

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**
THIRTY-EIGHTH SESSION
*Official Records**



SECOND COMMITTEE
54th meeting
held on
Monday, 5 December 1983
at 6 p.m.
New York

COPY
FOR INFORMATION
ONLY DO NOT
CIRCULATE

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 54th MEETING

(IN LIBRARY)

Chairman: Mr. DIETZE (German Democratic Republic)

CONTENTS

UN/DA COLLECTION

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

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

(1) NEW AND RENEWABLE SOURCES OF ENERGY (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 80: TRAINING AND RESEARCH (continued)

(a) UNITED NATIONS INSTITUTE FOR TRAINING AND RESEARCH (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 79: OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued)

(a) OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

(b) UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (continued)

(f) UNITED NATIONS SPECIAL FUND FOR LAND-LOCKED DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

*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 after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.2/38/SR.54
8 December 1983

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 6.35 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 78: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued)
(A/C.2/38/L.76 and L.98)

(f) ECONOMIC AND TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION AMONG DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (continued)
(A/C.2/38/L.80)

(1) NEW AND RENEWABLE SOURCES OF ENERGY (continued) (A/C.2/38/L.16 and L.91)

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

1. 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.91.
2. It was so decided.
3. Mr. PACHECHI (Iraq) said that his delegation had understood that the Chairman of the Group of 77 would make a statement on the resolution on behalf of all the Group's members. As she was absent, however, he wished to state that his delegation had joined in the consensus in a spirit of co-operation and in the hope that, at its forthcoming meeting, the intergovernmental Committee would pursue the implementation of the Nairobi Programme of Action with vigour.
4. His delegation wished to note, however, that the phrase "countries in a position to do so", used in the preamble and in the operative part of the draft resolution, did not reflect the drastic changes that had taken place in the world economic situation. It would oppose the inclusion of that phrase in similar resolutions in future, and had a vote been taken it would have voted against the paragraphs containing it.
5. Mr. HUSSEIN (Kuwait) said he agreed with the representative of Iraq. He hoped, however, that the Chairman of the Group of 77 would have an opportunity to make a statement on the draft resolution.
6. Mr. GIHANI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said he agreed with the previous speakers. He also hoped that the Chairman of the Group of 77 would have an opportunity to make a statement, with particular reference to part III, paragraph 3 of the resolution on the mobilization of financial resources.
7. Mr. DE ROJAS (Venezuela) and Mr. HEGELAN (Saudi Arabia) associated themselves with the views expressed by the preceding speakers.
8. Mrs. MORENO (Mexico), speaking as the Chairman of the Group of 77, said that the adoption by consensus of the resolution marked a step forward in the global consideration of the question of the development of new and renewable sources of energy. The Group of 77 was confident that the next meeting of the intergovernmental Committee would be an occasion for further progress. During the

/...

(Mrs. Moreno, Mexico)

consultations on the draft resolution, the Group of 77 had made it clear that they did not regard the words "countries in a position to do so" as reflecting current world economic conditions and that they would seek to use a different phrase in future.

9. Mr. ORLANDO (United States of America) said that his delegation believed that substantial improvements could be made in the allocation of resources within the United Nations system and that additional resources could thus be made available for activities related to the Nairobi Programme of Action. In the light of its support for zero net programme growth, however, the United States was not in a position to contribute additional resources to the United Nations for the purposes of the Programme of Action. Any increase in budgetary resources for the Programme of Action should be offset by savings in other areas. In addition, the United States had not supported the proposal to establish a World Bank energy affiliate and was not currently participating in it.

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.16

10. The CHAIRMAN said he took it that draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.16 had been withdrawn by its sponsors.

11. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.80

12. The CHAIRMAN said that Thailand had been erroneously included among the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.80 on co-operation between the United Nations and the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference.

13. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Committee) informed the Committee that the word "still" should be deleted from the fourth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution.

14. 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.80 as orally revised.

15. It was so decided.

16. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had thus concluded its consideration of agenda item 78 (f).

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.76 and L.98

17. Mr. GIBSON (New Zealand) said that extensive informal consultations had been held on draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.76. Agreement had been reached on the substance of the issue, and that agreement was reflected in draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.98. However, one delegation still had reservations about the title of the resolution, and further discussions might be necessary.

/...

18. The CHAIRMAN appealed to the delegation concerned to agree to the title of the draft resolution as soon as possible, so that the Committee could take a decision on it.

