



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 48th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. MWANGAGUHUNGA (Uganda)

CONTENTS

- AGENDA ITEM 62: OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued)  
AGENDA ITEM 63: UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME (continued)  
AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)

\* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be incorporated in a copy of the record and should be sent *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550.

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

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.2/33/SR.48  
6 December 1978  
ENGLISH  
ORIGINAL: SPANISH

The meeting was called to order at 11 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 62: OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued) (A/C.2/33/6 and Corr.1 and 2; A/C.2/33/L.30/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.30/Rev.1

1. Mr. KATIL (Afghanistan), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, who had been joined by Lesotho and Swaziland, introduced draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.30/Rev.1 on the United Nations Special Fund for Land-Locked Developing Countries. The Fund had been established, and its Statute approved, under General Assembly resolution 31/177 in order to compensate the land-locked developing countries for their additional transport and transit costs. Unfortunately, the results of the two pledging conferences had been disappointing, and the Fund had not yet been able to begin operations. Thus in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, Member States were strongly urged to make immediate and generous contributions to the Fund. Furthermore, in resolution 32/113 the General Assembly had authorized the Administrator of UNDP to propose, in close collaboration with the Secretary-General of UNCTAD, interim arrangements to implement the aims and purposes laid down in the statute of the Fund until the Fund became operational, and that provision was referred to in operative paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of the draft resolution, which he hoped could be adopted unanimously.
2. Draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.30/Rev.1 was adopted by 45 votes to none, with 18 abstentions.
3. Mr. YEVDOKHEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his Government understood the special needs of the land-locked developing countries and took them into account in its relations with those countries, particularly those which were neighbours of the Soviet Union. The USSR was one of the few nations which was a party to the international transit agreements.
4. Mr. TERADA (Japan) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.30/Rev.1 for the same reasons that had prompted it to abstain from voting on General Assembly resolution 32/113.
5. Ms. VARRATI (United States of America) said that her delegation had also abstained in the vote because it did not believe that the Special Fund could be an effective instrument for dealing with the problems of land-locked developing countries, which could quite well be dealt with through the existing machinery.
6. Mr. NEUHOFF (Federal Republic of Germany), speaking on behalf of the member States of the EEC, said that the position of those countries, which had already been explained on a number of occasions, had not changed, and they had therefore abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.30/rev.1.
7. Mr. JÖDAHL (Sweden) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.30/Rev.1 for the same reasons which had led it to abstain in the vote on that question the previous year. Sweden was not convinced

(Mr. Jödahl, Sweden)

of the usefulness of the Special Fund, although the problems of the land-locked developing countries deserved special consideration, UNDP should be the main source of United Nations assistance to those countries.

8. Mr. MNGOMEZULU (Swaziland) and Mr. ACENAH (Uganda) said that, if they had been present, they would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.30/Rev.1, of which they were sponsors.

Document A/C.2/33/6 and Corr.1 and 2

9. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to the Note by the Secretary-General (A/C.2/33/6), in which the Secretary-General proposed that the Assembly adopt a set of standard rules of procedure that would be applicable to all pledging conferences convened by the United Nations. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee approved the Secretary-General's proposal and, consequently, recommended that the General Assembly adopt the decision to approve the rules of procedure of pledging conferences contained in document A/C.2/33/6.

10. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 63: UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME (continued)  
(A/C.2/33/L.9/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.9/rev.1

11. Mr. da MOTTA (Portugal), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.9/Rev.1 (Report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme), who had been joined by the Ivory Coast and Kuwait, drew attention to a few minor corrections: in the English text of operative paragraph 3, the word "Economic" should be replaced by "Development"; in operative paragraph 5, after the words "bearing in mind", the words "paragraph 3 of" should be inserted: in the French text of the same paragraph, the words "sans délai" should be replaced by "dans le meilleur délai"; in operative paragraph 6, the words "invites other Governments concerned" should be replaced by the phrase "invites the Governments concerned". Draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.9/Rev.1 contained various amendments to the original draft resolution (A/C.2/33/L.9). A third preambular paragraph had been added, in which the Assembly would note with satisfaction the signing in Kuwait of the Final Act of the Kuwait Regional Conference of Plenipotentiaries on the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment and the Coastal Areas; in operative paragraph 3, the phrase "in view of the close interrelationship between environment and development" had been added; operative paragraph 6 was new and, lastly, operative paragraph 7 of the new text contained an invitation to Member States to ratify and implement the international conventions and protocols designed to protect the environment. The sponsors hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

12. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.9/Rev.1 without a vote.

13. Draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.9/Rev.1, as amended orally, was adopted without a vote.

14. Mr. FREYBERG (Poland), speaking on behalf of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, the Ukrainian SSR and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, said that he wished to reaffirm the position of those countries that assistance funds should be established on a voluntary basis and that, consequently, no quantitative targets could be set for contributions to the Environment Fund.

15. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, in accordance with its foreign policy of promoting the strengthening of peace and détente in international relations, the Government of the USSR supported all measures and treaties for the protection of the environment and, in particular, called attention to the importance, for all peoples of the world, of the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques, and urged all States which had not yet done so to accede to that Convention.

16. Mr. DHARAT (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) pointed out to the Secretariat that operative paragraphs 6 and 7 had been omitted from the Arabic text of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.9/Rev.1.

Draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.11

17. Mr. PONCET (France), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.11, on marine pollution, requested that, in view of the difficulties which had arisen, the Committee should postpone its consideration for a day or two so that consultations could continue.

18. The CHAIRMAN said that, unless the Committee decided otherwise, the draft resolution in question would be considered on the following day.

Draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.14/Rev.1

19. Mr. JÖDAHL (Sweden) said that two corrections needed to be made to the fourth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.14/Rev.1 on co-operation in the field of the environment concerning natural resources shared by two or more States. In the third line of the English text of that paragraph, the word "Shared" should be added after the word "Resources". At the end of the same paragraph, the words "the Group" should be changed to "expressed therein".

20. The need for co-operation in the field of the environment concerning natural resources shared by two or more States was obvious. In the Declaration of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment it was affirmed that the natural resources of the earth must be safeguarded for the benefit of present and future generations. Furthermore, questions of international law relating to the protection of the environment were becoming increasingly important.

21. In accordance with General Assembly resolution 3129 (XXVIII), the United Nations Environment Programme, in its decision 44 (III), had established an

(Mr. Jödahl, Sweden)

Intergovernmental Working Group of Experts on Natural Resources Shared by Two or More States. After five meetings, the Group had prepared draft principles of conduct, contained in its final report, which had been approved by the Governing Council of UNEP in its decision 6/14, in which it had transmitted the report to the General Assembly and invited it to adopt the draft principles. The adoption of the draft principles at the current session of the General Assembly would have been a very important step; it was to be hoped that the General Assembly would adopt them at its thirty-fourth session. He had drawn attention to the most important aspects of the draft resolution, the text of which had been the subject of various informal consultations; his delegation therefore hoped that it would be adopted by consensus.

22. Draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.14/Rev.1, as amended orally, was adopted without a vote.

23. Mr. NIZAMUDDIN (India) said that his delegation had not opposed the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.14/Rev.1 without a vote but that, had there been a vote, his delegation would have abstained. His delegation believed that the Intergovernmental Group of Experts had not completed its work satisfactorily, as it had not agreed on an acceptable definition of shared natural resources. The General Assembly must avoid adopting a multiplicity of guidelines or recommendations on the question of shared natural resources and taking decisions which might conflict with the work of the International Law Commission.

24. Mr. VALLE (Brazil) said that his delegation had not found it necessary to oppose the adoption of the draft resolution, notwithstanding the references which it contained to documents on which his delegation's reservations were well known.

25. Mr. LI Fao-yu (China) recalled that, both at the sixth session of the UNEP Governing Council and in the Second Committee at the current session of the General Assembly, his delegation had explained its basic position on co-operation with regard to resources shared by two or more States. That position remained unchanged.

