paragraph 2: in the first line the words "particularly those of the developed countries" would be deleted and, in the fourth line, the word "sustained" would be replaced by the word "continuing". The draft resolution was thus being proposed to the Committee for adoption without a vote.

51. Draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.63 was adopted.

Draft resolution on the trade embargo against Nicaragua (A/C.2/42/L.67)

52. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the words "dated 27 June 1986" should be inserted between the word "Justice" and the words "and once again requests" in paragraph 1.

53. Mr. SHAABAN (Egypt) Vice-Chairman, said that it had been absolutely impossible to reach an agreement in the informal consultations and consequently, the text of the draft resolution would have to be put to the vote.

54. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.67.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Rumania, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: El Salvador, Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Brunei Darussalam, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, France, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Honduras, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Luxembourg, Nepal, Netherlands, Niger, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Portugal, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

55. The draft resolution was adopted by 89 votes to 3, with 35 abstentions.

56. Mr. DAWSON (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote after the vote, said that the adoption of the draft resolution concerning the trade embargo against Nicaragua was a further example of United Nations hypocrisy. His delegation had hoped that the Committee might have served as an example for contradicting those who disparaged the United Nations system, and its hopes had been raised by the adoption by consensus of the resolutions on special assistance on the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and on the environment. Unfortunately, the vote on the embargo against Nicaragua demonstrated that the Committee was not ready to set aside political questions and to work for the good of all. That was particularly regrettable since the Committee could have achieved the ideals which had presided over the founding of the United Nations.

57. Mrs. COTE (Canada) said that the resolution on the Judgment of the International Court of Justice, which Canada had voted for in the plenary Assembly, also applied to the subject just voted on by the Committee. Canada opposed the trade embargo imposed by the United States against Nicaragua and, during its explanations of vote in the plenary Assembly, her delegation had urged all parties concerned to seek a peaceful settlement of their differences. She regretted that

(Mrs. Cote, Canada)

the issue of the trade embargo against Nicaragua appeared regularly on the Second Committee's agenda, and failed to see how the Committee could do any more than the plenary Assembly. That was why, as in 1986, her country had abstained in the vote.

58. Mr. HARAN (Israel) said that his country had itself been a victim of a trade embargo for nearly 40 years and, consequently, had more reason than any other Member State to reject the principle. He had nevertheless voted against the proposed draft resolution because it was inadmissible that the Second Committee and plenary Assembly should condemn one particular embargo while ignoring others. Furthermore, Nicaragua had the effrontery to ask for justice while it had been imposing a trade embargo itself against Israel for several years. If Nicaragua wanted the trade embargo against it to be lifted, it should begin by applying the same policy with respect to other countries.

59. Mr. EL-ATRASH (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that his country had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.67 because it attached great significance to the fact that the General Assembly regretted applying a trade embargo against Nicaragua. At the same time, he also wished to call the attention of the international community to the fact that a Member State of the Organization was using the device of trade embargo and economic blockade to exert political pressure on Nicaragua and other countries. His own country was suffering grievously because of a trade embargo and sanctions imposed on it by that country; consequently, he requested the immediate and unconditional lifting of that embargo and those sanctions in conformity with the resolutions adopted by the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and with the Judgment of the International Court of Justice. The General Assembly must use all the means at its disposal and spare no effort to put an immediate end to the economic boycott of which Nicaragua and other countries were victims, so that that arbitrary and unjustifiable practice could not be applied against Member States.

60. Mr. STEBELSKI (Poland), speaking also on behalf of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, said that he had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.67 because it was inadmissible that illegal economic measures should be used in order to exert political pressure.

61. Mr. BEN MOUSSA (Morocco) said that, had his delegation been present during the voting, it would have abstained, even though Morocco rejected, as a matter of principle, all coercive measures against developing countries. His delegation regretted that the Second Committee had had to consider the question of the trade embargo against Nicaragua, and hoped that the ongoing peace process in the region would make the submission of a draft resolution on that issue unnecessary in future.