19. Mr. LEE (Canada) stressed the importance which his country attached to the subject under consideration and to activities currently being pursued in that regard in many fora. Despite some reservations about the text of the draft resolution, his delegation's main difficulty was with the title which, it felt, should set out the substantive purpose of the international year, namely an increase in food and agriculture production, and not simply describe the year as being for the mobilization of financial and technological resources. Other measures were also required. The accepted guidelines for international years were that such years should be based on a global approach and seek to achieve substantive goals. There was no disagreement that the mobilization of resources was one of those goals, but to describe an international year as being for that purpose alone was questionable and could be regarded as setting a precedent. However, in view of the importance of the draft resolution and because its text allowed the possibility of further discussion of the title, he would not withhold agreement.

20. Mr. GIBSON (New Zealand) thanked the representative of Canada for his co-operation, which made it possible to submit the final compromise text of the draft resolution, as contained in document A/C.2/38/L.98, for adoption by the Committee.

21. 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.98 by consensus.

22. It was so decided.

23. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.76 agreed to its withdrawal.

24. It was so decided.

25. Mr. SALLU (Sierra Leone), speaking on behalf of the African Group, said he greatly appreciated Canada's contribution to the cause with which the draft resolution was concerned. The difficulty over the title had been caused not by intransigence on the part of other delegations but by their feeling that it would be dangerous to make any substantial change in the title adopted by the General Assembly in 1982. Their readiness to accommodate Canada's concerns had been shown by their acceptance of the amended title in document A/C.2/38/L.98.

26. Ms. DANIELSEN (Norway) said that her delegation had joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.98 because of the priority accorded to the sector concerned in her country's bilateral development assistance. However, she agreed with the representative of Canada that international years should provide a broad framework for action and should not focus on the mobilization of resources alone. There should therefore be further informal discussions on the exact title of the resolution.

/...

AGENDA ITEM 80: TRAINING AND RESEARCH (continued)

- (a) UNITED NATIONS INSTITUTE FOR TRAINING AND RESEARCH (continued)
(A/C.2/38/L.47/Rev.1 and L.92)

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.47/Rev.1

27. The CHAIRMAN said that Cyprus had been inadvertently omitted from the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.47/Rev.1 on the United Nations Institute for Training and Research.

28. Mr. FAREED (Pakistan), introducing the revised draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, said that the revised text was the outcome of intensive consultations. He noted that a further change had been made in paragraph 6, which should now read: "Again requests all States to continue to announce their contributions to the United Nations Institute for Training and Research early, if possible not later than the annual United Nations Pledging Conference for Development Activities, and to speed up the payment of their voluntary contributions to the Institute".

29. If the Committee adopted the draft resolution, it would be agreeing to an advance of \$866,000 to the Institute to cover the deficit in its budget for 1983 on the strict understanding that the money would be reimbursed. The position was such that some action must be taken: the problem of the deficit could not be solved out of UNITAR's normal budget of under one million dollars. Without the advance, the new Executive Director would be unable to carry out his programme for balancing the budget in future. Indeed, if the draft resolution was not supported, the Institute would have to close down. He therefore urged the Committee to adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

30. The CHAIRMAN said that the statement of the draft resolution's administrative and financial implications was contained in document A/C.2/38/L.92.

31. Mr. TIERNEY (United States of America) requested a recorded vote on the revised draft resolution. He said that his delegation would be obliged to vote against it because of the financial consequences of paragraph 8 and the implication that the General Assembly had agreed to a policy of bailing out voluntarily funded organs. The United States share of the proposed additional expenditure of \$866,000 would be \$221,500, which would be added to its regular assessment for 1984. The voluntary contribution it had earmarked for UNITAR for 1984 was \$422,000, the highest amount pledged by any State. If the resolution was adopted, the United States would have to reduce that contribution by the amount of the additional assessment. It believed that UNITAR's only appropriate response to its difficulties was to align its programmes with actual contributions. The approach his delegation was adopting was not directed against UNITAR but against the failure of Member States to support it. If it was not adequately supported, the Institute should cease to function.

32. Mr. PLECHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested separate recorded votes on paragraphs 8 and 9 of the draft resolution.

33. At the request of the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, a recorded vote was taken on paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.47/Rev.1.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, 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, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Canada, Israel, Italy, Japan, Portugal.

34. Paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.47/Rev.1 was adopted by 107 votes to 15, with 5 abstentions.

35. At the request of the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, a recorded vote was taken on paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.47/Rev.1.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Ghana, Greece,

Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, 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 Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe.

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

Abstaining: Belgium, Germany, Federal Republic of, Luxembourg.

36. Paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.47/Rev.1 was adopted by 116 votes to 9, with 3 abstentions.

37. 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.47/Rev.1 as a whole, as orally amended.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, 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, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zimbabwe.

/...

