

United Nations

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-THIRD SESSION

Official Records*



UN/SEA/CONF/CONF

SECOND COMMITTEE
60th meeting
held on
Tuesday, 12 December 1978
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 60th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. MWANGAGUHUNGA (Uganda)

CONTENTS

- AGENDA ITEM 65: UNITED NATIONS SPECIAL FUND (continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 59: UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT (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.

78-59231

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.2/33/SR.60
19 January 1979
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: SPANISH

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

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

Draft decision A/C.2/33/L.83

1. Mr. KAABACHI (Tunisia) said that, following the consultations held on draft decision A/C.2/33/L.83, entitled "United Nations Special Fund", the member States of the Group of 77 were proposing that in paragraph (c) the phrase following the words "the General Assembly" should be deleted and replaced by: "pending further consideration of the matter at the thirty-fourth session". The Group of 77 hoped that that change would make it possible to approve the draft decision by consensus.
2. The CHAIRMAN said that if he heard no objection, he would take it that the draft decision was approved without a vote.
3. Draft decision A/C.2/33/L.83 was approved without a vote.
4. Mr. YEVDOKHEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that although his delegation had agreed to having draft decision A/C.2/33/L.83, as orally revised by the representative of Tunisia, approved without a vote, that did not mean that the USSR agreed that the General Assembly, the legislative organ of the United Nations, should perform the functions of the Board of Governors of the Special Fund, which could be undertaken by UNDP.

AGENDA ITEM 59: UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT (continued) (A/C.2/33/L.60, L.79/Rev.1, L.85/Rev.1, L.92, L.93, L.94, L.96 and L.97).

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

5. Mr. IJHANI (Nepal), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.60, entitled "Special measures in favour of the least developed among the developing countries", said that, after further consultations, the sponsors had agreed to revise paragraph 3 by replacing the words "for the developing as well as the least developed countries" by "in the context of a special action programme".
6. Mr. ACEMAH (Uganda) said that his delegation wished to become a sponsor of the draft resolution.
7. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee approved draft resolution A/C.2/33/60, as orally revised, without a vote.
8. Draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.60 was approved without a vote.
9. Mr. YEVDOKHEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his country understood the special problems of the least developed among the developing countries, which were essentially the result of past and present colonial and neo-colonial exploitation. Those countries had been particularly hard hit by the

/...

(Mr. Yevdokeyev, USSR)

inflation, increased prices for manufactures and other phenomena which characterized the economic crisis of the capitalist system. In that respect, the Soviet Union fully supported the just demands of the least developed among the developing countries, which were claiming compensation for the damage inflicted on them. The USSR had agreements with 20 of those countries, which helped them to secure their economic independence and strengthen their national sovereignty. Those long-term agreements were designed to provide markets for the export products of those countries and supply them with the machinery and equipment they needed for the production of exports, thus mitigating the adverse effects of upheavals in the capitalist economy on them.

10. The position of the USSR on UNCTAD resolution 98 (IV) and the Conference on International Economic Co-operation was well known and had not changed. His delegation reaffirmed the statements made by Group D at the time of the adoption of Trade and Development Board resolutions 165 (S-IX) and 171 (XVIII), and the statements made in the Intergovernmental Group on the Least Developed Countries.

11. Mr. KOCH (Federal Republic of Germany), speaking on behalf of the member States of the European Economic Community, pointed out, in connexion with paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.60, that the EEC countries had participated actively in the preparation of resolution 165 (S-IX), adopted at the ninth ministerial special session of the Trade and Development Board and that the member States of the Community had introduced important measures to reschedule debt repayments. With regard to paragraph 6 of the draft resolution, the member States of the EEC would have preferred the wording of paragraph 8 of UNCTAD resolution 98 (IV) to be used, with the recommendation being directed to both the market-economy developed countries and the socialist countries of Eastern Europe, as well as to developing countries "in a position to do so".

