



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 42nd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. CALERO RODRIGUES (Brazil)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 77: INTERNATIONAL YOUTH YEAR: PARTICIPATION, DEVELOPMENT, PEACE: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 78: WORLD SOCIAL SITUATION: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 81: POLICIES AND PROGRAMMES RELATING TO YOUTH: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEMS 82 and 83: QUESTION OF THE ELDERLY AND THE AGED; WORLD ASSEMBLY ON AGING: REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 89: WORLD PROGRAMME OF ACTION CONCERNING DISABLED PERSONS: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (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 A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.3/37/SR.42
22 November 1982
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: SPANISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 77: INTERNATIONAL YOUTH YEAR: PARTICIPATION, DEVELOPMENT, PEACE: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/C.3/37/L.16, L.20/Rev.1, L.25/Rev.1, L.39)

AGENDA ITEM 78: WORLD SOCIAL SITUATION: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/C.3/37/L.27, L.28)

AGENDA ITEM 81: POLICIES AND PROGRAMMES RELATING TO YOUTH: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/C.3/37/L.23)

AGENDA ITEMS 82 and 83: QUESTION OF THE ELDERLY AND THE AGED; WORLD ASSEMBLY ON AGING: REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/C.3/37/L.21, L.26, L.30)

AGENDA ITEM 89: WORLD PROGRAMME OF ACTION CONCERNING DISABLED PERSONS: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/C.3/37/L.19/Rev.1, L.22/Rev.1, L.29/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.20/Rev.1

1. Mrs. DOWNING (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Benin and Guinea had become sponsors of the draft resolution.
2. Mr. SALAND (Sweden) proposed that operative paragraph 1 should be amended to read: "Calls upon all States, all governmental and non-governmental organizations and the interested bodies of the United Nations and specialized agencies to pay continuous attention to the realization of resolution 36/29 relating to efforts aimed at the promotion of human rights and their enjoyment by youth, particularly the right to education and vocational training and to work, with a view to resolving the problem of youth employment".
3. Mr. SLABY (Czechoslovakia), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution, said that the first part of the amendment would involve a change in the title of the draft resolution, which was not necessary, but if Sweden insisted on its amendment, he would accept it.
4. Mr. RANGACHARI (India) said that the final words of the paragraph should be "the problem of youth unemployment".
5. The CHAIRMAN said that if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution, as amended, without a vote.
6. Draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.20/Rev.1, as amended, was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.16

7. Mrs. DOWNING (Secretary of the Committee) announced that the following countries had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Botswana, Burundi, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Gambia, Kenya, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Qatar, United Arab Emirates and Upper Volta. In addition, there were various typographical

(Mrs. Downing)

errors in the French and Spanish versions of the draft resolution. In the French text, in the fifth preambular paragraph on page 2, third line, the word "humaines" should be replaced by "humaine". In the seventh preambular paragraph, the first word should be "Soulignant". In the Spanish text, in the second preambular paragraph, the words "Recordando también su decisión" should be replaced by "Recordando también su resolución".

8. Mr. GERSHMAN (United States of America) proposed that his delegation's amendment to operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution (A/C.3/37/L.39) should be added as a new operative paragraph 11.

9. He explained in that regard that the United States enjoyed no immunity from the current budget crisis which affected every nation in the world. Despite that, it was prepared to maintain the level of its support to constructive United Nations programmes and to make the necessary sacrifices to maintain the level of its assessed contributions to the Organization. It could not, however, accept continuing increases in those assessments without serious efforts being made to economize.

10. In the past five years, assessments had risen by 81 per cent. If that rate of increase continued, expenditures for the programme budget of the United Nations would approach \$3 billion by the year 1990. If the United Nations did not face economic reality and check those expenditures, there would be growing disillusionment among the taxpayers of the countries that were the principal donors to the United Nations, and, consequently, the political support which sustained the Organization would be undermined.

11. On repeated occasions, his country had stated that the United Nations must exercise strict control over its budget; yet, the budget continued to grow. By its amendment, the United States wished to emphasize that it could no longer support resolutions which provided for piecemeal extrabudgetary increases.