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

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Japan, Luxembourg, New Zealand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

38. Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.47/Rev.1, as orally amended, was adopted by 115 votes to 9, with 6 abstentions.

39. Mr. PLECHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation believed that, on the whole, UNITAR performed useful research and training work. The Soviet Union supported UNITAR's activities through its voluntary contribution, the participation of Soviet scientists in its research work, and the organization of training programmes in the Soviet Union. It was concerned, however, at the continuing attempts that were being made to change the way in which UNITAR was financed. It objected to granting the Institute an annual subsidy and to changing the voluntary nature of its funding. The Institute should solve its financial problems by cutting down expenditures, instituting stringent financial controls and balancing its budget. On the basis of its position of principle regarding the illegality of financing UNITAR's activities through the regular budget, his delegation had voted against paragraphs 8 and 9 and against the draft resolution as a whole.

40. Mr. SCHMID (Austria) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution in accordance with its long-established policy of support for UNITAR. It had thus agreed to the granting of a loan of \$866,000 to UNITAR, a loan made necessary by special circumstances for which UNITAR was not fully responsible. That decision should not, however, be regarded as an example to be followed on similar occasions in the future.

41. Miss FERNANDES (Brazil) said that her delegation had voted in favour of paragraphs 8 and 9 and the draft resolution as a whole, although it maintained its reservations regarding the financing through the regular budget of organs which were supposed to be financed by voluntary contributions. It had taken the view, however, that the advance would be non-recurrent and reimbursable, and it had voted in favour of granting the loan on an experimental basis, on the understanding that the Brazilian Government's position of principle was unchanged.

42. Ms. ERIKSSON (Sweden), speaking on behalf of the five Nordic delegations, said that they had voted in favour of the draft resolution. They were, nevertheless, concerned about the Institute's financial management and welcomed the efforts that had been made to strengthen the fourth preambular paragraph and paragraph 7 of the resolution, which emphasized the need for improved management and a balanced budget. She emphasized that the advance referred to in paragraph 8 was to be non-recurrent and that it did not imply any precedent for UNITAR or other bodies in the United Nations system.

43. Mr. FAURE (France) said that, during the discussion on the agenda item, his delegation had expressed its concern about UNITAR's situation and its hope that measures would be taken to improve UNITAR's financial management and to set priorities for its programmes in line with its budget. He noted that the Executive Director had taken steps in that direction. The revised draft had taken into account his delegation's views on the fourth preambular paragraph and on operative paragraphs 3 and 7 of the original draft. An essential point of the resolution adopted was that the advance was to be exceptional and non-renewable. It was only on that condition that his delegation had been able to vote in favour of the revised draft resolution.

44. Mr. MIGNOT (Belgium) said that, despite its traditional support for UNITAR, his delegation had been unable to support the draft resolution, even although an attempt had been made to meet one of its concerns regarding the need for a greater effort for improved financial and administrative management. Another vital concern, that emphasis should be placed on UNITAR's training programmes and on research linked to training, had been omitted. His delegation's greatest difficulty, however, had been with paragraph 8 which it felt was a renunciation by the General Assembly of the principle whereby UNITAR had been created on a voluntary basis.

45. Mr. LEE (Canada) said that his delegation had supported the basic idea of UNITAR from the outset and felt that the Institute should have a real place in the United Nations system. It had, however, been disappointed by the Institute's actual performance. It was prepared to agree, though very reluctantly, to an advance for 1983 only. It had abstained from voting on paragraph 8 because it was dissatisfied with that kind of ex post facto handling of a problem. It had supported the draft resolution as a whole, on the understanding that the situation would be thoroughly examined over the next 12 months, account being taken of the extent to which UNITAR dealt satisfactorily with its financial situation.

46. Mr. DIECKMANN (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the resolution as a whole but had been unable to support the recommendation in paragraph 8 that the deficit for 1983 should be covered out of the regular budget. As a mark of the value it attached to UNITAR, his Government had decided to increase its voluntary contribution for 1984 and 1985. It appreciated the efforts of the Executive Director to improve UNITAR's management and make it more effective, and it trusted that he would continue to streamline and rationalize UNITAR programmes. It was essential to establish long-term priorities in the training and research programme that would emphasize the programme's role in the development process. Greater efficiency was the best way to reduce costs and attract more voluntary contributions.

47. Mrs. NJIE (Gambia) said that, if her delegation had been present when the vote was taken, it would have voted in favour of the draft resolution.

48. Mr. BOYD (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) said that his delegation had voted against paragraph 8 of the draft resolution concerning the loan to UNITAR and had been unable to support the draft resolution as a whole. It

/...