Draft decision on the international conference on money and finance (A/C.2/42/L.69)

62. Mr. SHAABAN (Egypt), Vice-Chairman, expressed regret that it had not been possible to reach an agreement on the draft during informal consultations. He was therefore submitting it to the Committee for a decision.

63. A recorded vote was taken on draft decision A/C.2/42/L.69.

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

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

Abstaining: Finland, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Turkey.

64. Draft decision A/C.2/42/L.69 was adopted by 113 votes to 18, with 5 abstentions.

65. Mr. FAABORG-ANDERSEN (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the members of the European Economic Community, expressed regret that the draft decision had been put to a vote. Various groups and organizations had already stated their position on the holding of such a conference, and it was therefore unnecessary for the Secretariat to devote precious time to that question. Moreover, it was clear that the matter fell within the purview of international financial institutions.

66. Mr. VALDEZ (Peru) said that his delegation attached great importance to the Secretary-General's report on the current international monetary situation, and hoped that the report which would be submitted in 1988 would deal with all the issues which arose regarding the functioning and the role of the international monetary system.

67. Mr. FERNANDEZ (Liberia) said that, had his delegation been present during the voting, it would have voted in favour of the draft decision.

Draft decision on an international code of conduct on the transfer of technology (A/C.2/42/L.56)

68. Mr. FAABORG-ANDERSEN (Denmark), said that, in the English version of draft decision A/C.2/42/L.56, there seemed to be a discrepancy between the text which had been adopted as submitted by the Vice-Chairman and the original text received from Geneva. He wished to know whether it was merely a question of a typographical error.

69. Mr. SHAABAN (Egypt), Vice-Chairman, confirmed that a typographical error had been made. That error would be corrected in the Committee's report to the General Assembly.

AGENDA ITEM 82: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued)

(d) ECONOMIC AND TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION AMONG DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (continued)

Draft resolution on strengthening and improving intergovernmental programming exercises for technical co-operation among developing countries (A/C.2/42/L.72)

70. Mr. SHAABAN (Egypt), Vice-Chairman, said he was pleased to announce that the informal consultations had led to an agreement on the draft resolution currently before the Committee. It could therefore be adopted without a vote.

71. Draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.72 was adopted without a vote.

72. Draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.21 was withdrawn.

Draft resolution on technical co-operation among developing countries (A/C.2/42/L.74)

73. Mr. SHAABAN (Egypt), Vice-Chairman, suggested that, in the light of the informal consultations, the Committee should adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

74. Mr. KRAMER (Canada) welcomed the opportunity provided by the High-level Committee on the Review of Technical Co-operation among Developing Countries to strengthen the collective self-reliance of those countries. However, during the informal consultations, Canada had expressed reservations regarding paragraph 12 of the draft resolution. Decision 5/9 of the High-level Committee concerned the

(Mr. Kramer, Canada)

report of the Joint Inspection Unit on United Nations development system support to the implementation of the Buenos Aires Plan of Action for Promoting and Implementing Technical Co-operation among Developing Countries. That Plan of Action was simply a collection of objectives and could not be considered a posteriori as having binding force.

75. Draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.74 was adopted without a vote.

76. Draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.53 was withdrawn.

Draft resolution on co-operation between the United Nations and the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference (A/C.2/42/L.55)

77. The CHAIRMAN said that Austria, Brazil, Denmark, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Guinea, Italy, Mauritania, Morocco, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, Spain and the United Kingdom had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

78. Mr. SHAABAN (Egypt), Vice-Chairman, recommended that, in the light of the informal consultations, the Committee should adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

79. Draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.55 was adopted without a vote.

80. Mr. RENDOH (Botswana) said that his delegation was grateful to Member States for endorsing the draft resolution and was greatly encouraged by the international support.

