



UN/SA COLLECTION

SECOND COMMITTEE
59th meeting
held on
Friday, 8 December 1978
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 59th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. MWANGAGUHUNGA (Uganda)

CONTENTS

- AGENDA ITEM 59: UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT (continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 65: UNITED NATIONS SPECIAL FUND (continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 58: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 70: UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued)

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

* 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.59
17 January 1979
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: SPANISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 59: UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT (continued)

1. Mr. KAMAL (Bangladesh) said that his delegation had voted in favour both of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.69 as a whole, and of the last preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1, because it recognized the genuine difficulties faced by land-locked countries, essentially because of their unfavourable geographical situation. However, his delegation's affirmative vote should be interpreted in the context of the situation obtaining in the region in which Bangladesh was situated and without prejudice to the work currently under way in the Conference on the Law of the Sea.
2. Miss GARCIA-DONOSO (Ecuador) said that her delegation had abstained in the vote on the last preambular paragraph, and on operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.69, because it considered that the matters they referred to should be dealt with by the Conference on the Law of the Sea and that if the Second Committee took a position on them it would prejudge the outcome of the Conference.
3. Mr. AGUIRRE (Chile) said that his delegation had cast a vote in favour in each of the three votes taken on draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.69, because of its traditional support for measures to benefit land-locked developing countries. However, it considered that matters relating to access to the sea should be dealt with at the bilateral level between the countries concerned. Moreover, his delegation's affirmative vote did not prejudge the position his country would take when that matter was considered at the Conference on the Law of the Sea.
4. Mr. SHAPOVALOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had voted in favour, in the three votes on draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.69, since it understood the particular needs of the land-locked developing countries. The Soviet Union had been one of the first countries to accede to the Convention on Freedom of Transit and was prepared to expand its bilateral and multilateral co-operation with land-locked developing countries. However, his delegation's position remained unchanged with regard to UNCTAD resolutions 63 (III) and 98 (IV), which were referred to in the preambular part of the draft resolution.
5. Ms. STEPHENSON-VERNON (Jamaica) said that her delegation, had it been present during the voting, would have abstained in the votes on the fifth preambular paragraph and on operative paragraph 1, and would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.69 as a whole because, while it sympathized with the plight of the land-locked developing countries, it did not wish to prejudge the discussions on that question at the Conference on the Law of the Sea.
6. Mr. VALLE (Brazil) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.69 without prejudice to the results of the Conference on the Law of the Sea.

/...

7. Mr. LI TAO-YU (China) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.69 as a whole, but had abstained in the voting on the last preambular paragraph and on operative paragraph 1. He wished to reaffirm his country's position on the question, which had been stated at the thirty-first session of the General Assembly.

8. Mr. SABOUR (Chad) said he regretted that the Committee had had to put draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.69 to a vote. He disagreed with those who contended that the Second Committee and the General Assembly were not competent to take a position on the question of the right of land-locked developing countries to access to the sea. In that connexion, he recalled that in 1965, as a result of the decisions taken at UNCTAD I, a Convention on Transit Trade of Land-Locked Countries had been drawn up and had entered into force in 1967. UNCTAD II had adopted resolution 11 (II), which constituted a preliminary programme of action for the benefit of land-locked developing countries.

9. The main problem that concerned the land-locked developing countries was the attitude of transit countries towards their claim to right of access to the sea, since that issue could be settled only through international agreements. It was surprising that other developing countries, which had recognized their responsibility to the land-locked countries in UNCTAD resolution 63 (III), were now taking an attitude which reflected a lack of political will on the part of transit countries. The arguments put forward by those countries were not justified, because the land-locked countries were not seeking to violate the sovereignty of transit countries, since the right of transit would have to be recognized within a suitable legal framework. Access to the sea was most certainly not a privilege which coastal States granted to land-locked States.

10. Transit States should be consistent and settle the question of access to the sea with the land-locked countries. An international agreement guaranteeing land-locked countries the right of access to the sea would have to be concluded. In the absence of such an agreement, the land-locked countries would continue to be trapped by their unfavourable geographical situation. Since problems relating to the trade of land-locked developing countries were involved, his delegation saw no reason why the question could not be dealt with by the General Assembly and UNCTAD.