12. The Government and people of the United States fully supported the decision of the United Nations to declare 1985 International Youth Year and were already preparing for participation in it. His delegation approved and supported without reservation the themes of the Year, as well as the content of draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.16. Since it did not wish to vote against that draft resolution, it had prepared an amendment which, if adopted, would permit it to join in the consensus to adopt the resolution as a whole. The amendment was not intended to prevent new activities from being carried out, but rather to authorize the Secretary-General to manage the resources given him by Member States in a rational and responsible way. In essence, it charged him with the responsibility of establishing priorities, allotting the necessary resources to the most important activities and reducing activities that were superfluous, completed, obsolete, of marginal usefulness or ineffective. If the proposed amendment was not incorporated into the draft resolution, his delegation would be unable to continue to be part of the previous consensus, would call for a vote on the draft resolution and would vote against it.

/...

13. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that if the United States amendment was adopted, it would constitute a new operative paragraph 11 with the same text as appeared in document A/C.3/37/L.39.

14. Mr. FERGUSON (Australia), referring to the amendment submitted by the United States, proposed that, in order to make it clearer, the words "during the current budget period" should be inserted after the word "exceeding" and that the words "for 1982" should be deleted.

15. Mr. McDONALD (United States of America) said that he accepted the sub-amendment proposed by Australia.

16. Mr. UY (Budget Division) said that if the draft resolution was adopted as amended by the United States, the calculations on which the statement of administrative and financial implications contained in document A/C.3/37/L.25/Rev.1 had been based would have to be amended. The cost of \$134,400 for two temporary assistance posts (para. 11) would not be incurred. However, the 1984-1985 financial implications for those two additional posts (\$261,600) would remain unchanged, as would the travel and subsistence costs of \$28,700 in paragraph 13.

17. Mr. VOICU (Romania) requested the Chairman, acting on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.16, to inquire of the Assistant Secretary-General for the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs whether the Centre would be able to comply fully with the draft resolution if the United States amendment and the Australian sub-amendment were adopted.

18. Mrs. SHAHANI (Assistant Secretary-General, Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs) said that if the United States amendment was adopted in 1983, the Centre would not have at its disposal the two anticipated temporary assistance posts at the Professional level. Four persons were currently working in the youth division, and they could not take on unaided the programme of activities which the General Assembly at its last session had approved for the Centre. As a result, the programme would have to be considerably reduced.

19. Mr. VOICU (Romania) said that, after informal consultations with the United Nations Secretariat and with other delegations concerned, a number of delegations had reached agreement on the substantial reductions, outlined in document A/C.3/37/L.25/Rev.1, which had been made in the initial estimate contained in document A/37/348/Add.1. His delegation had understood that, with those reductions, all the financial difficulties foreseen by the United States delegation had been resolved, and that the draft was ready for adoption by consensus. The Secretariat had likewise confirmed that draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.16 could not be implemented if the minimum resources provided for in document A/C.3/37/L.25 were not available.

20. That draft resolution, moreover, was the result of the consensus reached at Vienna in June 1982, which the United States delegation had accepted. The amendment contained in document A/C.3/37/L.39 had created a paradoxical situation in which it was impossible to put into effect the recommendations adopted by consensus at Vienna.

(Mr. Voicu, Romania)

21. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.16 asked the United States delegation not to insist on an amendment that was incompatible with the implementation of the specific programme of measures and activities that were to be undertaken before and during the International Youth Year.

22. Mr. McDONALD (United States of America) said that his country's amendment would not necessarily result in insufficient funds to carry out the programme under consideration because the necessary funds could be transferred to those projects from other sectors of the United Nations system. It was a question of establishing priorities so that the goals of the programme could be achieved. His delegation was unable to withdraw the amendment.

23. The CHAIRMAN put the United States amendment as revised and amended orally, to a vote.

24. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Against: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Burundi, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Abstaining: Bahamas, Bulgaria, Burma, Central African Republic, Chad, Denmark, Djibouti, Fiji, Finland, Guyana, Iceland, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Malawi, Mexico, Nepal, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Poland, Somalia, Spain, Sweden, Togo, Viet Nam

25. The amendment proposed by the United States was revised and amended orally, was rejected 75 votes to 22, with 26 abstentions.

/...

26. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.16.

26a. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, 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, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, 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 Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: None

27. Draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.16 was adopted by 133 votes to 1.

Draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.23

28. Mrs. DOWNING (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following typographical errors should be corrected in the English version of the draft: in the fourth line of paragraph 3, the word "the" should be inserted between "of" and "guidelines" and also between "improving" and "channels". She also announced that the following countries wished to become sponsors of the draft resolution: Costa Rica, Denmark, Kenya, Malta, Nepal, Nicaragua and Suriname.

29. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

30. Draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.23 was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.21

31. Mrs. DOWNING (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following countries wished to become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.21: Argentina, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Ecuador, Egypt, Guinea, Guyana, Indonesia, Jordan, Lebanon, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Spain, Thailand, Togo, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay and Venezuela.
32. Mr. VELLA (Malta) proposed an oral amendment which, in his judgement, would make it easier for many delegations to support draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.21 and thus make it possible to arrive at a consensus. He suggested that at the end of paragraph 5, the semicolon should be replaced by a full stop, after which the following sentence would be added: "In doing so, the Secretary-General should make every effort to reallocate existing global resources;". He felt that in making that amendment, the sponsors of the draft resolution had made important concessions to obtain an agreement. He requested the United States delegation to adopt a similar attitude and not to propose an amendment, so that a consensus could be reached. If that was not possible, the sponsors of the draft would have no option but to oppose the United States amendment.
33. Mr. GERSHMAN (United States of America) replied that, in his delegation's view, what was at stake was a question of principle and not simply a monetary question. Consequently he was not able to accept the compromise formula proposed by the Maltese delegation.
34. Mr. MAYOLI (Italy), explaining his vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.21, stated it was the view of his delegation that the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs should have the necessary resources available to carry out the tasks entrusted to it at the World Assembly on Aging, as well as the tasks assigned to it pursuant to the draft resolution under consideration. Nevertheless, that did not necessarily imply that the staff of the United Nations would have to be increased at a time when most countries were experiencing a period of financial restrictions. Moreover, the creation of new posts should be avoided for reasons of budgetary discipline.
35. He welcomed the indication in paragraph 5 of the draft resolution that sufficient resources should be made available "within reasonable limits" and the fact that the sponsors had added to that paragraph a request to the Secretary-General to make every effort to reallocate existing global resources. He believed that, in view of the large number of posts available to the Secretary-General, there was a possibility of reallocating them so as to have the necessary staff for activities relating to aging.
36. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take a vote on the United States amendment to draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.30.

In favour: Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chad, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland,

/...

Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Against: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Benin, Bhutan, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Thailand, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Australia, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Botswana, Burundi, Denmark, Djibouti, Fiji, Finland, France, Iceland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Kenya, Malawi, Mexico, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Somalia, Spain, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Upper Volta, Viet Nam, Zaire

37. Draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.30 was rejected by 67 votes to 23, with 32 abstentions.

38. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take a vote on draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.21, as amended orally.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, 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 Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

39. Draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.21 was adopted by 121 votes to 1, with 7 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.19/Rev.1

40. Mrs. DOWNING (Secretary of the Committee) said that the Central African Republic, Chad, the Congo, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Equador, Guinea, Ireland, Kenya, Mali, Nepal and Somalia had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.19/Rev.1.

41. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

42. Draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.19/Rev.1 was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.22/Rev.1

43. Mrs. TIRONA (Philippines), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.22/Rev.1, proposed, as a last effort to have the draft resolution adopted without a vote, that operative paragraph 7 should be amended to read: "Requests further the Secretary-General to continue to give appropriate priority, within the programmes for disabled persons, to activities connected with organizations of disabled persons". That would make the implementation of the World Programme of Action more flexible without affecting the financial implications referred to in document A/C.3/37/L.29/Rev.1.

44. Mrs. DOWNING (Secretary of the Committee), referring to the English text of draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.22/Rev.1, said that the phrase "United Nations Decade for Disabled Persons" should read "United Nations Decade of Disabled Persons" wherever it appeared. She announced that Qatar had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

45. Mr. BANTHOUD (Congo), Mrs. KABA (Guinea) and Mr. TANDIA (Mali) said that their delegations were joining the sponsors of the draft resolution.

46. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

47. Draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.22/Rev.1, as amended, was adopted, without a vote.

48. The CHAIRMAN invited those representatives who wished to do so to speak in explanation of vote on the various draft resolutions which had been adopted.

49. Mr. GERSHMAN (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation first of all wished to comment on draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.20/Rev.1 which had just been adopted. At the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly, his Government had abstained in the vote on resolution 36/29 entitled "Efforts and measures for securing the implementation and enjoyment by youth of human rights, particularly the right to education and to work" because it did not explicitly include other fundamental freedoms and rights of youth, such as freedom of speech, of the press, of religion, of association and of the right to earn a living through freely chosen employment. He expressed satisfaction that resolution A/C.3/37/L.20/Rev.1, which had the same title, had been improved and that operative paragraph 2 referred to all international human rights instruments. His country had decided to join in the consensus in order to stress its firm commitment to youth and efforts to bring about a fruitful and productive International Youth Year at both the national and the international level.