(e) ENVIRONMENT (continued)

Draft resolution on international ecological security (A/C.2/42/L.34)

81. Mr. GAJENTAAN (Netherlands), Vice-Chairman, recommended that, in the light of the informal consultations, the Committee should decide to transmit the text of the draft resolution to the General Assembly for consideration at its forty-third session.

82. Referring to the note by the Secretary-General in document A/C.2/42/6 regarding accession by the United Nations to the 1986 Vienna Convention on Early Notification of a Nuclear Accident, and to the 1986 Vienna Convention on Assistance in the Case of a Nuclear Accident or Radiological Emergency, he suggested that, in the light of the informal consultations, the Committee should decide to refer the question to the General Assembly at its forty-third session. The Secretary-General should provide more information concerning the notification provided for in those Conventions.

Draft resolution on international co-operation in the field of the environment
(A/C.2/42/L.77)

83. Mr. GAJENTAAN (Netherlands), Vice-Chairman, recommended that, in the light of the informal consultations, the Committee should adopt the draft resolution by consensus, subject to insertion of the phrase "as adopted" at the end of paragraph 1.

84. Draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.77 was adopted by consensus.

85. Ms. COTE (Canada) said her delegation was pleased that the consensus had been restored on the question under consideration, and hoped that the spirit of co-operation would continue. Her Government regretted, however, that the UNEP experts had not produced a draft resolution on the question.

86. Mr. EL GHAOUTHE (Mauritania) thanked Sweden, the sponsor of draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.44, for the constructive spirit it had shown during the informal consultations. Mauritania was pleased that a paragraph on the environmental impact of apartheid on Black agriculture in South Africa had been included in the draft resolution.

87. Mr. MERANTE (United States of America) said he wished to have placed on the record that the acceptance by the United States of paragraph 1 of the draft resolution in no way meant that it had changed its mind about decision 14/11 of the Governing Council of UNEP, to which it remained opposed. UNEP could avail itself of the study on the environmental perspective to the year 2000 and beyond to deal with a number of international questions, but his Government reaffirmed that it did not subscribe to certain conclusions in that document, and reiterated the reservations it had voiced during the adoption of the report of the Governing Council of UNEP (A/42/25).

88. As a result of the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.77, draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.44 was withdrawn.

Draft resolution on traffic in toxic and dangerous products and wastes
(A/C.2/42/L.78)

89. Mr. GAJENTAAN (Netherlands), Vice-Chairman, recommended that, in the light of the informal consultations, the Committee should adopt the draft resolution without a vote, subject to replacement of the word "traffic" in the French text.

90. Draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.78 was adopted without a vote.

91. Mr. ANDRADE-DIAZ-DURAN (Guatemala), speaking on behalf of the States members of the Group of 77, welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus.

92. As a result of the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.78, draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.42 was withdrawn.

Draft resolution on the biennial cycle of sessions of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme (A/C.2/42/L.79)

93. Mr. GAJENTAAN (Netherlands), Vice-Chairman, recommended that, in the light of the informal consultations, the Committee should adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

94. However, as the participants in the informal consultations had voiced their concern about the provision of interpretation services to the Committee of Permanent Representatives to UNEP, the relevant estimates should be reviewed. The Second Committee should formally invite the Fifth Committee to consider the question at the current session.

95. The CHAIRMAN said that if the Vice-Chairman's proposal was approved, he would follow it up by sending a letter to the Chairman of the Fifth Committee. If there were no objections, he would take it that the Second Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.79 without a vote.

96. Draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.79 was adopted without a vote.

97. Mr. LEMERLE (France) said that the working conditions of the Committee of Permanent Representatives established by decision 13/2 of the Governing Council of UNEP were unacceptable. The Committee must have conference and interpretation services in conformity with rules 29, 63 and 64 of the Council's rules of procedure; that was currently not the case. It was unacceptable to France that such a body should function in violation of the principle of equal treatment of the official languages.

