



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 52nd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. DIETZE (German Democratic Republic)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 79: OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued)

- (a) OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL
- (b) UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME
- (c) UNITED NATIONS CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT FUND
- (d) UNITED NATIONS FUND FOR POPULATION ACTIVITIES
- (e) UNITED NATIONS VOLUNTEERS PROGRAMME
- (f) UNITED NATIONS SPECIAL FUND FOR LAND-LOCKED DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL
- (g) UNITED NATIONS CHILDREN'S FUND
- (h) WORLD FOOD PROGRAMME
- (i) TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

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

AGENDA ITEM 78: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued)

- (b) TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT

AGENDA ITEM 80: TRAINING AND RESEARCH (continued)

- (b) UNITED NATIONS UNIVERSITY: REPORT OF THE COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS UNIVERSITY

/...

*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.

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

** Reissued for technical reasons.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.2/38/SR.52**
14 March 1984
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

- (c) UNIFIED APPROACH TO DEVELOPMENT ANALYSIS AND PLANNING: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

AGENDA ITEM 81: SPECIAL ECONOMIC AND DISASTER RELIEF ASSISTANCE (continued)

- (a) OFFICE OF THE UNITED NATIONS DISASTER RELIEF CO-ORDINATOR: REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL
- (b) SPECIAL PROGRAMMES OF ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE
- (c) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MEDIUM-TERM AND LONG-TERM RECOVERY AND REHABILITATION PROGRAMME IN THE SUDANO-SAHELIAN REGION: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 79: OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued) (A/38/3 (Part II), A/38/106 and A/38/494):

- (a) OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/38/258 and Add.1 and Corr.1, A/38/276 and A/38/333)
- (b) UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (E/1983/20 and A/38/516)
- (c) UNITED NATIONS CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT FUND
- (d) UNITED NATIONS FUND FOR POPULATION ACTIVITIES (A/38/410)
- (e) UNITED NATIONS VOLUNTEERS PROGRAMME
- (f) UNITED NATIONS SPECIAL FUND FOR LAND-LOCKED DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/38/293)
- (g) UNITED NATIONS CHILDREN'S FUND (E/1983/21)
- (h) WORLD FOOD PROGRAMME (A/C.2/38/L.7)
- (i) TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/38/172 and Add.1, DP/1983/18 and Add.1 and 2)

1. Mr. WAFULA (Kenya) said that his Government, which recognized the catalytic role of UNDP within the United Nations system in promoting technical co-operation for development, had made a substantial increase in its pledge to UNDP at the recent Pledging Conference. The results of that Conference unfortunately pointed towards a rather grim future. In spite of the substantial increase in the contributions in national currency of quite a number of countries, at the close of the Conference it had been found that announced contributions still fell far short of the level required to enable the organizations of the system to meet the needs of developing countries. It was regrettable to note that, for the fourth consecutive year, voluntary contributions to the United Nations system as measured in dollar terms were continuing to stagnate, thus forcing an increasing number of United Nations bodies and agencies to cut back on their activities. In addition to having adverse effects on the economic and social development programmes of developing countries, the lack of contributions was contributing significantly to discrediting the principles of co-operation and interdependence which constituted the very foundation of the Organization.

2. Since its accession to independence Kenya had received supplementary support from UNDP in the form of technical co-operation under a series of country programmes drawn up in close consultation with the Government. His Government was grateful to UNDP for having closely followed the priorities set by it in its national development plans, above all in seeking to promote national self-reliance and using resources available locally for the execution of projects.

/...

(Mr. Wafula, Kenya)

3. His delegation wished to recall the conclusions of the Interessional Committee of the Whole of the UNDP Governing Council (E/1983/20) by which Governments had been called upon to do everything possible to maintain the real value of their contributions to UNDP from year to year and to make additional and supplementary contributions to overcome the current shortfall in its resources. His delegation supported those conclusions as well as the conclusions submitted by the UNDP Governing Council at its thirtieth session.

4. The efforts made by the United Nations Children's Fund to promote the well-being of children throughout the world were also of concern to his Government, which believed that children should grow up in a healthy environment. The President of the Republic had recently announced that milk would be distributed free of charge to all children in Kenya. His Government also welcomed UNICEF's initiative in launching an international campaign on the advantages of breast feeding and immunization.

5. The activities of the United Nations Fund for Population Activities had been extremely effective over the past decade. Many Governments had adopted family planning programmes which in some cases had reduced the population explosion. His Government had launched a campaign to enlighten the general public about the advantages of family planning. It should be borne in mind, however, that certain contraceptives could have the side effect of causing sterility, which was not the objective sought. The countries where those contraceptives were manufactured should make sure that such side effects were eliminated. His Government looked forward to the forthcoming world population conference to be held in Mexico in 1984 and was closely following the new initiatives of UNFPA, particularly in respect of migration and new democratic trends. It remained convinced that the ultimate objective of such activities should be to enhance the quality of life of mankind as a whole.

6. His delegation fully agreed with the view that the quality and effectiveness of the programmes of the United Nations system needed to be improved and that the resources available for that purpose should be used to the full. In that respect, it associated itself with the statement on operational activities for development made by the Group of 77 at the second regular session of the Economic and Social Council held in Geneva in July 1983 and appealed to all Member States to continue to support those activities so as to better the lot of the less privileged members of the world community.

7. Mr. WAHEED (Pakistan) said that the comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development called for in General Assembly resolution 35/81 was one of the most important issues of the session. The statement on operational activities by the Group of 77, which had dealt with all the central issues, was a useful starting point for the debate. However, the question was so wide-ranging and complex that it would have been better to have considered it in an open-ended working group rather than in the plenary meetings of the Committee, because the parties involved must be able to hold a real exchange of views on an extremely difficult subject.

/...

(Mr. Waheed, Pakistan)

8. Operational activities had two essential characteristics: they were designed above all to provide technical assistance, a very important feature in the progress of developing countries, and their approach was multilateral, universal and non-political. The review must therefore consider whether those activities were compatible with the priorities and principles established for the system as a whole. In that system, UNDP played a central funding and co-ordinating role which must be reaffirmed and strengthened.

9. The success of operational activities depended to a very large extent on the resources available to finance them. Thus far, such financing had not been commensurate with the growing needs of the developing countries. For example, UNDP had been obliged to reduce its programmes drastically - with serious repercussions on the development plans of the recipient countries - because the target for voluntary contributions had not been attained. The decline in funds was perhaps partly explained by the current economic recession, but the gradual decline in multilateral aid was mainly responsible. However, such financing should be considered to be the collective responsibility of the international community. In that connection, he expressed appreciation to the countries that had provided generous multilateral assistance, for example, the United States. However, in providing technical assistance to developing countries, some developed countries continued to prefer bilateral channels instead of using the multilateral channels of the United Nations system. That was contrary to the resolutions the United Nations had adopted on that matter. Countries in a position to do so must participate in operational activities by making generous contributions in convertible currencies. Perhaps a rough indicator of the desirable ratio between bilateral and multilateral assistance could even be discussed. In any case, the decisions adopted at the thirtieth session of the UNDP Governing Council on the question of intergovernmental consultations were a step in the right direction. All the suggestions made by the Governing Council must be explored, because the question of the financing of operational activities must remain under constant review.