50. With regard to draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.22/Rev.1, his country had firmly supported the International Year of Disabled Persons and expressed satisfaction that that resolution proclaimed a Decade of Disabled Persons. His country was preparing long-term plans in accordance with the resolution, and the national activities would fall within the framework of the United Nations Decade of Disabled Persons.

51. With respect to draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.21, his Government firmly supported the Vienna International Plan of Action on Aging. Unfortunately, the sponsors had not agreed on the text which the States had attempted to draft at Vienna. If that text had been included, his delegation would have voted in favour of the draft resolution.

52. Mr. WALKATE (Netherlands) said that his delegation wished to explain its vote on three of the draft resolutions which had been adopted, and observed that the Secretariat should have prepared a general outline of the financial implications which the adoption of the programmes and resolutions in question entailed.

53. With regard to the resolution adopted on the International Youth Year, his delegation had reservations concerning the recommendation of the Advisory Committee that an international instrument on the rights and responsibilities of youth should be drawn up. There was no need for a declaration on youth in general because the existing international instruments already dealt with the rights of special groups such as youth.

54. With regard to the draft resolution on aging, his country had reservations concerning the centralization of activities in the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs of the United Nations Department of International Economic and Social Affairs.

55. His country would also have wished a reference to be made to paragraph 96 of the report of the World Assembly on Aging in which the Secretary-General was requested to give, within the existing global resources of the United Nations, due consideration to the provision of appropriate increased resources for the implementation of the Plan of Action, which would be primarily at the national level.

(Mr. Walkate, Netherlands)

56. Lastly, with regard to draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.22/Rev.1, he said his delegation had joined in the consensus, but felt that the financial implications should have been covered through the reallocation and the use of existing financial resources. Furthermore, his country did not feel that it was necessary to hold a meeting of experts in 1987.

57. Mr. MASSOT (Brazil) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolutions on agenda items 77, 81, 82, 83 and 89 on the understanding that their primary objective was the enhancement of the situation of youth, the aging and the disabled. However, with respect to draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.16, and in view of the fact that documents A/37/237 and A/37/348 and its addenda had not been distributed in time for Governments to give them due consideration, his delegation wished to state that, firstly, the provisions of draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.16 - basically, the provisions contained in paragraph 1 - were contingent upon consideration of documents A/37/237 and A/37/348 by the Brazilian authorities; secondly, the assistance and co-operation mentioned in subparagraphs 85 (a) (i) and 85 (c) (iv) of appendix III of document A/37/348 should be provided at the request or in response to the express wish of States.

58. With regard to draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.21, his delegation had voted for its adoption because it favoured the Vienna International Plan of Action endorsed in paragraph 2. Nevertheless, his delegation, in accordance with the recommendations set forth in paragraph 96 of part IV B of the Plan of Action, understood that the Secretary-General was being requested, within the existing global resources of the United Nations, to give due consideration to the provision of appropriate increased resources for the implementation of the Plan of Action.

59. Mr. ALLEN (Canada), speaking in explanation of vote on draft resolutions A/C.3/37/L.16, A/C.3/37/L.21 and A/C.3/37/L.22/Rev.1, said that his delegation had difficulty in accepting what appeared to be an increasing trend in draft resolutions to ignore the recommendations which had been made by expert bodies or advisory committees. For example, in draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.21, the recommendation on financial implications contained in paragraph 96 of the Vienna Plan as set forth in the report of the World Assembly on Aging had been disregarded. Moreover, although his delegation valued the work done by the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs, it felt that, given the current financial situation, the Centre ought to be strengthened by means of a reallocation of resources and within existing budget allocations.

60. Mr. FURSLAND (United Kingdom), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had been guided by two considerations: firstly, support for the work done by the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs and the subjects addressed by the draft resolutions and, secondly, its concern at the financial implications of those draft resolutions. His delegation believed that new activities should be financed through the reallocation of resources and voluntary contributions. He agreed with the representative of Canada that, with regard to draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.21, note should have been taken of the recommendation of an expert body such as the World Assembly on Aging. Lastly, his delegation had reservations with respect to draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.22/Rev.1, particularly regarding the proclamation of a United Nations Decade for Disabled Persons.

/...