98. Mrs. MORENO DE DEL CUETO (Mexico) underscored the necessity of using Spanish as an official language at all important meetings.

99. Mr. AHMED (Bahrain) said that Arabic should be used at UNEP on an equal basis with all the other official languages.

100. Mr. FALL (Senegal), Mr. GHONDA (Zaire), Ms. COTE (Canada) and Mr. EL GHAOUTHE (Mauritania) endorsed the comments of the previous speakers with respect to the use of the official languages in the Committee of Permanent Representatives.

Draft resolution on the environmental perspective to the year 2000 and beyond (A/C.2/42/L.80)

101. Draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.80 was adopted by consensus.

Draft resolution on the report of the World Commission on Environment and Development (A/C.2/42/L.81)

102. Mr. GAJENTAAN (Netherlands), Vice-Chairman, drew attention to two errors in paragraph 9 of the draft resolution: in the second line of the English text, it was necessary to add the word "assistance" after the word "development", and in the

(Mr. Gajentaan, Netherlands)

fourth line, to replace the word "their" with the word "the". Likewise, it had been decided after informal consultations to recommend to the Committee that paragraphs 13 and 14 of draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.77 should be inserted in draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.81, as their repetition in that text was appropriate. He recommended that the Committee should adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

103. Draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.81 was adopted by consensus.

104. Mrs. MORENO DE DEL CUETO (Mexico) said that her delegation had joined the consensus which had made it possible to adopt the draft resolution on the report of the World Commission on Environment and Development. The notion of "sustainable development" assumed a restructuring of international economic relations based on equality and justice. Such development should allow all human beings to satisfy their needs fully and to fulfil their aspirations without compromising the future. From that standpoint, the report offered a useful diagnosis, but more depth would be helpful. On the other hand, it was unacceptable to tie the granting of loans or aid which the developing countries needed in order to resume their growth to ecologically-based conditions. Indeed, environmental problems and their solution were the responsibility of all. Paragraph 9 of the resolution should be interpreted, therefore, as an appeal to the multilateral financial institutions to help ensure sustainable development world-wide, without attaching new conditions to their aid, so that the recipient countries could freely determine their own priorities and goals with respect to development.

105. Mr. MOHAMED (Somalia), whose delegation had also joined the consensus, said that, like the representative of Mexico, he rejected the idea of placing direct or indirect conditions on aid based on ecological considerations.

106. Mr. OTOBO (Nigeria) said that the "new orthodoxy" with respect to the ecological consequences of economic development policies was not new, after all. What was new, perhaps, was the universal recognition of the fact that development could not be dissociated from other aspects of public affairs. Financial aid must continue, and the report of the World Commission on Environment and Development should not be interpreted as placing new conditions on aid.

107. Mr. HELO (Colombia) said he was pleased that the draft resolution had been adopted by consensus. He welcomed the new wording of paragraph 9 which took into account the concerns of the developing countries. In view of the significance of the report of the World Commission on Environment and Development (Brundtland Report), it was important for Governments to be made aware of it.

108. Mrs. GREGORY (Canada) said that she was also pleased by the consensus on the draft resolution, due to the spirit of co-operation which the delegations had shown during the informal consultations. Canada attached great importance to the international follow-up of the notion of sustainable development at the environmental level; the United Nations had an important role to play in that regard.

109. Mr. DASGUPTA (India) welcomed the consensus and said that paragraph 9, in its new version, ruled out any possibility of making the aid provided by multilateral financial institutions contingent upon ecological criteria.

110. Mr. PAULSEN (Norway) welcomed the consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.81, and said he hoped that the will to compromise which had permitted its adoption would also be demonstrated in the follow-up.

Draft resolution on international ecological security (A/C.2/42/L.34)

111. The CHAIRMAN, upon the recommendation of Mr. GAJENTAAN (Netherlands), Vice-Chairman, proposed that the question should be deferred until next session.