10. The multilateral technical assistance provided through United Nations operational activities should always be untied when it concerned the developing countries. Tied assistance should be applied only to countries that contributed in non-convertible currencies. In that connection, the use of convertible contributions in the latter countries must be halted entirely, because that was tantamount to an actual transfer of resources. The United Nations system should be made more responsive to the need for the utilization of non-convertible funds, for example by paying experts from the corresponding donor countries on assignment in developing countries in their own currencies. It was also necessary to determine the extent to which donor countries recovered the contributions they had provided. For example, it might possibly be decided that no more than 70 per cent of the contribution made by a particular country could be utilized in that country. Lastly, the developing countries' own experts and technical know-how should be utilized in so far as possible through the dissemination of all the necessary information to that end. A portion of the country IPF could perhaps be set aside for that purpose, and an indicative percentage set for the use of indigenous staff.

/...

(Mr. Waheed, Pakistan)

11. Of course, the evaluation of operational activities was important for both the donor and the recipient countries, but it should not be used to determine the level of contributions. At the thirtieth session of the UNDP Governing Council, Pakistan had supported the establishment of a central evaluation unit solely because it was important to keep the quality of the delivery mechanism under review, but the evaluation unit should not be used for other purposes. There was nothing wrong about an evaluation as such, but it must be carried out under well-defined and mutually accepted conditions. The aim must be to ensure the more effective utilization of scarce resources to the benefit of all the parties concerned. In that connection, he pointed out that, in most countries, United Nations technical assistance amounted to only a small percentage of the total project cost, while the rest was borne by the developing countries themselves. The quality of such assistance must therefore be as good as possible, otherwise it might increase the burden weighing on the recipient countries. It had been good thus far, as was reflected in the efforts the developing countries had made to increase their voluntary contributions and to participate in the financing of local support costs. Lastly, his delegation supported any measure directed towards increasing efficiency and reducing administrative costs.

12. The United Nations system remained capable of channelling meaningful technical assistance to the developing countries. For example, the activities of UNICEF and UNFPA were highly commendable. The World Food Programme had also co-operated admirably with the Pakistani Government in feeding 3 million Afghan refugees. Accordingly, those agencies deserved encouragement and support.

13. Mr. PESHKOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that, in his country's opinion, United Nations operational activities for development, in which it participated, were closely related to the efforts of the developing countries to remedy their backward situation, which had resulted from the merciless exploitation of their resources during the colonial era. An important element of those activities was the assistance provided to national liberation movements and the aid furnished by intergovernmental organizations at the regional level. Operational activities for development were inseparable from the struggle of States Members of the United Nations to strengthen international peace and security, to limit armaments and to settle conflicts by peaceful means. His delegation wished to stress the incompatibility between the arms race and economic and social development. Technical co-operation in the context of operational activities programmes would be effective only if it was based on respect for the Charter of the Economic Rights and Duties of States, on the Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order and on other progressive United Nations resolutions concerning the restructuring of international economic relations. His delegation also noted the positive results achieved through technical assistance in a number of industrial sectors, particularly with regard to the development of natural resources, the advanced training of staff at the national level and the development of agriculture. Moreover, some progress had been made in connection with assistance to national liberation movements.

14. With regard to UNDP activities, he observed that they should be subordinate to efforts directed towards helping the developing countries to acquire balanced economies so as to succeed in resisting the pressure from private foreign capital and from transnational corporations. The major Western countries persisted in transferring the burden of the crisis to the developing countries. An analysis of

(Mr. Peshkov, Byelorussian SSR)

UNDP activities unfortunately revealed that some parties were not averse to using the economic crisis as a means of introducing neo-colonialist methods in the area of technical co-operation. The growing collaboration between the UNDP administration, the World Bank and private financial organizations ensured the preponderance of the monopolistic capital of the United States and other major Western Powers. The strengthening of the influence those organizations had through UNDP and through its technical assistance system was accompanied by a trend towards pre-investment, which favoured the infiltration of private foreign capital in the developing countries, with all the disastrous effects such neo-colonialist methods had on the economies of those countries.

15. That aspect of UNDP activities was contrary to the principle of the sovereignty of the recipient States - they alone had the right to determine the objectives and means of their own economic and social development - and also to the principles adopted by the United Nations for the development of co-operation between States. In his delegation's opinion, the UNDP Governing Council should exercise strict control over resources and should seek to expand its financial base so as to prevent development programmes from being used for purposes that served the interests of transnational corporations and favoured the infiltration of private foreign capital under the cover of the United Nations. Of course, greater attention must be directed towards meeting the developing countries' needs in the area of industrialization and the training of personnel so as to enable them to have better-balanced economies.

16. Recently the UNDP administration had drawn attention several times to the difficulties it was encountering in mobilizing resources; those difficulties were due to such phenomena as inflation, the drop in the purchasing power of the currencies of the OECD countries and fluctuations in the exchange rate of the dollar. Accordingly, it was particularly useful to make the best use of the available resources in the interests of co-operation among member States of UNDP. That applied, in particular, to the voluntary contributions made by the socialist countries in non-convertible currencies. His delegation condemned all attempts at making it difficult to utilize such resources and deplored the fact that the UNDP administration was not taking the necessary steps to use them to the best advantage. According to the fundamental principles of UNDP, each State had the right to determine the size and nature of its contribution; his delegation therefore objected to proposals designed to change the voluntary nature of contributions and to impose set amounts and it objected to attempts to change the current pledging system.

17. The report entitled "Comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development" (A/38/258) sought to give reasons for the negative trends in UNDP activities. The documents submitted to the UNDP Governing Council at its thirtieth session also showed that the effectiveness of UNDP efforts was hampered by various factors, particularly the scattering of resources among a large number of small-scale projects and the fact that UNDP permanent staff members lacked the necessary technical and economic qualifications. The UNDP administration did not seem to notice those shortcomings even though they had been a factor in the organizational restructuring - the establishment, for example, of the Intersessional Committee of

/...

(Mr. Peshkov, Byelorussian SSR)

the whole of the Governing Council and of a committee of the whole to deal with programme matters - which have given rise to additional expenditure and needless administrative costs. The UNDP administration should take specific measures to reduce its expenses and improve its work; that subject should be discussed at the next session of the Governing Council. Finally, his delegation stuck to its position of principle concerning United Nations technical assistance, maintaining that such assistance should be voluntary and should cease to be charged to the regular budget of the Organization.

18. Mr. SALAM (Yemen) said that his delegation realized the importance of the operational activities for development; the report of the Director-General on the subject (A/38/258 and Add.1) showed how the international community was carrying out its collective responsibility for helping the developing countries, through multilateral and technical co-operation, to develop their natural resources and improve their national economy. According to the report the organizations of the United Nations system must keep their programmes under continuing review in order to adjust them to changing needs. His delegation supported that view provided that the development priorities of the recipient States were taken into account. Due attention should be accorded in the review to the least developed countries which were suffering from the effects of natural disasters. Following a disaster those countries experienced very great difficulty in continuing to implement their national programmes. Moreover, the assistance they received to repair the damage sometimes interfered with the implementation of projects included within those programmes. Accordingly, the mid-term review which was scheduled for June 1984, should take those factors into account as well as the indicative planning figures for the 1982-1986 programming cycle in light of new developments in each country.

19. One of the most serious problems encountered in the operational activities, particularly those of UNDP, was the shortage of financial resources. Despite the small increase in contributions at the 1984 Pledging Conference, resources remained below the desired level. It must therefore be assumed that the reduced IPF levels for country programmes would remain unchanged to the detriment of the least developed countries and notwithstanding the attention given by the organizations of the United Nations system to implementation of the Substantial New Programme of Action. UNDP expected that it would not be able to mobilize financial resources to increase technical assistance to the least developed countries and the Director-General himself recognized that that shortage of resources was preventing the United Nations system from participating fully in the implementation of the Substantial New Programme of Action. He paid tribute to the efforts made by the Director-General, in co-operation with the Secretary-General of UNCTAD and the Administrator of UNDP, regarding follow-up to and implementation of the Programme and he also welcomed the round tables organized by UNDP and the consultative group meetings of the World Bank with the participation of the least developed countries, since those activities were an effective mechanism of the new Programme. The strengthening of the resources of the Special Measures Fund for the Least Developed Countries and those of the United Nations Capital Development Fund were contributing to implementation of the Substantial New Programme of Action.