61. Mrs. ROSER (Federal Republic of Germany), speaking in explanation of vote, said that her country had reservations with respect to the financial implications of draft resolutions A/C.3/37/L.16, A/C.3/37/L.21 and A/C.3/37/L.22/Rev.1. In her delegation's view, the programmes dealt with in the draft resolutions should be funded within the present budgetary resources of the United Nations system or through voluntary contributions.
62. Mr. FERGUSON (Australia), speaking in explanation of vote on draft resolutions A/C.3/37/L.16 and A/C.3/37/L.21, said that, in general, his delegation would have preferred the adoption of the proposals of the United States of America with respect to both resolutions. His delegation was concerned about the way in which the issue of financial implications had been handled. In the first place, the Committee should take responsibility for the financial implications of the programmes it accepted. Secondly, the sponsors of resolutions having substantial financial implications should communicate them to the Secretariat at an early stage to ensure that programmes would be drawn up taking those implications fully into account. Thirdly, it was important that financial implications should be directly related to the draft resolutions to be considered and not based on any other consideration.
63. Ms. LUND (Norway), speaking in explanation of vote on behalf of her own delegation and those of Denmark, Finland, Iceland and Sweden, said that, although those delegations had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.21, it contained elements with which they had some difficulty. Resources for the elderly in the field of technical co-operation should be channelled through the relevant bodies within the United Nations system, such as UNDP. Furthermore, it was clear that resources must be reallocated to finance the world programme of action for the elderly and the aged.
64. Mrs. YAMAZAKI (Japan) said that her delegation was disappointed that not all the draft resolutions that had been put to the vote had been adopted by consensus, since her Government attached great importance to the social issues with which the draft resolutions dealt; her delegation considered that draft resolutions of that nature were more effective if they enjoyed the full and unconditional support of all Member States. It believed that the informal consultations which had been held concerning the financial implications of the draft resolutions had been very useful, but did not feel that the outcome had been entirely satisfactory; it would like the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and the Fifth Committee to give further consideration to the financial implications of the draft resolutions which had been put to the vote. Her delegation had joined in the adoption of draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.20/Rev.1, without a vote because Japan was concerned with the current problems of youth. However, it seemed inappropriate that the draft resolution mentioned only the right of youth to education, vocational training and work. Although her delegation had agreed to the adoption of draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.22/Rev.1 without a vote, she wished to reaffirm that the Government of Japan had some doubts about the necessity of adding a United Nations Decade for Disabled Persons to the activities of the Plan of Action for the International Year of Disabled Persons and the World Programme of Action.

65. Ms. FAWTHORPE (New Zealand), speaking in explanation of vote, said that her delegation had voted in favour of all the resolutions adopted, but had also supported the amendments contained in documents A/C.3/37/L.30 and A/C.3/37/L.39, aimed at limiting the expansion of the Organization's budget in general and relating particularly to resolutions A/C.3/37/L.16 and A/C.3/37/L.21. Her delegation wished to place on record its continued concern at the tendency, so often manifested in United Nations resolutions, to overlook the need for financial stringency in the implementation of programmes. However, that reservation in no way affected her delegation's support for the specific programmes concerned.

66. Mr. BYKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his country supported United Nations activities related to the problems of youth, the elderly and the disabled, and, consequently, the plans of action that had been developed in that respect; for that reason, it basically supported draft resolutions A/C.3/37/L.16, A/C.3/37/L.20 and A/C.3/37/L.22/Rev.1.

67. In his delegation's view, draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.20, on the right of youth to work and education, was of primary importance.

68. Although his delegation had not opposed the adoption of draft resolutions A/C.3/37/L.21 and A/C.3/37/L.22/Rev.1 without a vote, it had reservations with respect to their financial implications. At the same time it acknowledged the work done by the Secretariat to reduce the financial implications of draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.16. In particular, his delegation had noted with satisfaction that the regional meetings devoted to the IYY programme mentioned in paragraph 4 of that draft resolution might be financed from the allocations that had been approved during the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly.

69. His delegation could not accept the statement of financial implications for the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs of the United Nations Secretariat because it believed that the Secretariat was departing from the understanding reached at the second session of the Advisory Committee for the International Youth Year that recommendations of the Advisory Committee should not entail new financial implications for the regular United Nations budget.

70. With regard to the World Programme of Action concerning Disabled Persons, his delegation had not opposed the adoption of draft resolutions A/C.3/37/L.19 and L.22/Rev.1 without a vote. Activities under the Programme must be focused at national level and the well-being, rehabilitation and preparation of disabled persons for a useful life were Government obligations. His delegation could not agree to the financial implications proposed for draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.22/Rev.1 by the Secretariat, particularly those relating to activities at regional level, since they exceeded the resources already approved for the 1982-1983 biennium.