117. It was so decided.

Draft decision submitted orally by Mr. Gajentaan (Netherlands), Vice-Chairman

113. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Committee) read out the following draft decision prepared by the Vice-Chairman:

"Having considered the note by the Secretary-General regarding accession by the United Nations to the Convention on Early Notification of a Nuclear Accident, Vienna, 1986, and to the Convention on Assistance in the Case of a Nuclear Accident or Radiological Emergency, Vienna, 1986 1/

"Decides to revert to this matter at the forty-third session of the General Assembly in the light of additional information to be provided by the Secretary-General on the declaration to be submitted pursuant to article 12, paragraph 5 (c), of the Convention on Early Notification of a Nuclear Accident and article 14, paragraph 5 (c), of the Convention on Assistance in the Case of a Nuclear Accident or Radiological Emergency.

1/ A/C.2/42/6."

114. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should adopt the draft decision without submitting it to a vote.

115. It was so decided.

(h) SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT: REPORT OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued)

Draft resolution on the tenth anniversary of the adoption of the Vienna Programme of Action on Science and Technology for Development (A/C.2/42/L.70)

116. Mr. GAJENTAAN (Netherlands), Vice-Chairman, reporting on his informal consultations with regard to draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.70, proposed that the words "for all countries" should be deleted from the third line of the last

(Mr. Gajentaan, Netherlands)

preambular paragraph. He recommended that the draft resolution should be adopted without a vote.

117. Draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.70, as orally revised, was adopted by consensus.

118. The CHAIRMAN announced that draft resolutions A/C.2/42/L.31 and L.43, which had been replaced by draft resolution L.70, had been withdrawn by their sponsors.

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

Draft decision on the report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of General Assembly resolution 41/201 (A/C.2/42/L.82)

119. Mr. GAJENTAAN (Netherlands), Vice-Chairman, reporting on his informal consultations with regard to draft decision A/C.2/42/L.82, said that, in order to reach a consensus, the end of paragraph (a) had been reworded to read: "... to ensure effective response by the United Nations system in the field of disaster and other emergency situations". Paragraph (b) would read: "To request the Economic and Social Council to consider the matter on the basis of the report of the Secretary-General at its second regular session of 1988, and to consider the matter at its forty-third session together with a progress report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of the present decision". He recommended that the draft decision, as revised, should be adopted without a vote.

120. Mr. MULLER (Australia) proposed adding a reference to foot-note 1 after the words "on the basis of the report", in order to avoid confusion.

121. Mr. MOHAMED (Somalia) said that the Committee should accept the Vice-Chairman's proposal. He requested the representative of Australia to withdraw his proposal, which he said was not as trivial as it looked, but potentially confusing.

122. Mr. PAYTON (New Zealand) supported the Australian representative's proposal because there was no question of a second report being prepared in addition to document A/42/657.

123. Mr. RIPERT (Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation), in order to avert any misunderstanding as to what was expected of the Secretariat, said that the report referred to in paragraph (b) was indeed document A/42/657 and not a new report.

124. Mr. BEN MOUSSA (Morocco) asked the Committee to accept the changes made by the Vice-Chairman. There was no ambiguity because there was a definite article in front of the word "report" in paragraph (b) of the draft decision.

125. Mr. JØNCK (Denmark) supported the Australian proposal.

126. Mr. RIPERT (Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation) agreed that the presence of the definite article precluded any ambiguity, whether or not there was a reference to the foot-note.

127. Mr. MULLER (Australia) withdrew his proposal in the light of the Director-General's explanation.

128. Mr. MOHAMED (Somalia) said that it was pointless to ask the Economic and Social Council to re-examine a report that had already been considered by the Council and by the General Assembly. It would be useful, however, to consider the progress report referred to at the end of paragraph (b).