(Mr. Boyd, United Kingdom)

respected the determination of the Executive Director to overcome UNITAR's problems but it could not regard the course proposed in paragraph 8 as an acceptable procedure. It strongly believed that expenditure should be matched to income, and it welcomed the Executive Director's resolve to balance the Institute's budget.

49. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had thus concluded its consideration of agenda item 80.

AGENDA ITEM 79: OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued)

- (a) OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/C.2/38/L.101)
- (b) UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (continued) (A/C.2/38/L.102)
- (f) UNITED NATIONS SPECIAL FUND FOR LAND-LOCKED DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/C.2/38/L.103)

50. Mrs. MORENO (Mexico), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, introduced draft resolutions A/C.2/38/L.101, on operational activities for development of the United Nations system, A/C.2/38/L.102, on the situation of the financial resources of the United Nations Development Programme, and A/C.2/38/L.103, on the United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries (A/C.2/38/L.103). The draft resolutions were intended to strengthen United Nations activities in the fields concerned and would contribute greatly to operational activities for development. In view of the importance of those activities for the development of developing countries, priority should be given to reaching consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.101.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

51. The CHAIRMAN said he understood that action by the Committee was not yet possible on other draft resolutions having financial implications. He therefore invited the Vice-Chairmen conducting informal consultations on those resolutions to report on the progress made, so that the Committee could decide when it might take decisions on them.

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.30

52. Mr. ZIADA (Iraq) said that agreement had been reached on the whole of draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.30 except paragraph 10, which had financial implications. He was therefore requesting a further two days for consultations on all draft resolutions having financial implications. Whether or not consensus was achieved, the Committee should take decisions on them on 7 December 1973.

53. The CHAIRMAN suggested he should ask the President of the General Assembly that the time limit for the adoption of resolutions having financial implications be extended until 7 December 1983, on the understanding that the Committee would

/...

(The Chairman)

take action on the draft resolutions in question on that date. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed.

54. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.35

55. Mr. ZIADA (Iraq) said that draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.35 had no financial implications. However a difficulty had arisen over an amendment to paragraph 3 submitted by the representative of Greece on behalf of the European Economic Community.

56. Mr. PAPADATOS (Greece), speaking on behalf of the EEC countries, said that further consultations would make it possible to take the Group of 77's views on paragraph 3 and other paragraphs into consideration and to seek an acceptable package solution.

57. Mrs. MORENO (Mexico), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, said that progress had been made and that the best course was to try to conclude the informal consultations as soon as possible.

58. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to postpone taking a decision on draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.35 until 7 December 1983.

59. It was so decided.

Draft resolutions A/C.2/38/L.12/Rev.1 and L.13

60. Mr. GIBSON (New Zealand) said that the draft resolutions A/C.2/38/L.12/Rev. 1 and L.13 had been considered together in an attempt to produce an acceptable package. A package had been achieved, but time was needed to ascertain the reactions of Governments and the Committee should therefore postpone consideration of the draft resolutions until 7 December 1983.

61. Mr. PLECHKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) agreed with the representative of New Zealand that many delegations, including his own, needed more time to decide their positions on the draft resolutions under consideration. Many points had arisen in connection with their contents which made it difficult to speak of a package deal, but his delegation had made every effort to reach acceptable decisions on both resolutions and would continue to do so.

62. Mr. TIERNEY (United States of America) said that the two draft resolutions had been negotiated as a package and very definitely remained one.

63. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to postpone decisions on draft resolutions A/C.2/38/L.12/Rev. 1 and L.13 until 7 December 1983.

64. It was so decided.

/...

Draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.74

65. Mr. GIBSON (New Zealand) said he believed that a consensus had been achieved on draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.74 except with respect to the financial implications. He suggested that the Committee's decision should be delayed until 7 December 1983.
66. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to postpone a decision on draft resolution A/C.2/38/L.74 until 7 December 1983.
67. It was so decided.
68. The CHAIRMAN said that there were still 27 draft resolutions to be negotiated. He suggested that the Committee take action on those which had already been considered in a first round of informal consultations on 9 December 1983. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed.
69. It was so decided.
70. The CHAIRMAN said that the Economic and Social Council, by its decision 1983/164, had adopted a number of recommendations on the organization of the Committee's work, some of which had been implemented in recent months. At the beginning of the current session, he had mentioned the possibility of considering further measures which the Committee might wish to take. To facilitate informal consultations on the subject, he was circulating an informal draft resolution dated 5 December 1983 as a basis for discussions. He proposed to hold open-ended informal consultations in the near future to see if such a text might be adopted by the Committee.

The meeting rose at 8.00 p.m.