20. Operational activities for development helped reduce social and political tensions and were therefore a significant factor in world security and stability. Despite its own economic difficulties - which were due, in particular, to the

(Mr. Salam, Yemen)

recent earthquake - Yemen was continuing to pay its annual voluntary contributions and to increase them by 14 per cent. It appreciated the efforts made by the Administrator of UNDP to secure resources for UNDP on an increasingly predictable basis. Given the role it played in technical assistance to the developing countries UNDP was a fitting body to have the central role in co-ordinating multilateral technical co-operation.

21. Mr. QUINLIN (Australia) said that the report of the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation (A/38/258) had been supplemented by an addendum which drew together, for the first time, in one place a considerable body of data. It was a useful document but he noted, as another delegation had done before him, that the statistics contained in the addendum did not provide a foolproof methodology for measuring an individual country's commitment to development assistance. In the case of Australia, multilateral aid accounted for some 25 per cent of total official development assistance. The remainder went to Australia's extensive bilateral aid programme. Australia's particular geographical position as a relatively wealthy nation in a region of developing countries demanded of it a special commitment to the development of its neighbours. That in no way detracted from the importance which Australia attached to the United Nations system as a channel for disbursing multilateral aid.

22. When the report of the Director-General had been reviewed by the Economic and Social Council at its second regular session of 1983, the debate had focused on a number of key issues. In his presentation to the Second Committee, the Director-General had clearly picked up some of the points which had worried delegations at that session of the Council. That represented the kind of dialogue that the General Assembly had had in mind when it decided to establish the procedure for triennial reviews. By continuing that process and incorporating important debates on key policy issues by the relevant governing bodies, in particular that of UNDP, the Director-General would be able to submit future reports which were more sharply focused and better informed.

23. His delegation supported the importance placed on the central funding and co-ordinating role of UNDP in the field of technical co-operation. It noted the emphasis he had placed on ways and means for maintaining or even increasing the amount of money available. The Intersessional Committee of the Whole of the UNDP Governing Council had given close attention to that issue and to that of assuring the predictability of resources and his delegation subscribed to the important findings of the Governing Council as embodied in decision 83/5. However, in light of those findings, he wondered whether the emphasis on resource mobilization was likely to result in much progress so long as questions relating to the proliferation of funds and the quality of aid remained. His delegation would prefer to see greater realism in the setting of targets and better utilization of existing resources. That process should include the discarding of marginal projects or activities within the system. In that regard he supported efforts to ensure that the United Nations system remained responsive to the priority needs of the developing countries.

24. The Director-General's report also raised the complex issue of tied contributions. Australia believed that contributions to the general resources of UNDP should not be tied, although other contributions might be. However, tied

/...

(Mr. Quinlin, Australia)

contributions should not be emphasized at the expense of core-funding. Another relevant issue was non-convertibility, which had long been the subject of controversy.

25. With regard to the effectiveness of multilateral operational activities, the Australian Government, which had appointed an independent committee to review the country's programme of overseas development assistance, had taken note of the inter-agency consultations which had enabled the Director-General to prepare his report, as well as of the agencies' efforts to harmonize and co-ordinate their activities more closely. Further information was needed to ensure more coherent action at the national level, and it was unfortunate that the Director-General was not yet in a position to present information that might lead to a review of the work of the resident co-ordinators, work which affected the system's operational activities at the country level.

26. As for administrative and support costs, it was obvious that they must be kept to a minimum if donor confidence was to be maintained; efforts to enhance system-wide budget transparency must be made to that end. More generally, while evaluation was not an end in itself, it was nevertheless a key element in maintaining donor confidence. It was also important in ensuring that the needs and priorities of recipient countries were reflected in the system's operations at the country level. Any suggestions that would enhance the involvement of recipient Governments in project evaluation together with the donors and organizations concerned would be welcome. In conclusion, he said that Australia continued to regard UNICEF as one of the most effective, efficient and innovative organizations in the system. Thus, the decision taken at the most recent session of the Executive Board to use the infant mortality ratio in addition to per capita GNP as a criterion for the allocation and content of UNICEF programmes would help UNICEF to carry out its immense task even more effectively.

27. The CHAIRMAN announced that the deadline for the submission of draft resolutions on agenda item 79 had been set for Wednesday, 30 November 1983, at 6 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)
(A/C.2/38/L.77*)

Draft decision A/C.2/38/L.77*

28. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Committee) said that his attention had been drawn to the Spanish version of the draft decision which contained several inaccuracies. He wished to assure the members of the Committee that the translations in all languages would be aligned with the original English text.

29. The CHAIRMAN said that the the adoption of the draft decision would simply mean that the General Assembly would be deciding to reconvene the special session of the Commission on Transnational Corporations for one week for the purpose of assessing the work on the draft code of conduct on transnational corporations. However, it would be for the Economic and Social Council, at its organizational session for 1984, to convene a final meeting of the special session so that the Commission might complete its drafting of the code. At present, therefore, it was

/...

(The Chairman)

impossible to anticipate the decision of the Economic and Social Council, and the references to the second part of the reconvened special session in the fourth and sixth lines of paragraph 4 of document A/C.2/38/L.83 should be deleted. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft decision A/C.2/38/L.77*.

30. It was so decided.

31. Mr. PIRSON (Belgium) said that, during the first phase of the evaluation which would take place during the resumed special session of the Commission on Transnational Corporations in early 1984, the international community must identify ways of solving the problems which had led to the current impasse. While retaining texts which had been the subject of general agreement, the international community should not hesitate to seek new formulas which would allow the experts to reach agreement on outstanding issues and to prepare the final draft code of conduct during the course of the year. As for the second phase of the work, his delegation would have preferred the convening of a new session, open to all, which would not necessarily take the special session's disappointing results with regard to outstanding questions as its point of departure.

32. Mrs. MORENO (Mexico) said that the Group of 77 had joined in the consensus that had led to the adoption of the draft decision submitted by the Chairman, which testified to the Group's flexibility and spirit of compromise.

33. The fact that a code of conduct on transnational corporations had not yet been adopted continued to concern the developing countries, which remained convinced that high priority should be accorded to that task. The proposal of the Chairmen of Working Groups I and II, contained in annex IV to document E/1983/17/Rev.1, constituted, in the view of the developing countries, a highly encouraging compromise formula since it accommodated the interests of the various groups of countries. That proposal contained as many concessions as the Group of 77 was prepared to make. The Group wished to reiterate its support for the fundamental principles on which its position was based, principles which it had stated at the outset of negotiations on the code of conduct and in the various declarations adopted by its ministerial meetings. It was in that spirit that the Group of 77 had accepted the draft decision which had just been adopted, and it was to be hoped that the reconvening of a special session of the Commission on Transnational Corporations would provide an opportunity for a demonstration of the political will required for the preparation of the code of conduct.

34. Mr. ZAPOTOCKY (Czechoslovakia), speaking on behalf of the socialist countries, emphasized the importance which those countries attached to the elaboration of a code of conduct on transnational corporations. As could be seen in United Nations resolutions concerning the establishment of a new international economic order, the elimination of the adverse effects of the activities of transnational corporations was a prerequisite for the restructuring of international economic relations on a just and democratic basis.

35. It was obvious that the negotiations begun six years ago had reached an impasse because of the negative attitude of the Western countries, which were blocking the proposals submitted by the Chairman of the special session of the

/...