129. Mr. RIPERT (Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation) said that the Secretariat intended to present an oral report on implementation of the decision taken by the General Assembly during the current session. That was consistent with the suggestion of the representative of Somalia.

130. Draft decision A/C.2/42/L.82, as orally revised by the Vice-Chairman, was adopted by consensus.

131. Mr. BEN MOUSSA (Morocco) said that he had accepted the compromise reflected in the changes made by the Vice-Chairman, but that, in his opinion, however paragraph (b) was interpreted, it could in no way hamper implementation of the provisions contained in paragraph (a). His delegation would therefore pay particular attention to the oral report on the implementation of General Assembly resolution 41/201 to be presented by the Director-General at the Council's second regular session of 1988.

132. Mr. RIPERT (Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation), referring to the question of indicative patterns of consumption, said that the necessary funds had been made available to the Research Institute for Social Development, which would be responsible for the technical work required and which should in due course be able, therefore, to provide the Statistical Commission with the documentation it needed so as to discuss the matter.

AGENDA ITEM 82: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued)

(b) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SUBSTANTIAL NEW PROGRAMME OF ACTION FOR THE 1980s FOR THE LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

Draft resolution on the United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries (A/C.2/42/L.65)

133. Mr. SHAABAN (Egypt), Vice-Chairman, reporting on his informal consultations with regard to draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.65, said that, in the opinion of the delegations consulted, paragraph 1 should be reworded to reflect the wording of Trade and Development Board decision 349 (XXXIV); the words "United Nations" should

(Mr. Shaaban, Egypt)

be inserted before the word "Conference" in the second line of paragraph 2; paragraph 4 should read "... to submit before the first preparatory meeting report, ..."; and the wording of the annex should also reflect that of the annex to Trade and Development Board decision 349 (XXXIV). He proposed that the text, as orally revised, should be adopted by consensus.

134. The CHAIRMAN said that the budgetary implications of that draft resolution were not yet known.

135. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Committee) said that the financial implications of the draft resolution had not yet been communicated because the services in Geneva had had to be consulted.

136. The CHAIRMAN therefore suggested that the Committee should decide later on draft resolution A/C. 42/L.65.

137. It was so decided.

Draft decision A/C.2/42/L.66

138. Mr. JØNCK (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the European Community, wondered what exactly was meant by the words "potential for absorption" in the statement of financial implications of the draft decision and how the printing of summary records would be financed.

139. The CHAIRMAN, replying to the question raised by the representative of Denmark, said that the words "potential for absorption" meant the capacity of the Department of Conference Services to assign translators to the preparation of summary records. Since that task was performed by permanent staff members it did not involve any additional expenditures.

140. Mr. PAYTON (New Zealand) asked how long it would take for the summary records of the seventh session of UNCTAD to appear. If there was to be a wait of several years for those documents, they would no longer be of use to anyone but the archivists.

141. Mrs. MORENO DE DEL CUETO (Mexico) said that in view of the success of the seventh session of UNCTAD, it was extremely important to publicize its proceedings. It was therefore necessary to have the summary records of the discussions as reference material for decisions to be taken at future sessions.

142. Mr. PAULSEN (Norway) recognized the importance of summary records but wondered whether it was true that the records of the UNCTAD meetings also existed in the form of written texts and tapes available to the delegations.

143. Mr. VALDEZ (Peru) reminded the Committee that only summary records were official documents.

144. Mr. DAWSON (United States of America) said that, according to the Geneva Office, the cost of preparing summary records for the seventh session of UNCTAD would be \$300,000, whereas the Secretariat in New York set the cost at approximately \$180,000. He would like that difference to be explained.

145. Mr. STEBELSKI (Poland) expressed surprise that the resources provided for the holding of the seventh session of UNCTAD did not cover the preparation of summary records. Since the figures for the cost of preparing those summary records varied, he proposed that the Committee should wait for more precise information before taking a decision.

146. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee must take a political decision on the question.