12. Mr. YAGI (Japan) said, with reference to the special action programme mentioned in paragraph 3, that his Government, in accordance with the commitments it had undertaken in June 1977, would allocate \$114 million for the purposes in question for the financial year 1978; with the exception of \$19.5 million representing loans already granted, 86 per cent of that sum would be in the form of grants. With regard to paragraph 4, on alleviating the debt burden, Japan had decided to provide assistance in the form of grants to its least developed debtors in an amount which was more or less equivalent to their annual debt service; in the case of other debtor countries which were seriously affected by the oil crisis, the assistance would constitute a reduction in debt service. Lastly, he pointed out that the official development assistance provided by Japan to the least developed among the developing countries had increased.

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

13. Mr. LUTFI (Jordan), on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.79/Rev.1, entitled "Reverse transfer of technology", proposed the following changes, which were the product of consultations: in the third preambular paragraph, the words "exporting skilled manpower" should be replaced by "negatively affected by the reverse transfer of technology"; the fifth preambular paragraph should open with the words: "Noting the need further to examine national and international measures..."; and the word "national" should be added in the

/...

(Mr. Lutfi, Jordan)

last line of paragraph 3, so that the revised text would read "international, regional, interregional and national aspects of the problem". The sponsors hoped that those changes would make it possible for the draft resolution to be approved by consensus.

14. Mr. DONNELLY (United Kingdom), supported by Mr. KOCH (Federal Republic of Germany) and Mrs. WELLS (United States of America) suggested that consideration of the draft resolution should be postponed so that there could be informal consultations on it.

15. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to postpone its consideration of the draft resolution until the following meeting.

16. It was so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.85/Rev.1

17. Mr. CHANDLER (Barbados) announced that Bangladesh and Nigeria had become sponsors of the draft resolution and that, after informal consultations, the sponsors had decided to make some revisions to the preamble. A new fifth preambular paragraph had been added which reproduced the text of the fourth preambular paragraph of General Assembly resolution 32/186, and the fourth and fifth preambular paragraphs of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.85 had been combined to form a new fourth preambular paragraph.

18. Mr. LOPEZ PAZ (Cuba) said that the fourth preambular paragraph should refer to "a" Caribbean Group and not "the" Caribbean Group.

19. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to approve the draft resolution without a vote.

20. Draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.85/Rev.1 was approved without a vote.

21. Mr. YEVDOKYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had not opposed the approval of the draft resolution because it understood that the document referred to colonial territories under the administration of the United Kingdom, which was primarily responsible for their development. The Soviet Union maintained on the draft resolution the same position of principle as it had expressed at the time of the adoption of General Assembly resolution 32/186. Any attempt by the United Kingdom to transfer its responsibility for colonial territories would run counter to the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

22. Mr. DALTON (United Kingdom) said that his Government's position on the draft resolution was the same as that which it had taken at the time of the adoption of General Assembly resolution 32/186; he pointed out that his country had already initiated a broad programme of assistance to the territories referred to in the draft resolution.