(Mr. Zapotocky, Czechoslovakia)

Commission on Transnational Corporations. Like the Group of 77, the group of socialist countries believed that those proposals represented a realistic compromise.

36. The delegations of the socialist countries had been prepared to support draft resolution E/1983/C.1/L.21 (A/38/3 (Part II)) submitted by the Group of 77 to the Economic and Social Council, but no consensus had been reached during the consultations on the draft for the same reasons which had prevented the Commission on Transnational Corporations from completing work successfully at its special session. The socialist delegations were therefore not opposed to adopting draft decision A/C.2/38/L.77* which set out the procedure for reopening negotiations, since it was hoped that those negotiations would pave the way for the early adoption of a code of conduct based on the set of proposals put forward by the Chairman of the special session of the Commission on Transnational Corporations.

AGENDA ITEM 78: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued)
(A/C.2/38/L.2, L.41/Rev.1, L.46 and L.82)

(b) TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.82

37. The CHAIRMAN said that draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.82 was based on a decision which had been adopted by the United Nations Conference on an International Code of Conduct on the Transfer of Technology at its fifth session and which was reproduced in annex I to the report of the Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (A/38/580).

38. He drew attention to the related statement of administrative and financial implications (A/C.2/38/L.89) and informed the members of the Committee that the words "at Geneva in 1985" in line 1 of paragraph 2 should be replaced by the words "not later than the first half of 1985", which was the formulation used by the Conference in its decision.

39. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.82.

40. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.2

41. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the General Assembly, in decision 37/440, had decided to refer to its thirty-eighth session for consideration the draft resolution entitled "Specific action related to the particular needs and problems of land-locked developing countries". In the course of the informal consultations on that question, it had been decided that the draft resolution should be referred to the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee endorsed that decision.

42. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.46

43. At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.46.

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

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Finland, Greece, Spain, Sweden.

44. Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.46 was adopted by 112 votes to 19, with 5 abstentions.

45. Mr. MARTINEZ-FRESNO (Spain), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had abstained because, as the representative of Spain had indicated at the sixth session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, his Government was opposed to the adoption of coercive economic measures, regardless of the countries involved. The draft resolution should have been formulated in more general terms.

46. Mr. PAPADATOS (Greece), speaking on behalf of the States members of the European Economic Community, said that those States had voted against the draft resolution. They subscribed to the relevant provision of the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, which stated

(Mr. Papadatos, Greece)

that no State could use or encourage the use of economic, political or any other type of measures to coerce another State in order to obtain from it the subordination of the exercise of its sovereign rights and to secure from it advantages of any kind; however, they could not vote to adopt a draft resolution that mentioned only coercive measures applied by the developed countries.

47. Mr. BASAGA (Turkey) said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution. Turkey had stated its position on the question at the sixth session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, and that position remained the same.

48. Mrs. MARTINHO (Portugal) said that her delegation was opposed to the use of coercive measures, whatever their origin. It had nevertheless voted against the draft resolution because it still held the position on the question which it had set forth at the time of the adoption of resolution 152 (VI) by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development at its sixth session.

49. Mr. KUMLIN (Sweden) said that his delegation had abstained on the draft resolution in question. Sweden had always been against coercive measures, which were the subject of the draft resolution. Such measures should be applied only on the basis of Security Council decisions. The criteria, however, should be the same for all countries be they developed or developing countries. His delegation's abstention had also been prompted by another reason: questions relating to the application of coercive measures were currently being examined by GATT, and Sweden did not want to prejudice the results of the negotiations in progress.

50. Mr. HILLEL (Israel) said that his delegation, more than any other, was opposed to the application of economic measures as a means of political coercion, since Israel had for the last 30 years been under an embargo imposed by the Arab countries. Israel therefore subscribed to the relevant provisions of the Ministerial Declaration adopted at the thirty-eighth session of GATT in November 1982. Those provisions had been formulated in very general terms and applied to all countries, whereas draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.46 covered only measures applied by the developed countries, which was why his delegation had voted against it.

51. Mr. NAITO (Japan) said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution in question because it dealt with political questions and the Committee was not the proper forum in which to take up such questions. The draft, moreover, was not balanced, because it did not put all countries on an equal footing.

52. Ms. DANIELSEN (Norway) said that her delegation had voted against the draft resolution because it referred only to the obligations of developed countries. Norway could not accept the draft resolution under those circumstances.

53. Ms. GOETSCH (Austria) recalled that her country had repeatedly spoken out against the practices described in draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.46, but it drew no distinctions between countries in that regard. Economic sanctions were legitimate only if they were adopted on the basis of Security Council decisions. Furthermore, like Sweden, Austria did not want to prejudge the results of the GATT negotiations on the question. Her delegation had therefore abstained.

/...

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.41/Rev.1

54. Mr. SZEREMATA (Poland), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution, thanked the countries which had taken part in drafting the text, particularly Tunisia and Pakistan, and asked that the expression "new international economic order" at the end of the fifth preambular paragraph be capitalized.

55. Mr. KAABACHI (Tunisia) expressed his gratitude to the Polish delegation for the spirit of compromise it had shown during the negotiations on the draft resolution under consideration.

56. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) requested a separate vote on the text.

57. Mr. VELLOSO (Brazil) said that it was surprising that the draft resolution should be put to a vote. His delegation would not participate in the vote because voting was incompatible with the objective set forth in the text.

58. At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.41/Rev.1.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Philippines.

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Somalia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

59. Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.41/Rev.1 was adopted by 95 votes to 1, with 27 abstentions.*

* See paras. 60 and 71 below.

60. Mr. FERNANDEZ (Philippines) said that his delegation had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.
61. Mrs. GARCIA DONOSO (Ecuador) said that her delegation had not participated in the vote because the draft resolution dealt with an issue which was very important for international economic relations, and the fact of putting it to a vote could only be detrimental to the North-South dialogue because East-West differences were thus being introduced into the work of the Committee.
62. Mr. KUMLIN (Sweden) said the fact that his delegation had abstained in the vote did not mean that it attached little importance to confidence-building in international economic relations. On the contrary, steps should be taken in that direction at both the national and international levels. Nevertheless, the mandate which the resolution assigned to the Secretary-General was too vague.
63. Mr. de la TORRE (Argentina) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it reflected the desire to promote confidence. Nevertheless, there seemed to be a contradiction between the objective of the text and the procedure chosen for its adoption. A draft resolution of that nature should have been adopted by consensus and the Committee members should have decided to continue the consultation procedure until such a consensus had been reached.
64. Mrs. GOETSCH (Austria) reiterated that her country was prepared to support all measures for increasing confidence and stability in international economic relations. Her delegation's abstention in the vote was due solely to the fact that it was not certain that the procedure set forth in the text would make it possible to attain that objective. It was regrettable that it had not been possible to continue the consultations with a view to achieving a consensus.
65. Mr. SAAD (Egypt) said that he had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it set a desirable objective, but his delegation would have preferred to see further efforts made towards reaching a consensus on the text.
66. Mrs. ZHANG Zhong-an (China) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it supported its orientation. She drew attention particularly to the fourth preambular paragraph and considered that international tensions should not jeopardize economic relations with developing countries. Furthermore, the fact that China had voted in favour of the draft resolution did not in any way change the position it had adopted with regard to certain issues on which decisions had been taken at the sixth session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.
67. Mr. AMORIN (Uruguay) said that he had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it set forth a sound principle which should have been studied in greater depth. The procedure chosen for adopting the draft resolution was not the best because it revealed a lack of agreement which did not actually exist with regard to the substance. It would have been preferable to try to establish a text on which a consensus might have been reached instead of hastening to vote on the draft resolution under consideration.

68. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) said that it was a sad joke to entitle the draft resolution "Confidence-building". The fact that 27 States had abstained and that others had not participated in the vote seemed to confirm that view. Actually, the sponsors of the draft resolution had never shown any real desire to negotiate. During the informal consultations the representative of Poland had stated at the outset that he would put the text to a vote. The delegation of the United States had tried to propose a number of minor changes which could have led to a consensus, but the representative of Poland had refused to extend the consultations by one day in order to reach agreement. The United States delegation was forced to conclude from that that the draft resolution had been submitted for reasons which were not concerned solely with confidence-building. In fact it detracted from instead of building confidence.

69. Mr. MALIK (India) said that he had supported the draft resolution in spite of the fact that it was of limited scope: confidence could only be built if a favourable climate was created for negotiation and the text did not reflect that concern.

70. Mrs. DANIELSEN (Norway) said that her delegation had abstained in the vote because, although the text had been improved, its content and objectives were still vague.

71. Mr. ARTAN (Somalia) said that his delegation had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

72. Mr. SZEREMETA (Poland) said, in reply to the representative of the United States, that at the end of the informal consultations it had been agreed, and the Chairman of the Working Group had even announced, that the decision to request that the draft resolution should be put to a vote had not impeded further formal or informal negotiations and that the sponsors of the draft resolution had been prepared to consider possible amendments proposed by delegations in order to achieve a consensus, but no such proposals had been made. Therefore, the comments made by the representative of the United States were not entirely justified.

73. Mr. PAPADATOS (Greece) expressed regret that it had not been possible to continue the consultations. As the representative of EEC, he had tried to initiate further informal or formal negotiations which unfortunately had not yielded any result.

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.90

74. Mrs. MORENO (Mexico) speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, introduced draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.90, entitled "International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade", which was designed to make the appraisal of the Strategy as successful as possible. It did not set forth precise measures because they would be defined at an organizational meeting which the Group would hold in the near future. It reaffirmed the objectives of the Strategy and stressed the need to measure the progress made in that direction. During the appraisal it would be possible to study the corrective measures to be taken in order to reorient action periodically in accordance with the defined objectives.

AGENDA ITEM 80: TRAINING AND RESEARCH (continued) (A/C.2/38/L.48, L.49 and L.78)

(b) UNITED NATIONS UNIVERSITY: REPORT OF THE COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS UNIVERSITY

(c) UNIFIED APPROACH TO DEVELOPMENT ANALYSIS AND PLANNING: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.48

75. The CHAIRMAN said that, in the absence of any objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution.

76. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.78

77. The CHAIRMAN said that, in the absence of any objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution.

78. Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.78 was adopted.

79. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) said that his delegation had voted for draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.78, even though it considered it very vague. To his mind, the title "unified approach to development analysis and planning" meant that countries should take into account all the factors which contributed to development and especially the creation of conditions conducive to the free operation of market forces and the key role played by private enterprise.

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.49

80. The CHAIRMAN said that, in view of the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.78 and in the absence of any objection, he would take it that the sponsors wished to withdraw draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.49.

81. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 81: SPECIAL ECONOMIC AND DISASTER RELIEF ASSISTANCE (continued) (A/C.2/38/L.39, L.40, L.50 to L.61, L.63 to L.68, L.69/Rev.1 and L.70)

(a) OFFICE OF THE UNITED NATIONS DISASTER RELIEF CO-ORDINATOR: REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

(b) SPECIAL PROGRAMMES OF ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

(c) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MEDIUM-TERM AND LONG-TERM RECOVERY AND REHABILITATION PROGRAMME IN THE SUDANO-SAHELIAN REGION: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.39

82. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Committee) read out an amendment to paragraph 4 of the draft resolution: the word "fully" and the phrase "annexed to the report of the Secretary-General" should be deleted and the phrase "pertaining to assistance to Ghana" should be added after the words "multi-agency mission".

/...

83. The CHAIRMAN said that, in the absence of any objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution, as orally amended.

84. Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.39, as orally amended, was adopted.

85. Mr. HAYFORD (Ghana) thanked the Committee for adopting the draft resolution and hoped that the consensus would be reflected in a generous response of the international community in order to ensure the resettlement of the million Ghanaians who had returned to their country in 1983 and to implement the different projects described in the Secretary-General's report (A/38/215), to which were annexed the conclusions and recommendations of the multi-agency mission sent to Ghana.

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.40

86. Mr. NGUYEN QUOC DUNG (Viet Nam) announced that his country wished to join the sponsors of the draft resolution.

87. The CHAIRMAN said that, in the absence of any objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution.

88. Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.40 was adopted.

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.50

89. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Committee) read out an amendment to the draft resolution concerning the addition at the end of paragraph 2 of the words "pertaining to assistance to the development of Sierra Leone".

90. The CHAIRMAN said that, in the absence of any objection, he would take it that the Committee decided to adopt the draft resolution, as orally amended.

91. Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.50, as orally amended, was adopted.

92. Mr. SALLU (Sierra Leone) thanked the sponsors for submitting the draft resolution and the Committee for adopting it by consensus.

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.51

93. The CHAIRMAN said that, in the absence of any objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution.

94. Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.51 was adopted.

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.52

95. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Committee) read out two amendments to the draft resolution: a new paragraph reading: "Noting the appeals of the Secretary-General in favour of assistance to Uganda", should be inserted after the fourth preambular paragraph and the fifth preambular paragraph of the original text should be replaced by the words: "Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General submitted in response to General Assembly resolution 36/218, to which was annexed the report on Uganda's needs for assistance".

/...

96. The CHAIRMAN said that, in the absence of any objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution, as orally amended.

97. Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.52, as orally amended, was adopted.

98. Mr. NAGGAGA (Uganda) thanked the Committee for adopting a resolution on assistance to Uganda.

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.53

99. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Committee) read out an amendment to the fourth preambular paragraph: the phrase "caused by armed bandits supported by the apartheid régime of South Africa" should be replaced by the words "as identified in the report of the Secretary-General".

100. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution, as orally amended.

101. Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.53, as orally amended, was adopted.

102. Mr. PSUNGO (Mozambique) thanked the Committee for adopting the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.54

103. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution.

104. Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.54 was adopted.

105. Mr. MOUSSA (Comoros) thanked the Committee for adopting the draft resolution by consensus.

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.55

106. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Committee) pointed out that the words "to tackle those difficulties" in the third preambular paragraph of the English version of the draft resolution should be replaced by the words "to address those difficulties".

107. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution, as orally amended.

108. Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.55, as orally amended, was adopted.

109. Mr. CAKPO-TOZO (Benin) thanked the Committee for adopting the draft resolution by consensus, which would make it easier to implement the planned projects.

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.56

110. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Committee) read out a minor amendment to the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, whereby the words "of State" following the word "Minister" were to be deleted.

111. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objections, he would take it that the Committee decided to adopt the draft resolution, as orally amended.

112. Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.56, as orally amended, was adopted.

113. Mr. NGRENGAI (Central African Republic) thanked the Committee for adopting the draft resolution by consensus, which he viewed as a sign of the countries' sympathy with and understanding of the efforts exerted by the Central African Republic to overcome the difficulties caused by the world crisis and the drought.

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.57

114. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution.

115. Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.57 was adopted.

116. Mrs. NJIE (Gambia) expressed her deep appreciation to the members of the Committee for adopting the draft resolution, thereby demonstrating that they were prepared to assist the Gambia in solving its problems. It was to be hoped that the international community would participate fully in the donors' round table to be held in November 1984 to consider the country's needs.

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.58

117. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution.

118. Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.58 was adopted.