147. Mr. SHAABAN (Egypt), (Vice-Chairman), said that the Secretary-General's statement in document A/C.2/42/L.76 was the only authoritative one as far as the budget implications were concerned. Speaking as the representative of Egypt, he proposed that the Committee should act immediately on draft decision A/C.2/42/L.66.

148. Mr. BEN MOUSSE (Morocco) noted that all the delegations wanted to have summary records and wanted to have them as soon as possible. The Committee therefore simply had to take a decision on the subject.

149. Mr. RIPERT (Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation) confirmed what the Vice-Chairman had said, namely, that there would be no other information concerning the financial implications of the draft decision other than that provided in document A/C.2/42/L.76. The speed with which the summary records could be produced would depend upon the resources available.

150. Mr. VALDEZ (Peru) supported what had been said by the representative of Mexico and requested the adoption of the draft decision by consensus.

151. Mr. ANDRADE-DIAZ-DURAN (Guatemala), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, said that action must be taken on draft decision A/C.2/42/L.66 and that nothing would be gained by postponing settlement of the question. He therefore asked delegations to be realistic. The Group of 77 attached very great importance to those summary records, which reflected the political will of the countries. Moreover, the Secretariat had stated that the resources required for their preparation were available. He therefore asked the Committee to take a decision without delay.

152. Mr. PAULSEN (Norway) said that the draft decision before the Committee was essentially financial and procedural, but that there were times when even such decisions required a vote.

153. Mr. DJOGLAE (Algeria) said he understood the concerns of some delegations with respect to the financial implications of the draft decision. Account should also be taken, however, of the financial implications of the current discussion. In his view, the information in document A/C.2/42/L.76 was very clear and the draft decision should therefore not present any difficulty.

154. Mr. FAABORG-ANDERSEN (Denmark) said that, after hearing the statements of the representatives of Guatemala and Algeria, his delegation did not object to a vote.

155. The CHAIRMAN said that the Guatemalan and Danish delegations had proposed putting draft decision A/C.2/42/L.66 to a vote.

156. Mr. VALDEZ (Peru), speaking on a point of order, said that the Group of 77 had requested that the Committee should act on draft decision A/C.2/42/L.66, which did not necessarily mean that a vote should be taken.

157. Mrs. MORFNO DE DEL CUETO (Mexico), also speaking on a point of order, said that her delegation would like draft decision A/C.2/42/L.66 to be adopted without a vote.

158. The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee whether it was prepared to adopt the draft decision without a vote.

159. Mr. MERANTE (United States of America) said it was clear from the discussion that there was no consensus on the draft decision and he therefore requested a vote.

160. A recorded vote was taken on draft decision A/C.2/42/L.66.

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

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, El Salvador, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

161. Draft decision A/C.2/42/L.66, as orally amended, was adopted by 108 votes to 1, with 22 abstentions.

162. Mr. KIURU (Finland) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft decision A/C.2/42/L.66 because of the importance it attached to the preparation of summary records for the plenary meetings of the seventh session of UNCTAD. It would, however, have preferred that decision to be taken after a cost-benefit analysis of the preparation of summary records had been made.

163. Mr. MERANTE (United States of America) said that his delegation had been unable to support the draft decision not because it underestimated the importance of summary records but because the financial implications of the decision had not been clearly spelt out. The amount of \$180,300, which was given in document A/C.2/42/L.76, was considerable, and, in his delegation's view, could have been more judiciously used elsewhere.

164. Mr. STEBELSKI (Poland) said that his delegation, which had voted for the draft decision on the basis of the information given in document A/C.2/42/L.76, regretted that the draft decision had had to be put to the vote. It also regretted that delegations had not had time to obtain an explanation about the financial implications.

165. Mr. KHALIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had voted for the draft decision since it saw no reason not to rely on the information given in document A/C.2/42/L.76, from which it was quite clear that the adoption of the draft decision would not involve any additional cost.

