



COPY:
DO NOT REMOVE
FROM ROOM
L-201 (WWRR)

SECOND COMMITTEE
42nd meeting
held on
Friday, 19 November 1982
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 42nd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. FAFOWORA (Nigeria)

CONTENTS

- AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 71: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 73: TRAINING AND RESEARCH (continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 74: SPECIAL ECONOMIC AND DISASTER RELIEF ASSISTANCE (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-3850, 66 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.2/37/SR.42
24 November 1982

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)
(A/C.2/37/L.39, L.44, L.65)

1. Mr. AYYUB (Lebanon), speaking in explanation of his vote on the draft resolution on assistance to the Palestinian people (A/C.2/37/L.39), reiterated his delegation's position on humanitarian assistance to the Palestinians in Lebanon. His Government would support all efforts to provide assistance and would make the necessary facilities available. It was, however, its understanding that all such assistance would be channelled through UNRWA under the supervision of the Lebanese authorities.
2. Mr. WAKASUGI (Japan) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.39. Japan nevertheless maintained the position it had stated at the thirty-third session of the General Assembly regarding assistance by the United Nations system to national liberation movements.
3. His delegation had also voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.44. It sympathized with the Arab States and peoples regarding the problem of national resources in the occupied Arab territories and hoped that the problem would be solved by the parties concerned in an expeditious and peaceful manner in conformity with international law. Its position on permanent sovereignty over national resources in general, however, which had been made clear on previous occasions, remained unchanged.
4. Mr. IVERSEN (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the ten members of the European Economic Community, said that the Foreign Ministers of the Ten had vigorously condemned the Israeli invasion on several occasions. Israel would never attain the security to which it was entitled by the use of force; it could, however, find that security by satisfying the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinian people, who should have the opportunity to exercise the right to self-determination with all that that implied.
5. The Ten reaffirmed the importance they attached to the independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and national unity of Lebanon. They were deeply concerned about the situation there and deplored its tragic consequences for the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples. They were horrified by the loss of human life and the sufferings of the civilian population as well as the massive material destruction. They would, therefore, continue to contribute to humanitarian assistance in order to alleviate the sufferings of both Lebanese and Palestinians. They would do so directly and through the Community as such, as well as through the different institutions of the United Nations system, each of which should determine for itself how best and through what channels it could assist the Lebanese and Palestinians. They strongly urged the other members of the international community to contribute to that extremely important international effort.

6. Ms. DANIELSEN (Norway) said that her delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.29 as an expression of support for the efforts of the United Nations and the specialized agencies to provide humanitarian assistance to the Palestinian people. The position of her Government towards the Palestine Liberation Organization remained unchanged.
7. Mr. HAGNILO (Benin) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution as for other resolutions concerning the problems of the Palestinian people. It urged the United Nations system to increase its assistance to the Palestinians who were struggling against all forms of adversity.
8. Mr. PAULA COELHO (Portugal) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution on permanent sovereignty over national resources in the occupied Palestinian and other territories (A/C.2/37/L.44), but wished to reiterate its reservations in regard to operative paragraph 4.
9. Mr. PAPAPOPOULOS (Greece) said that his delegation had also voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.44. He had read with interest the report by the Secretary-General explaining why the report called for in the last preambular paragraph had not been submitted to the General Assembly at its current session (A/37/600). He was sure that the Secretary-General would make every effort to ensure the timely submission to the thirty-eighth session of the report requested.
10. Mr. GÖKCE (Turkey) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, in accordance with the well-known views of the Turkish Government on the questions of the Middle East and Palestine.
11. Mr. PRODROMOU (Cyprus) said that his delegation had been absent during the vote on draft resolutions A/C.2/37/L.39 and L.44. It would have voted in favour of both resolutions.
12. Ms. PEREZ CONTRERAS (Venezuela) introduced the draft resolution on protection against banned, severely restricted and non-approved products (A/C.2/37/L.65) on behalf of the sponsors, including Trinidad and Tobago.
13. It had been agreed at the second regular session of the Council that the question of the need to adopt measures to protect countries, particularly the developing countries, against products that had been prohibited or subjected to restrictions in their countries of origin and which were a danger to public health and the environment, should be reintroduced. It was a matter for great concern that a large number of harmful products continued to be manufactured, despite the fact that their use and sale were prohibited in the country of origin, and to be exported - to developing countries in particular, many of which lacked the necessary capacity to protect themselves effectively against them either because they were unaware of their dangerous character or for technological reasons. Moreover, even if they possessed the technology to offset the consequences of using such harmful products, there was no reason why they should continue to be subjected to such situations.