11. Mr. BARREIRO (Uruguay) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.69 as a whole in order to express its solidarity with the land-locked developing countries. It nevertheless considered that the Committee was not the appropriate forum to deal with legal questions, and that it might be encroaching on the functions of the Conference on the Law of the Sea.

12. Mr. SEFIANI (Morocco) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.69 as a whole, but had abstained in the vote on the last preambular paragraph and on operative paragraph 1 because it believed that the matters dealt with in those paragraphs came within the purview of the Conference on the Law of the Sea.

13. Mr. FOLI (Ghana) said that, although his delegation fully appreciated the problems and needs of the land-locked developing countries, it considered draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.69 to be premature, since the Conference on the Law of the Sea had not completed its work. It had therefore abstained in the vote on the last preambular paragraph and on operative paragraph 1, although it had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

14. Mr. KOCH (Federal Republic of Germany), speaking on behalf of the European Economic Community, said that the position of the EEC countries regarding the matters under consideration was already known and remained unchanged.

15. Mrs. HIEN (Viet Nam) said that her delegation had voted affirmatively in the three votes on draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.69. However, the right of the land-locked developing countries to free access to the sea should be based on respect for the sovereignty of coastal transit States and should be exercised within the framework of bilateral relations between the countries concerned.

16. Mr. BARBERI (Colombia) said that, although his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.69 as a whole, it felt that it was not for the Committee but for other United Nations forums to take decisions on legal questions.

17. Mr. KAABACHI (Tunisia) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.69 as a whole. However, it had abstained in the separate votes, because it did not wish to prejudge the outcome of the Conference on the Law of the Sea.

18. Mr. MANSJUC (Indonesia) said that he had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.69 as a whole, but had abstained in the separate voting on the last preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1, because he considered that the Second Committee was not the competent body to take decisions on such matters and that it would be wrong to prejudge the results of the Conference on the Law of the Sea in that area.

19. Mr. SEBURYAMO (Burundi) said that if his delegation had been present during the voting it would have voted in favour in the three votes taken on draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.69. He had been surprised at the negative votes cast by some delegations, which served to obstruct activities to benefit land-locked developing countries.

20. Mr. BA-ISSA (Democratic Yemen) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on the last preambular paragraph and on paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.69 so as not to prejudge the results of the Conference on the Law of the Sea. However, his delegation fully understood the problems of land-locked developing countries.

21. Mr. FREYRE (Argentina) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.69, including the last preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1, on the understanding that the right of access to the sea of land-locked countries was not absolute but was subject to negotiation, with regard to its modalities, between the countries requesting and granting access to the sea, and

(Mr. Freyre, Argentina)

also on the understanding that the decision taken would not prejudice the conclusions to be reached on the subject by the Conference on the Law of the Sea.

22. Mr. TANTEM SAPYA (Thailand) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.69 as a whole but had abstained in the vote on the last preambular paragraph and paragraph 1, in keeping with the position taken by his country in the Second Committee at the thirty-second session of the General Assembly.

23. Ms. RODRIGUES (Mozambique) said that her country had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.69 as a whole because it recognized the need to adopt measures to benefit land-locked developing countries; however it had abstained on the last preambular paragraph and paragraph 1 because it felt that the Committee should not prejudice the results of the Conference on the Law of the Sea.

24. Mr. SHASHANK (India) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.69 as a whole, as well as on the last preambular paragraph, and had voted against operative paragraph 1. The right of land-locked countries to access to and from the sea had never been recognized in international law in the unqualified way in which it was formulated in the draft resolution, in violation of the sovereign rights of transit States. At the Conference on the Law of the Sea his country had agreed that land-locked countries had certain specific, but not unqualified rights of access to and from the sea, and that they should enjoy freedom of transit in accordance with the terms and modalities agreed between the land-locked States and the transit States concerned, through bilateral, subregional or regional agreements, and that transit States, in the exercise of their full sovereignty over their territory should have the right to take all necessary measures to ensure that their legitimate interests were not infringed in any way. His country's position also applied, as appropriate, to paragraph 3, dealing with transport and transit infrastructures and facilities for land-locked developing countries in the transit State.