26. Mr. KATIL (Afghanistan) said that the fact that his delegation had agreed to the adoption of the draft resolution without a vote in no way altered his country's position of principle with regard to shared natural resources. His delegation believed that the draft principles of conduct prejudged the work of the International Law Commission, which was engaged in drafting the law on international rivers as well as the non-navigational uses of international water courses. His delegation's support for the draft resolution should in no way be construed, therefore, as a change in policy or as prejudging the position of his country with regard to shared natural resources, taking fully into consideration the cardinal principle of the permanent sovereignty of States over their natural resources.

27. Mr. TERADA (Japan) reiterated his reservations with regard to the draft principles of conduct in view of the legal implications which they might have in the future.

/...

28. Mr. FUENTES (Spain) said that his delegation had been able to join in the consensus on the draft resolution as a result of the spirit of compromise shown by its sponsors, in particular the delegation of Sweden. Nonetheless, its support for the draft resolution did not reflect a change in his country's position of principle with regard to the question of shared natural resources, which it had set out at the Stockholm Conference and in the votes on General Assembly resolutions 3129 (XXVIII) and 3281 (XXIX).
29. Mr. WORKU (Ethiopia) said that his delegation had joined in the consensus because it believed that improvements had been made in the text of the draft resolution. However, with regard to the problem of shared natural resources, account must be taken of the fact that States must be able to exercise their sovereign rights as they deemed necessary. His country's position on that question, which had already been expressed in various forums, remained unchanged.
30. Mr. KAMAL (Bangladesh) recalled that, in its statement in the general debate in the Committee, his delegation had explained its position regarding the report of the Governing Council, which had adopted the final report of the Intergovernmental Group of Experts containing the draft principles of conduct prepared by the Group in accordance with General Assembly resolution 3129 (XXVIII). He hoped that the Assembly would adopt the draft principles.
31. Mr. GORITZA (Romania) reiterated his country's position with regard to the question of shared natural resources, as explained in the Intergovernmental Group of Experts, in the UNEP Governing Council and in the debate in the Committee.
32. Miss GARCIA-DONOSO (Ecuador) reiterated her country's reservations, which had been expressed on various occasions when the question of shared natural resources had been discussed.
33. Miss SAMPIETRO (Argentina) joined in the consensus on the draft resolution and expressed the hope that the General Assembly would take a decision on the draft principles at its next session in accordance with the recommendation of the UNEP Governing Council.
- Draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.21/Rev.1
34. The CHAIRMAN announced that a separate vote had been requested on operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution.
35. Mr. HACHANI (Tunisia) said that the draft resolution had been revised following consultations with a number of countries. The following amendments had been made: subparagraph (c) of the second preambular paragraph had become a separate third preambular paragraph beginning with the words "Taking note of"; in operative paragraph 1, other international organizations were mentioned in addition to FAO, which had been the only one mentioned in the original text; in paragraph 5, the word "Urges" had been replaced by the word "Invites"; and the words "in response to their requests for the financing of concrete projects" had been added

(Mr. Hachani, Tunisia)

at the end of paragraph 6. If a separate vote was taken on paragraph 4, he requested that the vote be taken by roll-call.

36. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, a roll-call vote would be taken on paragraph 4 of the draft resolution.

37. At the request of the representative of Tunisia, a vote was taken by roll-call on operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.21/Rev.1.

38. Belgium, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cape Verde, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, 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, Zaire, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados.

Against: Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Japan, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstaining: Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Austria.

39. Operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.21/Rev.1 was adopted by 89 votes to 7, with 26 abstentions.

40. Draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.21/Rev.1 as a whole was adopted by 90 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

41. Mr. TERADA (Japan) said that his country was aware of the urgent need to combat desertification and was prepared to co-operate with other countries and with international organizations to solve that problem. However, it had felt obliged to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.21/Rev.1, as it did not agree with the establishment of a special account as proposed in operative paragraph 4. His delegation had already explained its views on that question on other occasions, and its position remained unchanged.