(Ms. Perez Contreras, Venezuela)

14. The resolution acknowledged that the primary responsibility for consumer protection rested with each State. Nevertheless, the countries producing those products, which had taken steps to protect their own populations by prohibiting their consumption, use or sale within their own borders, were called upon to cease their manufacture for export to other countries, particularly the developing countries. The draft resolution also stressed the importance for the countries affected of being provided with the necessary information and assistance in order to strengthen their own capacities to protect themselves against the consumption of banned or severely restricted products. It was important therefore that the Secretary-General should, on the basis of the work already done, prepare and regularly update a consolidated and easily understood list of those harmful products whose consumption, use and sale had been banned or severely restricted by the Governments of the producer countries.

15. In view of the moral and humanitarian purpose of the draft resolution, the sponsors hoped that it would be adopted by consensus.

AGENDA ITEM 71: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued)
(A/C.2/37/L.25, L.29, L.45, L.47, L.48 and L.68)

16. Mr. DI PACE (Italy) said his delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution on remnants of war (A/C.2/37/L.25), as it had in the case of similar resolutions introduced at the thirty-fifth and thirty-sixth sessions of the General Assembly. His Government had always addressed itself to the problem of remnants of war, particularly mines, with great care, in the light of its importance to the countries concerned and the humanitarian aspect. It believed, nevertheless, that the questions raised by the draft resolution should be settled bilaterally. There was no legal basis for the notion of the responsibility of certain States.

17. Mr. DIECKMANN (Federal Republic of Germany) said that, although his delegation sympathized with the humanitarian aspects of the draft resolution, it had abstained in the vote on the grounds that the problems involved should be dealt with on a bilateral basis. At the beginning of the 1970s, his Government had transferred to the Libyan Government all the existing information on places where mines might be concealed in Libyan territory. Its position in that regard was unchanged, but it had not accepted responsibility under international law. It did not think that the convening of a conference would bring the problem any nearer to a solution.

18. Mr. DMITRIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution on the basis of its unchanging support for the just demands of those developing countries which suffered from the remnants of imperialist and colonialist wars. It felt, nevertheless, that the references in the third preambular paragraph were not wholly appropriate in a United Nations resolution.

19. Mr. BOYD (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution. While it sympathized with the problems experienced by certain countries, it believed that the matter was best dealt with in a bilateral context. The United Kingdom did not accept that it had any obligation under international law, but it would continue to give sympathetic consideration to requests for information. The United Kingdom itself was faced with the results of indiscriminate mine-laying by Argentina during the Falklands conflict. It looked forward to receiving information from the Government of Argentina that would help it to remove the threat to the lives and welfare of the civilian population of the islands.
20. Mr. ASSADI (Iran) said that his delegation would have voted in favour of the draft resolution if it had been present at the time. It was its understanding, however, that the results of the study referred to in operative paragraph 4 would not be binding on States or violate their national sovereignty.
21. Mr. TETTAMANTI (Argentina) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution on the remnants of war as it had on similar resolutions on previous occasions. His Government believed that there was a moral obligation to try to resolve problems of that nature. Although the case of the Malvinas was not specifically covered by the draft resolution, as its national territory was involved, the Government of Argentina had nevertheless offered to supply information to the Government of the United Kingdom through the Swiss diplomatic mission in Buenos Aires. The information would be provided whenever the United Kingdom requested it.
22. Mr. KUMAR (Fiji) explained that, if his delegation had been present when the draft resolution on the living conditions of the Palestinian people in the occupied Palestinian territories (A/C.2/37/L.29) had been voted on, it would have voted in favour.
23. Mr. KHATIB (Jordan) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.29 because the question of the welfare and prosperity of the Palestinian people in the occupied territories was of paramount concern to Jordan. However, nothing in the resolution should be taken as impairing Jordan's obligations and responsibilities towards the occupied territories as defined in the principles of international law relating to the duties and rights of States in times of war and conquest. The Jordanian Government would co-operate in any steps taken by the Secretary-General to implement the draft resolution in consultation and co-ordination with it. That attitude should not be construed, however, as any change in Jordan's position on the question of the occupied Palestinian territories.
24. Mrs. WALDER-BRUNDIN (Sweden) said that her delegation had voted for draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.29. It welcomed the fact that the text had been drafted in a way which had made it possible for Sweden to support it. The Swedish position with regard to the references in the preamble, however, remained unchanged.