119. Mr. HASSAN (Djibouti) expressed his thanks to the Committee for adopting draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.58 and to the sponsors for their expression of solidarity with Djibouti.

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.59

120. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Committee) pointed out that, in the third line of paragraph 4 of the French text of the draft resolution, the word "reglement" should be replaced by the word "relèvement".

121. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution.

122. Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.59 was adopted.

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.60

123. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution.

124. Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.60 was adopted.

/...

125. Mr. LAVROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to draft resolutions A/C.2/38/L.53 and L.60, recalled that his delegation had always supported the struggle against colonialism, neo-colonialism and apartheid and that it condemned the acts of aggression committed by the racist South African régime against the independent States of southern Africa. Moreover, it was convinced that, as long as the vestiges of racism and colonialism were not eliminated once and for all and as long as South Africa continued to receive assistance from the Western countries, the young African countries would not be able to overcome the difficulties that confronted them.

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.61

126. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Committee) said that the last four lines of paragraph 4 of the draft resolution should be reworded to read: "... improving the national machinery to combat the effects of drought and other natural disasters, to apprise the Economic and Social Council at its second regular session of 1984, and to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-ninth session on the progress achieved in the implementation of the present resolution".

127. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.61, as orally amended.

128. Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.61, as orally amended, was adopted.

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.63

129. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Committee) pointed out that, in paragraph 6 of the draft resolution, the word "favourable" should be replaced by the word "due". Moreover, the text of paragraph 7 should be replaced by the following new text: "Calls upon Member States, pending consideration by the Committee for Development Planning at its twentieth session, of the report submitted to it, and in view of the critical economic situation of Vanuatu, to accord Vanuatu special measures and, as a matter of priority, to give special consideration to the early inclusion of Vanuatu in their programme of development assistance."

130. Mr. VAN LIEROP (Vanuatu) said that Yemen and Democratic Yemen had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.63 and that UNESCO should be added to the list of bodies in paragraph 3 of the draft resolution.

131. The CHAIRMAN said that if he heard no objection he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution under consideration as orally amended.

132. Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.63, as orally amended, was adopted.

133. Mr. VAN LIEROP (Vanuatu) said that it was the first time that the Second Committee had adopted a draft resolution on economic assistance to Vanuatu since that country's accession to independence. In that connection, he wished to thank all those who had contributed to the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus, and in particular the sponsors who had shown their faith in the people of Vanuatu

/...

(Mr. Van Lierop, Vanuatu)

and their determination to assist them in eliminating poverty, illiteracy and disease. He particularly thanked the representative of New Zealand, who had presided over the informal consultations during which the draft resolution had been worked out, the representative of Papua New Guinea, who by introducing the draft resolution had demonstrated his friendship and co-operation, and all the members of the secretariat who had offered their co-operation and assistance.

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.64

134. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Committee) said that the phrase "and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its thirty-ninth session" should be deleted from the end of subparagraph (b) of paragraph 11.

135. The CHAIRMAN said that if he heard no objection he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.64 as orally revised.

136. Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.64, as orally revised, was adopted.

137. Mr. RAMOS (Cape Verde) thanked the members of the Committee for adopting the draft resolution, as well as those delegations which had joined the sponsors and the Vice-Chairman of the Committee who had worked very hard during the preparation of the draft.

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.65

138. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Committee) said that the word "first" in paragraph 6 of the draft resolution should be replaced by "second".

139. The CHAIRMAN said that if he heard no objection he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution as orally amended.

140. Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.65, as orally amended, was adopted.

141. Mr. BITAR (Lebanon) thanked the Committee for adopting the draft resolution under consideration and all the delegations which had joined the sponsors. The draft resolution, and the efforts of the donor countries, would undoubtedly help to ensure the well-being of the Lebanese people.

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.66

142. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Committee) said that the word "global" in the ninth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution should be replaced by the word "comprehensive".

143. The CHAIRMAN said that if he heard no objection he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution as orally amended.

144. Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.66, as orally amended, was adopted.

/...

145. Miss GLYNN (Honduras) said that her delegation had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.66 in order to demonstrate its solidarity with a country whose economic and social needs were very similar to those of Honduras. Consequently, her delegation understood the importance attached by the international community to assistance to Guinea-Bissau and hoped that the same efforts would be made on behalf of countries, such as Honduras, which faced similar problems.

146. Mr. TOURE (Guinea-Bissau) thanked all the officers of the Committee who had taken part in the drafting of the resolution and the delegations which had joined its sponsors. He also wished to thank the members of the Committee and in particular the representative of Honduras for her kind words about the Government and people of Guinea-Bissau.

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.67

147. The CHAIRMAN said that if he heard no objection he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution.

148. Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.67 was adopted.

149. Mr. ARIAS STELLA (Peru), speaking on behalf of the delegations of Ecuador, Bolivia and Peru, expressed his deep gratitude to the members of the Committee for adopting the draft resolution under consideration. As was well known, the drought and floods had had intensely damaging effects on agricultural production, stock-raising and the infrastructure in various parts of Bolivia, Ecuador and Peru, and demanded a reconstruction and rehabilitation effort that the affected countries were unable to assume by themselves.

150. The international community had taken various steps to deal with the situation. The Economic and Social Council had adopted resolution 1983/45 and the Secretary-General of the United Nations, to whom Bolivia, Ecuador and Peru paid a special tribute, had appointed a Personal Representative and dispatched a multisectoral mission to evaluate the damage caused by the natural disasters of which those three countries had been the victims. In addition, he wished to express his gratitude to the Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator and the United Nations Development Programme for the work they had done and to the Governments, the programmes and agencies of the United Nations and the governmental and non-governmental organizations which had provided emergency assistance.

151. The task of reconstruction and rehabilitation would require a continuing effort by the countries concerned and the draft resolution just adopted was therefore of capital importance. He was sure that the implementation of the draft resolution would make it possible to obtain positive results that would be new evidence of international solidarity and co-operation.

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.68

152. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Committee) said that the sixth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.68 should read: "Noting that, during the months of June to September 1982, Nicaragua suffered a serious drought which considerably affected the agricultural and livestock sectors constituting the most important economic activities of the country,".

153. Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.68, as orally amended, was adopted.

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.91

154. The CHAIRMAN said that a decision could not be taken on draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.91 since the text was still in the process of being issued.

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.70

155. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Committee) said that a new paragraph should be inserted after the sixth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.70, to read: "Noting with satisfaction the collaboration between the Permanent Inter-State Committee on Drought Control in the Sahel and the Club du Sahel and urging that this collaboration be continued and strengthened,". With respect to paragraph 5, subparagraph (d), the words "an institution" should be replaced by the word "institutions". He then read out revised paragraph 8: "Reaffirms the role of the United Nations Sudano-Sahelian Office as the co-ordinator of the efforts of the United Nations system to help the countries of the Sahel to implement their recovery and rehabilitation programme,".

156. With regard to paragraph 9, he said that the acronym CILSS should be inserted in round brackets after the words "Permanent Inter-State Committee on Drought Control in the Sahel", and the word "itself" should be added to the English version after the words "and with the Committee".

157. Mr. RAMOS (Cape Verde), referring to the new seventh preambular paragraph which the Secretary had read out, proposed that the acronym CILSS be inserted in round brackets after the words "Permanent Inter-State Committee on Drought Control in the Sahel".

158. It was so decided.

159. Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.70, as orally amended, was adopted.