25. India understood the problems of land-locked developing countries and therefore fully supported the other provisions of the draft resolution. Furthermore, in its bilateral relations it had attempted to take into account, as far as possible, the difficulties of neighbouring land-locked countries.

26. Mr. YAO (Ivory Coast) said that, as a coastal State and in keeping with its policy of regional and subregional co-operation, his country had always granted free transit and use of port facilities without thereby recognizing any absolute right; besides, it did not wish to prejudice the results of the negotiations now being held in connexion with the Conference on the Law of the Sea. It had therefore abstained in the vote on the last preambular paragraph and on operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.69, although it had voted in favour of the resolution as a whole.

/...

27. Mr. CAPUÑAY (Peru) said that his delegation had joined in the consensus on the draft resolution as a whole, showing the concern of the Second Committee over the situation of land-locked countries. It had also voted in favour of the last preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1 on the understanding, however, that its adoption would not prejudice the results achieved on the subject by the Conference on the Law of the Sea and that in each particular case the scope of the terms used in the resolution should be the subject of consultations between the parties concerned.

28. Mr. GADEL HAK (Egypt) said that his delegation had abstained in the votes on the last preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.69, as it felt that they prejudged the results of negotiations that were being held in other forums, although it had been very pleased to vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

29. Mr. AL-SHARAFI (Yemen) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.69 as a whole, but had abstained on the last preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1. It felt that the measure adopted had no solid foundations and that the rights granted to land-locked countries should be the subject of bilateral agreements.

30. Mr. WAKASUGI (Japan) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.69 as a whole, although his country's position, as stated in various forums, remained unchanged.

31. Mr. ARIYO (Nigeria) said that his delegation had not been present during the voting although, if it had participated, it would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.69 as a whole but would have abstained in the vote on the last preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1, because it believed that the matters dealt with in those paragraphs should be the subject of bilateral negotiations between the land-locked countries and the coastal States concerned. He added that his country had always borne in mind the interests of land-locked countries in its relations with them.

32. Mr. EMAM (Malaysia) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.69 as a whole, but had abstained in the votes on the last preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1, since the matters referred to in those paragraphs were being discussed at the Conference on the Law of the Sea and the final results of that Conference should not be prejudged.

33. Mr. ONAT (Turkey) said that his country had abstained in the vote on the last preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.69, but had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole. The views of his Government on the subject had been stated on various occasions and were to be found in the records of the General Assembly.

/...

34. Miss MBETTE (United Republic of Cameroon) said that her delegation appreciated the situation of the land-locked countries and had therefore voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.69 as a whole. However, it had abstained on the last preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1 because it felt that such questions should be settled by means of bilateral negotiations. That had always been her country's attitude in dealings with its neighbours, since it felt that it was not a matter of rights of those countries but of facilities granted to them. The two paragraphs to which she had referred were out of place in the draft resolution, which dealt with measures to benefit land-locked developing countries.

35. Mr. MNGOMEZULU (Swaziland) said that if his delegation had been present during the vote, it would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.69 of which it was a sponsor. His delegation, like the delegation of Burundi, was surprised that some delegations had abstained in the votes on those paragraphs of the draft resolution which dealt with the rights of land-locked developing countries.

36. Mr. VILLA (Philippines) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.69 because his country understood the problems and needs of land-locked countries. However, it had abstained in the vote on the last preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1 so as not to prejudge a matter that was still under negotiation in the Conference on the Law of the Sea.

Draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.79/Rev.1

37. Mr. LUFTI (Jordan) said that the sponsors of document A/C.2/33/L.79/Rev.1 had decided to replace the words "Regretting that no concrete steps have yet been taken ...", in the fifth preambular paragraph, with the words "Noting that no concrete steps have been taken ...".