71. His delegation could not agree to draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.21, despite the changes made by the sponsors to paragraph 5. The reformulation of paragraph 5 did not adhere to the formulation given in the report of the World Assembly on Aging, in particular the recommendation (para. 96) that international and regional activities should be tailored to existing resources.

(Mr. Bykov, USSR)

72. The General Assembly had already approved, in the United Nations budget for the 1982-1983 biennium, appropriations for the question of the elderly and the aged which above all affected the manning table of the Centre for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs. His delegation could not agree to the Secretariat's requests for additional resources.

73. In conclusion, it should be recalled that any additional expenditures arising from the above-mentioned programmes must be financed through the reallocation of resources released as a result of the termination of marginally useful, obsolete or inefficient programmes.

74. Mr. SALAND (Sweden), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries, said that, although the draft resolution contained in document A/C.3/37/L.22 regrettably introduced some new and divisive elements as compared with the Advisory Committee's recommendations, the Nordic countries had agreed to the adoption of that resolution without a vote. They wished, however, to reiterate with regard to the Trust Fund for the International Year of Disabled Persons that resources for programmes for the disabled should be channelled through existing United Nations bodies such as UNDP in order to avoid the unnecessary creation of new bodies.

75. The Nordic countries saw a risk in the proliferation of decades, years and days for special groups of people since too frequent use of those concepts might not only erode their meaning but even prevent efforts from being concentrated on the enhancement of the situation of those groups.

76. Ms. RADIC (Yugoslavia) said that her delegation's vote against draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.39 had not appeared in the results of the voting. She requested that the summary record contain an indication to that effect.

77. Mr. VOICU (Romania) said that, in view of the enthusiasm generated by the International Youth Year, he trusted that all sectors of the United Nations Secretariat would take the necessary steps to ensure the implementation of recommendations adopted in that field. He hoped that the Secretariat would organize the holding of five regional meetings in 1983 and set the dates for them, send out invitations for each meeting as soon as possible and prepare the necessary documentation.

78. Mr. GBATI (Togo) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.39 and requested that an indication to that effect appear in the summary record.

Draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.27

79. Mr. ALI (Bangladesh), introducing the draft resolution contained in document A/C.3/37/L.27 on behalf of the Group of 77, outlined the main elements of the draft and stated that the failure to implement the Declaration on Social Progress and Development and the objectives adopted and reaffirmed in the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade was a matter of great concern, especially if one bore in mind that the economic expansion of

(Mr. Ali, Bangladesh)

most developing countries had, over the past four years, failed to keep pace with preceding years, resulting in a decline in standards of living and in a loss of confidence in the future.

Draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.28

80. Ms. RADIC (Yugoslavia), introducing draft resolution A/C.3/37/L.28 on behalf of the sponsors, said that the draft resolution had been prepared entirely on the basis of some of the general conclusions and recommendations of the International Seminar on Popular Participation held under United Nations auspices, as contained in document A/37/442.

81. The Seminar had recommended a number of policy measures for consideration by national authorities and international organizations. The sponsors had therefore felt that further time was needed for the elaboration of the concept of popular participation in all its forms by both national authorities and international organizations and that a suitable framework was needed to carry out such action on a periodic basis. That was why the sponsors had deemed it appropriate to call for further consideration of that issue by the Commission on Human Rights at its next session and by the General Assembly at its thirty-ninth session. That request must be viewed, in particular, in the light of the agreement reached among countries that had participated in the Seminar on the need to promote popular participation in development, and the fact that many of those countries had already launched programmes for that purpose for specific sectors and groups of the population. Their experience in that field would be of major importance for further consideration of the issue.

82. The Commission on Human Rights and the United Nations system played an important role in that respect. The sponsors believed that the United Nations system must continue to provide technical co-operation to countries to enable them to design and implement programmes of popular participation, and promote exchanges of experience among different countries at different levels.

83. Popular participation was not exercised to the same extent in all countries where it existed. The fact remained, however, that the concept was known to many and that various forms of popular participation were being practised in many developing as well as some developed countries. The sponsors believed that the Commission on Human Rights and the General Assembly provided an appropriate framework for the further exchange of experiences in that field.

84. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that the deadline for the submission of draft resolutions on items 91 and 92 had been extended to 1 p.m. on Tuesday, 16 November. The deadline for submission of draft resolutions on item 94 had been extended to 6 p.m. on Friday, 20 November.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.