160. Mr. WABUGE (Kenya) said that before the current version of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.69/Rev.1 had appeared, its sponsors had held informal consultations with a view to achieving consensus. A number of changes had been made as compared with the first version, in particular in operative paragraphs 8 and 9. As a result, paragraph 9 ended with the words "within existing resources as far as possible". The sponsors had in the end agreed to the insertion of that phrase, which they had originally opposed, in order not to jeopardize the chances of consensus. As for paragraph 8, since some delegations had considered the reference to non-governmental organizations inadequate, it had been replaced by wording in line with General Assembly resolutions 36/225 and 37/144, i.e. "appropriate voluntary organizations working in the area of disaster relief".

/...

(Mr. Wabuge, Kenya)

161. Like all the sponsors, he was sorry that delegations which had officially expressed reservations about draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.69 had been unable to join in a consensus even after acceptance of the amendments which they had proposed, in particular the words "within existing resources as far as possible" at the end of paragraph 9. That was why the sponsors had thought that the Committee should take a decision on the draft resolution at its current meeting. Then again, since disaster struck every region of the world, it was natural for delegations from every region of the world to associate themselves with the draft. The group of African States and other groups too had in fact supported the draft and its sponsors therefore hoped that the Committee would be able to adopt the text by consensus.

162. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Committee) read out the revised statement of the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution as they appeared in operative paragraph 9. He recalled that an appropriation of \$720,000 had already been requested in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1984-1985. On the basis of \$600,000 a year, which would allow at least 12 requests for emergency assistance to be met at the normal ceiling of \$50,000 per country in the case of any one disaster, implementation of the decision might make it necessary to open a supplementary appropriation of \$480,000 under section 22 of the proposed programme budget, which would bring the total to \$1.2 million for the biennium. If that proved impossible, the Secretary-General intended to report on any relevant supplementary expenditure in his final programme budget performance report for the biennium 1984-1985.

163. Mr. LEE (Canada) recalled that in its resolution 37/234 on programme planning, the General Assembly had requested the Secretary-General to take the necessary measures to provide it, at its thirty-eighth session, with programme implications of draft resolutions being considered by the Assembly. He therefore wished to be provided with some indication of what the implications of the draft resolution under consideration would be, as also those of draft resolutions A/C.2/38/L.13 and L.30.

164. The CHAIRMAN said he took it that the representative of Canada wished to have the programme implications of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.69/Rev.1 spelled out. Unless he was mistaken, the other two draft resolutions to which the representative of Canada had referred had already been adopted. Thereafter, it was for the Fifth Committee to tackle the question of the programme implications of the draft resolutions.

165. Mr. LEE (Canada) said that so far as he knew, the draft resolutions dealing respectively with the conversion of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization into a specialized agency (A/C.2/38/L.13) and with the Transport and Communications Decade in Africa (A/C.2/38/L.30) had not been adopted. It would therefore be interesting to hear the necessary explanations of the programme implications of those three draft resolutions from the representative of the Secretary-General.

166. Mr. EL HASSAN (Sudan) said that resolution 37/234 could be interpreted in various ways. Before being able to indicate the programme implications of the draft resolutions, the Secretary-General had to submit a report on the subject to CPC. But CPC had not yet approved that report. The question was therefore in abeyance and did not currently arise.

167. Mrs. MORENO (Mexico) said that the question of the implications of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.69/Rev.1 had first to be settled by the Fifth Committee. Since the latter had decided that it would take a decision later, she thought it was not yet appropriate to reach a decision, especially as the matters concerned fell within the competence of the Fifth Committee.

168. Mr. WABUGE (Kenya), Mr. KAABACHI (Tunisia) and Mr. VELLOSO (Brazil) said they thought the Committee should take a decision at its current meeting on the draft resolution under consideration.

169. Mr. LEE (Canada), referring to paragraph 7 of General Assembly resolution 37/234, II, expressed the view that its two subparagraphs dealt with two actions which were not necessarily consecutive, but parallel, for the necessary measures to provide the programme implication of draft resolutions did not depend on reporting to the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination. The Legal Counsel might be able to clarify the matter.

170. Mr. DON (United Kingdom) said that it would be useful if the Controller could provide some explanations.

171. Mr. FORAN (Controller) said that the question of reporting on the programme implications of the draft resolutions proposed at the current session was being considered by the Fifth Committee in informal consultations. It would be necessary to wait at least until the next consultation meeting to have definite information on the subject and to know what kind of documents might be made available to the Second Committee and when they might appear.

172. Mr. LAVROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.69/Rev.1 should be amended by deleting everything that followed the words "Red Crescent Societies". The non-governmental organizations mentioned in the paragraph had not had an opportunity of expressing their views on the establishment of a small consultative group as suggested in the text. It was a complex question which it was better to omit in the absence of more complete information.

173. Mr. DON NANJIRA (Kenya) expressed astonishment at the way in which the Committee was dealing with draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.69/Rev.1; he had understood that it would first vote on the draft resolution and then hear the Controller.

174. With regard to paragraph 8, he said that the sponsors had thought they had already taken the USSR representative's views duly into account when drafting it. They had also repeatedly explained at the time that they could not accept the amendment which had just been proposed once again, and their position had not

(Mr. Don Nanjira, Kenya)

changed. Paragraph 8 in its present form was a jointly agreed text; the organizations mentioned in it were by definition relief organizations and clearly belonged in the text.

175. The USSR amendment to paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.69/Rev.1 was rejected by 91 votes to 26, with 10 abstentions.

176. A recorded vote was taken on paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.69/Rev.1.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, 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, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Canada, Congo, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, New Zealand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

177. Paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.69/Rev.1 was adopted by 107 votes to 11, with 11 abstentions.

178. Mr. MILLER (United States of America) proposed that paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.69/Rev.1 should be amended by deleting the words "as far as possible" at the end.

179. Mr. DON NANJIRA (Kenya) said that he would have agreed to the amendment if the United States representative had also proposed the deletion of the words "within existing resources". The text as it stood was a compromise which could not be altered.

180. The United States amendment to paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.69/Rev.1 was rejected by 97 votes to 21, with 9 abstentions.

181. A recorded vote was taken on paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.69/Rev.1.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, 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, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Congo, Ireland, Israel, Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

182. Paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.69/Rev.1 was adopted by 106 votes to 16, with 8 abstentions.

183. A vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.69/Rev.1 as a whole.

184. Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.69/Rev.1 was adopted by 116 votes to 1, with 15 abstentions.

185. Mr. MILLER (United States of America) explained that he had voted against draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.69/Rev.1 for budgetary reasons: the Organization's budget should be kept within zero-growth limits and there was no need to increase it by the expenditure that would result from the draft resolution, since the existing funds for disaster relief were quite adequate.

(Mr. Miller, United States)

186. He stressed, however, that the United States was always ready to assist the victims of natural disasters; that had been proved by its contribution of nearly half the international aid provided over the past 18 years and its assistance to 43 countries in the year 1982-1983. United States aid had been set at \$25 million for the coming year and efforts would be made to supplement it if necessary. That assistance was intended for the operations of the Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator and also for any emergency operations that might be necessary.

187. Mr. LAVROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.69/Rev.1 because there were two paragraphs which were unacceptable and which, most regrettably, certain sponsors had not agreed to withdraw. First, a consultative group of non-governmental organizations as envisaged in paragraph 8 could be a means of interfering in the internal affairs of the country where it operated. Moreover, it would by its very nature weaken the essentially intergovernmental character of the Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator. Secondly, the provisions of paragraph 9 would entail a considerable increase in the Organization's budget.

188. However, as everyone knew, the Soviet Union strongly sympathized with countries struck by natural disaster. It commended the Office of the Co-ordinator on its work, as it had done on other occasions, in particular when supporting a draft resolution of the Economic and Social Council on the subject.

189. He noted that the discussion on draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.69/Rev.1 had been further complicated by the fact that the Secretariat had not prepared a report on the programme implications of its provisions, as it should have done under General Assembly resolution 37/234.