38. The CHAIRMAN said that Colombia and Ethiopia had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.79/Rev.1.

39. Mr. ALLEN (United States of America) said that his delegation wished to hold consultations with the sponsors of the revised draft resolution.

40. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objections, he would take it that the Committee agreed to postpone taking a decision on the revised draft resolution for the time being.

41. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.60

42. Mr. LOHANI (Nepal) said that, as a result of the informal consultations, the sponsors had decided to make the following amendments to the draft resolution: in operative paragraph 3, the words "developing as well as the least developed countries" would be replaced by "least developed countries and other developing countries most in need"; in operative paragraph 4, after the words "at the ministerial level" the rest of the paragraph should be replaced by "urges, as soon

(Mr. Lohani, Nepal)

as possible, implementation of the measures envisaged therein and also welcomes the implementation measures already adopted;". In operative paragraph 6, the words "the specific and" should be deleted from the third line.

43. He announced that Viet Nam had withdrawn from the list of sponsors of the draft resolution.

44. The CHAIRMAN announced that Cape Verde and the United States of America had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.60.

45. Mr. HACHANI (Tunisia), referring to the first amendment announced by the representative of Nepal, said that in the United Nations there was no recognized category of developing countries most in need, and suggested that the wording of operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.60 should be similar to that used in operative paragraph 5 of resolution 32/190, such as: "Endorses the allocation of \$1 billion to the Special Action Programme pledged by the developed countries at the Conference on International Economic Co-operation held in Paris;".

46. Mr. PONCET (France) proposed that the wording of the resolution should conform to the text adopted by the Conference on International Economic Co-operation: "To help meet the immediate needs of individual low-income countries, in particular LLDCs and other countries most in need" (A/31/478/Add.1, annex, chap. III F, para. 1).

47. Mr. LAZEROVIC (Yugoslavia) agreed with the comment made by the representative of Tunisia to the effect that no reference should be made to categories of countries other than those already established, and proposed that the last part of operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.60, after the words "\$1 billion", should be deleted. If that proposal was accepted, his delegation would wish to become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

48. Mr. DIARRA (Mali) suggested that the sponsors of the draft resolution should hold consultations with the delegations that suggested amendments, with a view to reaching agreement on the text. For its part, his delegation believed that the wording of the paragraph should correspond to the text adopted by the Conference on International Economic Co-operation.

49. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should postpone taking a decision on the draft resolution.

50. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.85

51. Mr. CHANDLER (Barbados) introduced the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, which had been joined by the Bahamas, Cyprus, Guyana, Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago and Venezuela, and recalled that, at the thirty-second session of the

(Mr. Chandler, Barbados)

General Assembly, a similar draft resolution had been submitted, which had been adopted as resolution 32/186. He emphasized the difficulties faced by the countries referred to in the draft resolution, which were, among others, a one-crop economy, scarcity of resources, the mountainous and volcanic nature of the land and geographical isolation. The extent to which those countries depended on external aid to cover budgetary deficits was alarming. Despite their problems, the islands possessed real potential in the areas of tourism, light industry and exports; given an adequate supply of capital and technical assistance, they could develop into viable economies.

52. He pointed out that the sponsors of the draft resolution had added a third operative paragraph, requesting the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth session on the implementation of the resolution, since little or nothing had been done to implement the earlier resolution.

53. Mr. LOPEZ PAZ (Cuba) said that his delegation was becoming a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.85.

54. Mr. DONNELLY (United Kingdom) said that his delegation was prepared to join in a consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.85, but would, in due course, make a statement concerning the reference to the United Kingdom Government in the first operative paragraph of the resolution.

Draft resolutions A/C.2/33/L.87, L.88 and L.89

55. Mr. HACHANI (Tunisia), introducing draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.87, entitled "United Nations Conference on Restrictive Business Practices" on behalf of the Group of 77, read out the main provisions and pointed out that paragraph 4 followed the traditional formula for invitations to conferences.