42. Mr. AURISCH (Federal Republic of Germany), speaking on behalf of the States members of the European Economic Community, said that the delegations of those States had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.21/Rev.1 in order to express their support for the activities undertaken to combat desertification. However, they had abstained in the vote on operative paragraph 4 in the belief that projects for combating desertification should be financed through the existing bilateral and multilateral channels. The establishment of a special account was not the best means of attracting more financial resources and would cause those resources to be used less effectively. The Governments of the EEC countries had serious doubts about the principle of establishing special accounts and had already explained their position on that question at the thirty-second session of the General Assembly and on other occasions.

43. Ms. VARRATI (United States of America) said that her delegation fully supported the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification and had participated in the work of the Consultative Group for Desertification Control. However, both at the United Nations Conference on Desertification and in the Second Committee, it had expressed its opposition to the establishment of special accounts to finance projects to combat desertification. The establishment of a special account would duplicate other activities, would complicate the work of co-ordinating activities within the United Nations system, and would increase administrative costs to the detriment of field activities. Her delegation had therefore abstained in the vote on operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.21/Rev.1. Her country would continue to provide aid in connexion with the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification through the existing bilateral and multilateral channels.

44. Mr. XIFRA (Spain) said that his delegation continued to follow the rule which it had applied at the thirty-second session of the General Assembly, when resolution 32/172 had been adopted, as it was opposed to the creation of special accounts. It had therefore abstained in the vote on operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.21/Rev.1, but had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole, being aware of the crucial importance of the problem of desertification.

45. Mr. JÖDAHL (Sweden) said that his delegation had voted in the same way as it had voted during the consideration of resolution 32/172, for the same reasons. It therefore referred the Committee to the statement which it had made on that occasion.

46. Mr. FREYBERG (Poland), speaking on behalf of the delegations of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Poland, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, said that those delegations had abstained from voting



(Mr. Freyberg, Poland)

on draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.21/Rev.1 and had voted against operative paragraph 4 because, although they viewed the results of the United Nations Conference on Desertification as positive, and supported the measures adopted with a view to implementing the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification, they found the idea of establishing a special account to finance projects to combat desertification unacceptable. Measures of that kind were incompatible with the United Nations Charter, as they involved interference in the domestic affairs of Member States.

Draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.15/Rev.1

47. Mr. OULD SIDI AHMED (Mauritania) informed the Committee that the delegations of Denmark, France and the Netherlands had become sponsors of the draft resolution, which he hoped would be adopted unanimously. He also said that in the French text of operative paragraph 1, the words "pour le développement" should read "pour l'environnement".

48. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objections, he would take it that the Committee decided to adopt draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.15/Rev.1 without a vote.

49. Draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.15/Rev.1 was adopted without a vote.

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)(A/33/106, A/33/112 and Add.1, A/33/120, A/33/139, A/33/166 and Corr.1, A/33/167, A/33/170, A/33/173 and Corr.1, A/33/179 and Corr.1, A/33/343; E/1978/114/Rev.1)

50. Mr. FARAH (Assistant Secretary-General for Special Political Questions and Co-ordinator of United Nations Special Economic Assistance Programmes)\*, introducing the reports of the Secretary-General on the ten special economic assistance programmes requested in resolutions of the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council, said that the reports described the current economic situation and identified development projects and programmes which required urgent support for each country for which a special economic assistance programme had been established. On the basis of the data available on Djibouti, Guinea-Bissau, Sao Tome and Principe and Seychelles, the Committee for Development Planning had concluded that none of those countries satisfied the criteria for inclusion in the list of least developed countries. It had, however, recommended that they should be assisted during the remainder of the current decade in view of the special difficulties which they were experiencing. Several countries had expressed dissatisfaction with the criteria applied by the Committee for Development Planning in determining eligibility for least-developed status. Since those criteria required the use of statistics relating to a fixed time base which predated independence, their application could only reflect the situation under colonial rule and gave a distorted picture of current economic conditions.

---

\* The full text of this statement will be issued as a separate document.