190. Miss HILTON (United Kingdom) said that she had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.69/Rev.1 because the Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator was doing valuable work and its effectiveness should be further strengthened. Her delegation had voted for the amendment to paragraph 9, however, because it very much wished to see the Organization's regular budget kept within certain limits. The rejection of the amendment would mean additional expenditure, but it was to be hoped that the Secretariat would do its best to resist requests to that effect and remain "within existing resources" as stipulated in the text adopted.

191. Mr. KUMLIN (Sweden) speaking on behalf of the five Nordic countries, pointed out that they had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.69/Rev.1 on the understanding that, when considering the establishment of the consultative group mentioned in paragraph 8, the Secretary-General would first consult all the interested organizations and would take full account of their views before taking concrete measures.

192. Miss COURSON (France) regretted that draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.69/Rev.1 had not been adopted by consensus. Her delegation had abstained in the vote on paragraph 8 because it considered it premature to contemplate the establishment of a consultative group, since the interested voluntary organizations had not been consulted on the need for such a step. It had voted against paragraph 9 because it could not be too strongly emphasized that the task of the Office of the Co-ordinator was basically to co-ordinate information; it would not be wise to assign operational duties to that agency since assistance should remain the responsibility of governments and of appropriate non-governmental organizations. For its part, France had always responded favourably to appeals from stricken countries.

193. Her delegation had consequently abstained in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole but that in no way implied any criticism of the Office of the Co-ordinator which it had recently congratulated on the effective work it had done in the co-ordination of information.

194. Mr. LEE (Canada) said that his delegation, to its great regret, had found it impossible to support draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.69/Rev.1 although in previous years it had approved somewhat similar resolutions. In connection with paragraph 8, it had no problem with the idea of establishing a consultative group and for that reason it had abstained in the vote on the amendment which would have deleted that part of the text. However, during the informal consultations, his delegation had made a number of proposals which did not appear in the draft and it had therefore been unable to vote for paragraph 8. His delegation had voted in favour of the amendment to paragraph 9; the financial implications of the paragraph as it stood were quite vague and it had therefore voted against it as unamended. For those reasons, his delegation had had to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

195. It would have been very useful to have had timely information on the programme implications of the draft resolution's provisions. It was unfortunate that General Assembly resolution 37/234, which called for such documentation, was not being implemented. While it was entirely normal that there should be informal negotiations on the matter, concerning which information would also have been welcome, there was no reason for not immediately complying with the directives of the resolution as they stood. It was the duty of the Secretariat to provide programme implications and the Committee must take them into account in making its decisions.

196. Mr. QUINLAN (Australia) said that he had voted for draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.69/Rev.1 although he regretted that it had not been adopted by consensus. That was not to say that the Australian delegation approved uncontrolled budgetary expansion, for it had voted in favour of the amendment to paragraph 9. As he saw it, it was understood that everything possible would be done to limit expenditure.

197. Mr. DELPREE CREPSO (Guatemala) announced that, if he had been present during the vote, he would have voted against the amendments to paragraphs 8 and 9 of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.69/Rev.1 and in favour of the text as a whole.

198. Mr. WABUGE (Kenya) wished to dispel any doubt regarding the solidarity of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.69/Rev.1; there were absolutely no differences among them and they had collaborated closely in virtually constant consultations while drafting the text.

The meeting was suspended at 7.25 p.m. and resumed at 7.50 p.m.

199. The CHAIRMAN noted, with reference to the various agenda items before the meeting, that the Secretariat had circulated an informal list of the sponsors and subsequent additional sponsors of the various draft resolutions. He invited delegations to verify the list and to bring any error to the attention of the Secretariat.

200. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Committee) indicated that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.60 were Djibouti, Guinea-Bissau, Japan, Lesotho, Liberia, Malawi and Uganda. In addition, the following delegations had added their names as co-sponsors of the following draft resolutions: A/C.2/38/L.39: Afghanistan and Romania; A/C.2/38/L.40: Afghanistan, Guinea-Bissau, Lebanon, Mauritania and Vanuatu; A/C.2/38/L.49: Guinea-Bissau; A/C.2/38/L.50: Guinea-Bissau, Lebanon and Romania; A/C.2/38/L.51: Afghanistan, Guinea-Bissau and Mauritania; A/C.2/38/L.52: Afghanistan, Guinea-Bissau and Romania; A/C.2/38/L.53: Afghanistan, Gambia, Mauritania and Portugal; A/C.2/38/L.54: Gambia, Mauritania and Romania; A/C.2/38/L.55: Afghanistan, Gambia, and Romania; A/C.2/38/L.57: Egypt, Guinea-Bissau, Mauritania, Nigeria and Thailand; A/C.2/38/L.58: Qatar; A/C.2/38/L.59: Congo and Gambia; A/C.2/38/L.60: Guinea-Bissau; A/C.2/38/L.61: Guinea-Bissau and Lebanon; A/C.2/38/L.62/Rev.1: Brazil; A/C.2/38/L.63: Afghanistan, Democratic Yemen, Viet Nam and Yemen; A/C.2/38/L.64: Afghanistan; A/C.2/38/L.65: Guinea-Bissau and Malaysia; A/C.2/38/L.66: Afghanistan, Democratic Yemen, Mauritania, Portugal and Qatar; A/C.2/38/L.67: Guinea-Bissau, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Portugal and Romania; A/C.2/38/L.68: Afghanistan and Congo; A/C.2/38/L.69/Rev.1: Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mauritania, Pakistan, Sierra Leone, Trinidad and Tobago, Togo, United Republic of Cameroon and Yemen. He indicated that an updated list would be distributed later.

201. Mr. SALLAH (Yemen) said that all members of the Group of Arab States, as well as Bangladesh, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia, should be included in the list of co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.40. In addition, Yemen had become a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.69/Rev.1.

202. Mr. MALIK (India) said that India had become a co-sponsor of draft resolutions A/C.2/38/L.53, L.60, L.65 and L.67.

203. Mr. TUAN (Liberia) said that his country was a co-sponsor of draft resolutions A/C.2/38/L.53, L.54, L.56, L.57, L.58, L.65, L.66 and L.69.

204. Mr. LOUMA (Papua New Guinea) said that the Syrian Arab Republic, Suriname and Yemen had become co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.63.

205. Mr. HASSAN (Djibouti) said that the United Republic of Cameroon had become a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.58.

206. Mr. WABUGE (Kenya) announced that Algeria, Egypt, Mozambique, Togo and Zimbabwe were co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.69.
207. Miss SENCION (Dominican Republic) said that her country was a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.62/Rev.1.
208. Mr. RAKOTONAIVO (Madagascar) said that his country was a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.62/Rev.1.
209. Mr. FAREED (Pakistan) announced that his country was a co-sponsor of draft resolutions A/C.2/38/L.59, L.61 and L.62/Rev.1.
210. Mr. EKANEY (United Republic of Cameroon) said that his country was joining the sponsors of draft resolutions A/C.2/38/L.39, L.50, L.52, L.57 and L.70.
211. Mr. PSUNGO (Mozambique) said that his country was a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.39.
212. Mr. AL-JABRI (Oman) announced that his country was joining the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.40.
213. Miss ZANABRIA (Peru) and Mr. DE ROJAS (Venezuela) announced that their delegations were joining the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.62/Rev.1.
214. Mr. LICHILANA (Zambia) announced that his country was a co-sponsor of draft resolutions A/C.2/38/L.39, L.50, L.53, L.55, L.56, L.57, L.58, L.59, L.61 and L.69/Rev.1.

The meeting rose at 8.55 p.m.