166. Mr. VALDEZ (Peru), supported by Mr. ANDRADE-DIAZ-DURAN (Guatemala), said he regretted that the draft decision had had to be put to the vote. He trusted that it did not mean the consensus which had emerged at the seventh session of UNCTAD and the extremely important commitments entered into then were not being called into question.

167. Mr. PAULSEN (Norway) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft decision. In its view, the large amounts which the United Nations was going to spend on the preparation of summary records that would not be available for a long time could have been put to better use, particularly at a time of budgetary restriction. Such expenditure seemed to be all the more unnecessary since records of the discussions already existed in the form of written texts, sound recordings and press releases prepared by the UNCTAD information services.

168. Mr. BROWN (Canada) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft decision because the matter should have been settled during the preparations for the seventh session of UNCTAD and because no sufficiently clear explanation had been given of the financial implications of the decision. Also, his delegation considered that for a meeting as important as the UNCTAD session, which was held every four years, measures should be taken in advance to ensure that the discussions were recorded in an appropriate manner.

169. Mr. PAYTON (New Zealand) said he wished to assure the Guatemalan representative and the members of the Group of 77 that his delegation's abstention in the vote on the draft decision should not be construed as a renunciation of the commitments which his country had entered into at the seventh session of UNCTAD. His delegation shared the Norwegian delegation's doubts as to the value of summary records that would probably not be available before the beginning of the eighth session of UNCTAD.

170. Mr. MELENDEZ (El Salvador) said that his delegation's vote on the draft decision had been recorded as an abstention whereas its intention had been to vote in favour of the draft decision.

171. The CHAIRMAN said that would be reflected in the summary record.

Draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.55

172. Mr. SHAABAN (Egypt), Vice-Chairman, said that, according to the information given in document A/C.2/42/L.83, draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.65, if adopted, would not give rise to any additional cost under section 29 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1988-1989. In view of that information, he trusted that the draft resolution could be adopted by consensus.

173. Mr. PAYTON (New Zealand) said that the convening of a United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries was too important a matter to warrant a hasty decision in that regard. He therefore requested that the decision on the draft resolution should be postponed until the following meeting to enable the members of the Second Committee to consult the specialists in the Fifth Committee.

174. The CHAIRMAN said that it would be advisable to have a new version of the draft resolution, incorporating the changes introduced into the operative part by the Vice-Chairman. He suggested that the draft resolution should be reissued for technical reasons and that the Committee should take a decision on it at the following meeting. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to proceed in that manner.

175. It was so decided.

176. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee still had to take a decision on draft resolutions A/C.2/42/L.32/Rev.1, A/C.2/42/L.39 and A/C.2/42/L.40.

177. Mr. GAJENTAAN (Netherlands), Vice-Chairman, asked for the decision on those draft resolutions to be postponed until the following week so that he could hold further informal consultations.

178. The CHAIRMAN, asked Mr. Shaaban, Vice-Chairman of the Committee, what progress had been made in the consultations on draft resolutions A/C.2/42/L.61 and A/C.2/42/L.20.

179. Mr. SHAABAN (Egypt), Vice-Chairman, said that, in view of the lateness of the hour, the consultations which he had intended to hold on draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.61, entitled "Consequences of the recent turmoil in the international financial and stock markets and its implications for the development of the developing countries", and on draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.20, regarding the external debt problem, should be postponed until the following week. He therefore proposed that the decision on those draft resolutions and on the draft resolution regarding UNITAR (agenda item 84) should be deferred.

180. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to consider the draft resolutions outstanding the following week.

181. It was so decided.

182. Mr. MKANDAWIRE (Malawi) said that, had his delegation been present during the vote on paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.54/Rev.1, it would have voted in favour of that paragraph.

183. Mr. RENDOH (Botswana) said that his delegation wished to join the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/42/L.54/Rev.1.

The meeting rose at 8.50 p.m.