(Mr. Farah)

51. The assistance programme for Botswana was in response to the continuing acts of aggression committed against that country by the forces of the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia, which had interfered with the development programme of Botswana and had obliged it to divert development funds to defence. The influx of large numbers of refugees from Southern Rhodesia, the low price of copper and other adverse factors had recently aggravated the situation. As a result, there was an urgent need to maintain the flow of contributions to deal with the emergency situation facing Botswana. Between \$40 million and \$45 million were still required to complete projects previously identified.

52. South Africa's creation of the Transkei bantustan in 1976 had severely dislocated the economy of Lesotho. The new restrictions on travel between Lesotho and South Africa had had serious consequences for the people of Lesotho, and a number of projects were required to improve communications between the affected regions and the rest of the country. Since February 1977, when the United Nations mission had visited Lesotho, the international community had contributed considerable financial and technical assistance to that country. However, while the international response had been encouraging, the emergency situation had continued. There was a pressing need to develop local industries and services in the affected areas and to help the increasing numbers of refugees arriving in Lesotho from the Transkei. Further assistance of \$75 million to \$80 million was needed to enable Lesotho to deal with the situation and to implement its economic development programme.

53. Mozambique continued to face grave difficulties as a result of its decision to comply fully with sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. The Government had projected a budget deficit of at least \$60 million and a balance-of-payments deficit of \$225 million, in spite of the grants and long-term loans which had been arranged. In that connexion, it was requesting assistance for a number of high-priority projects at a total cost of \$48 million. In addition, as a result of the recent floods, the country would have to import 395,000 tons of foods. International assistance was also required for the ever-increasing number of refugees seeking asylum in Mozambique. The Government of Mozambique had indicated that it urgently required \$35 million in programme assistance or balance-of-payments support.

54. In addition to the economic burden of applying sanctions, which had cost the country over \$800 million, Zambia was also suffering from the drop in the price of copper and a continual worsening of its terms of trade. Transport problems had considerably increased its difficulties. The increase in the number of refugees, who by the end of September had numbered 45,000, was creating serious difficulties, and the repeated attacks by the rebel régime in Southern Rhodesia had resulted in heavy loss of life and necessitated major defence expenditures. In addition to assistance required to overcome the present crisis, Zambia needed assistance estimated at \$850 million for projects and programmes to restructure the economy in order to reduce its dependence on copper. With the level of commitments made to date, it was unlikely that much more than half the amount required would be covered.

(Mr. Farah)

55. Cape Verde was suffering the consequences of more than 10 years of drought which had largely destroyed its fragile economy. Since independence, it had received international assistance, which continued to be of vital importance. The Secretary-General's report recommended a programme of assistance totalling \$95 million, of which \$56 million were related to urgent projects for immediate implementation, and the balance was for accelerated development projects. The major elements in the programme related to tapping ground water supplies, fisheries, mineral development, maritime transport, primary education and technical training, urban development and health services. Cape Verde, which was a least developed country as well as a most seriously affected country, and had again suffered a serious drought in 1978, required balance-of-payments support, assistance for the financing of its development projects and commodity assistance including food and fodder.

56. Because of political developments in the Comoros in May 1978, it had been possible to prepare only a summary of donors' responses and a progress report on the various projects. Once the new Government had completed its work on documentation relating to the country's economic and development problems, it would be interested in receiving another United Nations visiting mission to study the situation in the country. The budget deficit for 1978 was expected to approach \$11 million. The Comoros had problems with food supplies, a fact which was recognized by FAO. Rice stocks were very low and wheat stocks had been exhausted. Shipping problems and inadequate storage facilities had also affected food deliveries. The Comoros urgently needed international assistance, in particular food assistance to cover requirements for early 1979.