25. Mr. SEIF EL-NASR (Egypt), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, introduced the draft resolution on the implementation of the Plan of Action to Combat the Desertification (A/C.2/37/L.48) and the draft resolution on the implementation in the Sudano-Sahelian region of the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification (A/C.2/37/L.45). Desertification was one of the most serious environmental problems facing the world and, despite the efforts of the United Nations bodies and States concerned to cope with its consequences, further efforts were needed at the national, regional and international levels. Both resolutions were non-controversial and he hoped that the Committee would be able to adopt them by consensus. He noted that the delegations of Bangladesh, Liberia and Yugoslavia had joined the list of sponsors of both draft resolutions.

26. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee already had had before it a draft resolution concerning human settlements (A/C.2/37/L.47). Informal consultations had been held on the text and a new version had been prepared as document A/C.2/37/L.68. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/37/L.47 were ready to withdraw it in favour of the draft resolution submitted by the Vice-Chairman of the Committee on the basis of the informal consultations.

27. It was so decided.

28. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution document A/C.2/37/L.68.

29. The draft resolution was adopted.

AGENDA ITEM 73: TRAINING AND RESEARCH (continued) (A/C.2/37/L.14)

30. Mr. SALLU (Sierra Leone), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution expressing appreciation to the Executive Director of the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (A/C.2/37/L.14), adopted at the previous meeting, thanked all the members of the Committee for the co-operation and understanding that had made it possible for the resolution to be adopted without a vote, thereby adding to its significance. In view of its special interest in the topic, Sierra Leone was particularly grateful to the other sponsors of the draft resolution. He announced that the delegations of Bangladesh, China, Guinea, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Tunisia and Uganda wished to be added to the list of sponsors.

AGENDA ITEM 74: SPECIAL ECONOMIC AND DISASTER RELIEF ASSISTANCE (continued) (A/C.2/37/L.56 and L.67)

31. Mr. VELIOSO (Brazil) said that his delegation wished to co-sponsor the draft resolution on assistance to Nicaragua (A/C.2/37/L.56).

32. Mr. KHATIB (Jordan) introduced the draft resolution on assistance for the reconstruction and development of Lebanon (A/C.2/37/L.67) on behalf of the sponsors. Most of its aspects were self-explanatory and non-controversial as it

(Mr. Khatib, Jordan)

was mainly concerned with questions of economic and humanitarian assistance. The preamble alluded to the generally shared concern at the destruction in Lebanon, which had taken so heavy a toll in terms of human life and material damage, and to the determination of the Lebanese Government to undertake a programme of reconstruction and rehabilitation as a matter of the highest priority. It also affirmed the urgent need for international efforts to assist the Government of Lebanon in that task. The operative part had been drafted in such a way as to give the Secretary-General and the bodies of the United Nations system a considerable degree of flexibility that could be important for the effective provision of that assistance. He announced that the delegations of Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Brazil, Democratic Yemen, Iraq, Liberia, Morocco, Pakistan, Paraguay, the Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, the Sudan, the United Arab Emirates and Yugoslavia had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

The meeting rose at 4.15 p.m.