56. He then introduced draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.88, entitled "United Nations Conference on Trade and Development: fifth session", and drew attention to the main provisions, and particularly operative paragraph 3, which set out the general objectives to be pursued at the fifth session of UNCTAD.

57. Draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.89, which he introduced next, was entitled "Effects of the world inflationary phenomenon on the development process". After commenting briefly on some of its provisions he drew particular attention to paragraph 4, which mentioned the need, in negotiations for the establishment of the New International Economic Order and the elaboration of the New International Development Strategy, to pay special attention to the problem of inflation, in view of the harmful effects of inflation on the developing countries.

58. The co-sponsors of the draft resolutions he had just introduced were prepared to hold informal consultations in order to ensure the adoption of those resolutions by consensus, if possible.

59. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) drew attention to the financial implications of paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.87, in which the Secretary-General was requested to ensure that the necessary arrangements were made for the effective participation in the Conference of two representatives of each least developed country. The inclusion of that provision might make it difficult to adopt the draft.

60. Mr. HACHANI (Tunisia) agreed that it was necessary to hold informal consultations in order to clarify positions on the draft resolution. With regard to the question raised by the representative of the USSR, he believed that it was necessary for the international community to make an effort to ensure that the least developed countries could participate actively in the Conference.

61. The CHAIRMAN announced that consideration of draft resolutions A/C.2/33/L.75 and A/C.2/33/L.76 would be postponed until the next meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)(A/33/438)

Draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.47/Rev.1

62. Mr. KHURELBAATAR (Mongolia), introducing draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.47/Rev.1 entitled "The role of the public sector in promoting the economic development of developing countries", on behalf of the sponsors said that informal consultations on that subject had been held and that a consensus had been reached on various questions. The sponsors had made it clear that they considered the draft to be of fundamental importance to the new international development strategy, and expressed the hope that it could be adopted by consensus.

63. During the consultations it had been decided to insert the word "important" before the word "role" in operative paragraph 2. Furthermore, a printing error in the second preambular paragraph of the English text needed to be corrected: instead of "30 August 1978" it should read "3 August 1978".

64. Mr. KRYZHANOVSKY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that his delegation was joining the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.47/Rev.1.

65. Mr. KOCH (Federal Republic of Germany) said that, during the informal consultations, his delegation had proposed on behalf of the member States of the European Economic Community that a new paragraph should be included in the text of the draft, requesting the General Assembly to consider, at its thirty-fourth session, the question of drafting a final report on that question on the basis of the report mentioned in paragraph 7 of General Assembly resolution 32/179. After extensive discussions it had been agreed not to insert that paragraph on the general understanding that the question of the preparation of a final report would be considered again at a later date. He requested the representative of Mongolia to confirm that understanding.

66. Mr. KHURELBAATAR (Mongolia) confirmed that a consensus had been reached on the question mentioned by the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany.

67. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.47/Rev.1, as orally amended.

68. Draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.47/Rev.1, as amended orally, was adopted without a vote.

69. Mr. DONNELLY (United Kingdom) said that, in agreeing to the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.47/Rev.1 by consensus, his delegation wished to emphasize the importance it attached to the reference in paragraph 6 to activities in public administration and finance; that reference was based on the evaluation contained in the report on the subject prepared by the Joint Inspection Unit, which had been submitted to CPC and approved by the Fifth Committee. That report recommended reducing the purely theoretical work on the role of the public sector in public administration and finance and stressed the need to attach greater importance to practical technical co-operation activities in that field. Furthermore, with regard to the fifth preambular paragraph, which mentioned the right of every State to exercise full and permanent sovereignty over its natural resources, his delegation reaffirmed its position that that right should be exercised in accordance with international law.

70. Mr. ALLEN (United States of America) said that while his delegation acknowledged the importance of the role of the public sector in promoting the economic development of developing countries, that by no means implied that it underestimated the importance of the private sector. Moreover, although his delegation recognized the "full and permanent sovereignty" of each State over its natural resources, it also believed that sovereignty must be exercised in accordance with the rules of international law.