57. When resolution 32/93 had been adopted, Djibouti had been experiencing an economic set-back as a result of the disruption of road and rail connexions between the port of Djibouti and its hinterland. Besides, the influx of a large number of refugees had imposed an additional burden on the Administration. Apart from having an inadequate economic and social infrastructure and having to bear the cost of creating a new governmental structure on independence, the country had been subject to a long period of drought which had reduced the already low levels of real income of the population. In that connexion, the provision of improved housing, health and education services would have an immediate impact on the well-being of the poorest members of the population. In addition, assistance was required to help the Government provide adequate food, shelter and clothing for the refugees, who were currently living under most unsatisfactory conditions. The mission sent by the Secretary-General had concluded that the development of port facilities would continue to be essential for the long-term economic prospects of the country. Moreover, agriculture, animal husbandry, forestry, fisheries and the exploration of mineral resources and geothermal energy should be actively encouraged. The Government had presented the mission with a list of high-priority projects. The total cost of the assistance programme was \$130 million, plus technical assistance and training. Of that total, \$31.5 million were needed for urgent projects and \$83.2 million for the later stages of projects, or for projects requiring further study. The Government had also proposed a number of other projects, estimated at a cost of approximately \$15.45 million.

(Mr. Farah)

58. Many of Guinea-Bissau's problems were the legacy of the colonial period. During the war of liberation, much of the existing limited infrastructure had been destroyed or damaged, and after independence the country had been faced with acute shortages in almost all vital areas: food, trained manpower, equipment and spare parts. At the present time, exports covered only one third of imports. The development programme called for external assistance amounting to \$38 million, of which \$25 million were required for projects for immediate implementation. Technical assistance and training were also required. The major projects covered rice and livestock production, fish processing and industries based on agriculture. Emphasis was also placed on water projects, and substantial investments were required in the transport sector. Projects were also proposed with regard to health and housing. Although Guinea-Bissau had made significant efforts to rehabilitate its economy and to lay the basis for its long-term development, it still urgently required international assistance on a substantial scale.

59. On independence, Sao Tome and Principe had inherited an infrastructure which had not allowed it to maintain even its previous levels of economic activity, still less to lay the basis for an effective development programme. The population's standard of living and level of welfare had been significantly lower than could be inferred from existing statistics. Limited education and a lack of technical training aggravated the difficulties arising from the country's geographical situation and its inadequate transport and communications facilities. The proposed development programme totalled over \$21 million, and, in addition, technical assistance and training were required. The main elements in the programme related to food production, fisheries development, improved maintenance of plant and equipment and the transport sector. The programme also included elements for education, health and housing.

60. The Seychelles had a very limited land area, spread over a large number of islands, of which the principal island, Mahe, had attracted people from other islands, so that there had been rapid urban growth and congestion with their attendant problems. The proposed programme of assistance provided for the extension of full administration to all the islands of the archipelago, the encouragement of settlement and development of the outer islands, the prevention of excessive growth and concentration of population in the capital and on the main island, and reduction of the heavy dependence of the Seychelles economy on the tourist industry and the import of basic food-stuffs. The projects recommended by the mission which had visited the islands comprised those which the mission considered urgent, costing approximately \$6.7 million, and those which should require accelerated implementation, costing approximately \$6.9 million. Unless some of the urgently needed projects were implemented immediately, Seychelles would face even more serious problems in the near future.

61. It was not always easy to mobilize international assistance for those programmes, for few countries were in a position to provide development assistance, and even those which were able to do so had their own constraints, particularly with regard to establishing new bilateral assistance programmes. In the circumstances, donor countries might wish to consider the possibility of earmarking part of their contributions to multilateral programmes for countries which were

/...

the subject of United Nations special economic assistance programmes. In order to facilitate the provision of assistance, a United Nations Trust Fund for Special Economic Assistance Programmes had been created, with subsidiary accounts for each of those programmes. The Secretary-General hoped that the international community would contribute generously to the implementation of the recommended programmes of assistance, in view of the urgent need of the countries concerned for assistance at the present time.

62. Mr. CHABALA (Zambia), supported by Mr. FARAH (Djibouti), requested that, in view of its importance, the text of the statement made by the Assistant Secretary-General for Special Political Questions should be published in full.

63. Mr. VORONIN (Secretary of the Committee) said that if the Committee decided to issue the full text of the statement by the Assistant Secretary-General, the financial implications would be \$3,500.

64. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished the statement by the Assistant Secretary-General for Special Political Questions to be published in full.

65. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.