71. Mr. KOCH (Federal Republic of Germany) thanked the sponsors for their understanding, which had made the consensus possible, and, with regard to the fifth preambular paragraph, reiterated that the right to permanent sovereignty over natural resources should only be exercised in accordance with the principles of international law.

Draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.67

72. The CHAIRMAN, resuming consideration of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.67, entitled "Assistance for the reconstruction and development of Lebanon", drew attention to the financial implications of that draft resolution, in document A/C.2/33/L.90. He also announced that Brazil, Democratic Yemen, France, the Netherlands and Qatar had become sponsors of the draft resolution.

73. Mr. KOCH (Federal Republic of Germany), supported by Mr. ROUSSEAU (Canada), said that the financial implications of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.67, which had just been made known, were not in keeping with the understanding reached, and he therefore proposed that the adoption of the draft resolution should be postponed until the next meeting so that consultations could be held.

74. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.80

75. Mr. OULD SIDI AHMED (Mauritania) introduced draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.80, concerning assistance to the Palestinian people, on behalf of the sponsors which now included Angola, Benin, the Comoros, the Federal Republic of Germany and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and said that in the last preambular paragraph in the French text the word "réaction" should be replaced by "réponse". In operative paragraph 2 the words "in consultation with" should be added before "the specialized agencies" and in the Spanish text, "intensifiquen" should be changed to "intensifique". The draft resolution was based on resolutions adopted by the Economic and Social Council on the same item, and particularly resolution 2100 (LXIII), calling upon the specialized agencies and other organizations within the United Nations system to continue and to intensify their efforts in identifying the social and economic needs of the Palestinian people. In implementation of that resolution and other provisions, various specialized agencies were providing assistance to the Palestinian people, in their respective fields of competence, through the Palestine Liberation Organization. For example, a few months earlier the Industrial Development Board of UNIDO had approved a complete programme of technical co-operation for the Palestinian people. UNDP, as the central agency for technical co-operation, should play a fundamental role in the provision of that assistance, which constituted a moral obligation towards the oppressed Palestinian people, whose rights were recognized by the great majority of members of the international community.

76. During the consultations the sponsors of the draft resolution had shown great flexibility and co-operation. The text he was introducing took account of practically all the objections and avoided mentioning certain basic points that had proved controversial, to facilitate approval of the draft.

77. The CHAIRMAN announced that a decision on draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.80 would be taken at the next meeting.

Draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.84

78. Mr. MUNGAY (Kenya) introduced draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.84 on behalf of the sponsors, which now included Cyprus, Ethiopia, Japan, Mali, New Zealand, the Sudan, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Zaire. The energy crisis of 1973 and 1974, from which many developing countries had not yet recovered, had shown that world petroleum supplies could soon be depleted, and that it was necessary to make greater use of new, renewable sources of energy, and that energy-importing countries should harness their indigenous energy resources more effectively. A conference of the kind called for in the document would provide an opportunity to share knowledge and information concerning such sources of energy as solar and geothermal energy, on which some developed countries had already begun research, and to assess technological possibilities and needs in that field.

79. The CHAIRMAN announced that a decision on draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.84 would be taken at the following meeting.

Draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.64/Rev.1

80. Mr. KAABACHI (Tunisia) introduced revised draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.64/Rev.1, concerning the replenishment of the IDA, on behalf of the sponsors, and drew attention to the changes made in operative paragraphs 2 and 3, as a result of consultations held with a view to accommodating the concerns expressed by other delegations so that the draft resolution could be adopted unanimously.

81. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objections, he would take it that the Committee agreed to adopt revised draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.64/Rev.1 without a vote.

82. Draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.64/Rev.1 was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution contained in document A/C.2/33/L.2

83. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the statement of financial implications of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.2/33/L.2, which was to be found in document A/C.2/33/L.50, and said that, if there were no objections, he would consider that the Committee adopted the draft resolution on the United Nations Transport and Communications Decade in Africa.

84. The draft resolution contained in document A/C.2/33/L.2 was adopted without a vote.

85. Mr. KOLEV (Bulgaria), also speaking on behalf of the delegations of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, noted that the socialist countries followed a policy of co-operation with the African countries and actively supported all their development efforts. It should be pointed out, however, that the draft resolution in document A/C.2/33/L.2 did not resolve many of the questions raised, and the delegations of the socialist countries therefore reserved the right to raise those questions again for discussion. He also suggested that the pledging conference provided for in operative paragraph 3 should be convened jointly with the pledging conference to be held for the entire United Nations system.

AGENDA ITEM 65: UNITED NATIONS SPECIAL FUND (continued) (A/33/21; A/C.2/33/L.83)

86. Mr. DONNELLY (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had some doubts about operative paragraph (c) of the draft decision in document A/C.2/33/L.83 and had asked the sponsors to make certain changes.

87. Mr. KAABACHI (Tunisia) said that the sponsors were prepared to hold consultations regarding draft decision A/C.2/33/L.83.

AGENDA ITEM 58: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.72/Rev.1

88. Mrs. ALLAM (Egypt) introduced the revised draft resolution in document A/C.2/33/L.72/Rev.1 on behalf of the sponsors and said that the topic of women and

(Mrs. Allam, Egypt)

development should be discussed not only on the basis of the criteria of social equality and human rights but also on the basis of recognition of the productive capacity of women and the benefits which, under proper conditions, could be derived from their participation in the over-all development process. Women should contribute to, as well as benefit from, development and progress in their countries. In preparing the new international development strategy, it was necessary to take account of the important factor of the integration of women in and their contribution to development.

89. She outlined the contents of the revised draft resolution in document A/C.2/33/L.72/Rev.1, calling special attention to operative paragraph 3.

90. Mrs. SIPILÄ (Assistant Secretary-General for Social Development and Humanitarian Affairs) expressed appreciation for the Second Committee's growing interest in the economic aspects of the lives of women and their contribution to the development process. In resolution 3505 (XXX), the General Assembly had requested the Secretary-General to prepare a report on the extent to which women participated in fields such as agriculture, industry, trade and science and technology. The report under consideration had focused upon the role of women in agriculture and trade. In the following report, the Secretariat would endeavour to deal with the participation of women in industry. Since it would be necessary to deal concurrently with preparations for the 1980 World Conference, the report to be submitted at the following session might have to be limited.

91. Mr. SMIRNOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation feared that the number of studies requested in operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution might be excessive. Perhaps it would therefore be better to request the Secretary-General, in consultation with the bodies mentioned, to prepare a compendium containing the views of organizations in the United Nations system and making specific recommendations.

92. The CHAIRMAN announced that Malaysia and Sweden had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.72/Rev.1.

Draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.82 (Comprehensive policy review of operational activities)

93. Mr. ONCET (Finland) introduced the draft resolution on behalf of the delegations of Denmark, Iceland, the Netherlands, Norway and Sweden, as well as his own delegation. The objective of the draft resolution was to provide the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council with an improved factual background for their decisions regarding operational activities. The report requested would make it possible to consider policy issues which were common to all operational activities of the United Nations system. The draft resolution aimed at creating guidelines for the continuous and regular review of the central policy questions relating to operational activities and at establishing machinery by which the Member States could follow the implementation of the strategies and policies laid down by the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council.

(Mr. Oncet, Finland)

94. The framework for the report would be provided by the relevant recommendations of General Assembly resolution 32/197, concerning the restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system, because they represented the latest and most comprehensive list of policy issues related to operational activities which had been approved by consensus in the General Assembly.

AGENDA ITEM 70: UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT
(continued)

Draft decision A/C.2/33/L.40

95. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft decision A/C.2/33/L.40 concerning summary records for the United Nations Conference on Science and Technology for Development.

96. Draft decision A/C.2/33/L.40 was adopted without a vote.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

97. Mr. DA MOTTA (Portugal) suggested that, in view of the many draft resolutions which still had to be considered, informal consultations should be held under the chairmanship of the sponsors instead of the Vice-Chairmen.

98. The CHAIRMAN took note of the suggestion made by the representative of Portugal.

The meeting rose at 6.25 p.m.