Draft resolutions A/C.2/33/L.92, L.93, L.94 and L.96

23. Mr. KABACHI (Tunisia) introduced the draft resolutions on behalf of the sponsors. Draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.92 on the United Nations Conference to negotiate an international arrangement to replace the International Wheat Agreement of 1971, as extended, expressed regret at the suspension of negotiations, called upon the Chairman of the Conference to carry out the consultations envisaged on resuming the negotiations and urged Governments to intensify their efforts towards an early and successful conclusion of an international arrangement to replace the 1971 Agreement.
24. Draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.93 on the United Nations Conference on an International Code of Conduct on the Transfer of Technology was designed to ensure that a resumed session of the Conference would be held in the first quarter of 1979, as well as a subsequent session, if requested.
25. Paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.94, on the United Nations Negotiating Conference on a Common Fund under the Integrated Programme for Commodities, the dates for the third session of the Negotiating Conference should be changed to "from 12 to 16 March 1979". Under the draft resolution, the General Assembly would endorse the decision of the Negotiating Conference to hold its third session from 12 to 16 March 1979, request all participating countries to exert all the necessary efforts so as to reach agreement on the basic aspects of the Common Fund so as to provide the necessary basis for work on the articles of agreement and stress the need for reaching such agreement before the fifth session of UNCTAD.
26. Draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.96, on the debt problems of the developing countries, called upon all developed countries to implement in full the agreement on debt problems contained in Trade and Development Board resolution 165 (S-IX) in respect of the most seriously affected, land-locked and island developing countries, particularly the least developed among them. It also called upon the developed countries and international institutions to implement the provisions of Trade and Development Board resolution 132 (XV), on the debt servicing of the developing countries, and welcomed the inclusion of items on debt problems in the provisional agenda of the fifth session of UNCTAD.
27. The sponsors hoped to achieve consensus on all the draft resolutions in the course of informal consultations. At all events, whether or not consensus was reached, the Committee would have to take decisions on them.
28. Mr. MULLER (Secretary of the Committee), outlined the financial implications of the draft resolutions. If draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.92 was adopted, appropriations of \$172,200 for conference services for the meeting of the Interim Committee and of \$354,900 for the resumption of the conference itself would be required. The cost estimates for those meetings had already been submitted to the Fifth Committee in document A/C.5/33/52 which, in the context of the financial implications of expanding the Integrated Programme for Commodities, envisaged an over-all appropriation for commodity conferences which would cover the meetings mentioned. Consequently, no additional financial implications would arise out of the draft resolution.

/...

(Mr. Muller)

29. If draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.94 was adopted, \$168,600 would be needed for conference services. That amount also would be included in the appropriation envisaged in document A/C.5/33/52, so that the draft resolution would create no additional financial implications.

30. The CHAIRMAN said, in response to a request by the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany, that if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to postpone its consideration of the draft resolutions until the following day.

31. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)
(A/33/438, A/C.2/33/L.67, L.90, L.80, L.84 and L.91)

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

32. Mr. EL-JEAAN (Kuwait) said that in paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.67, entitled "Assistance for the reconstruction and development of Lebanon", the words "in Beirut" should be added after the word "establish".

33. The CHAIRMAN said that if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to approve draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.67 without a vote.

34. Draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.67 was approved without a vote.

35. Mr. STIBRAVY (United States of America) said that his delegation had been glad to be a sponsor of the draft resolution, which constituted a reaffirmation of international concern about the needs of Lebanon. The draft resolution aimed to involve all Governments in the work of reconstructing Lebanon and in all long-term activities which required the co-operation of the international community, with a view to ensuring broader participation in the assistance efforts.

36. Mr. YEVDOKHEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had joined in the approval by consensus of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.67; it considered that the United Nations Secretariat had sufficient staff to carry out all the work involved in the implementation of the draft resolution without the need for additional resources.

37. Mr. YAGI (Japan) welcomed the approval by consensus of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.67 and said that his delegation understood the tragic situation in which Lebanon and the Lebanese people found themselves. In that connexion, he pointed out that in April 1978 Japan had made a contribution of \$500,000 as emergency assistance for the refugees in southern Lebanon.

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

38. The CHAIRMAN said that the statement of the financial implications of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.84, entitled "United Nations Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy", was not yet available.

39. Mr. TURPIN (Senegal) said that his delegation wished to become a sponsor of the draft resolution.
40. Mr. MUNGAI (Kenya) said that consultations on draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.84 were continuing, and it was hoped that consensus could soon be reached; he therefore requested that consideration of the draft resolution should be postponed.
41. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, and in view of the circumstances mentioned, he would take it that the Committee agreed to postpone its consideration of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.84 until the following meeting.
42. It was so decided.

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

43. Mr. KINSMAN (Canada), Vice-Chairman, reported on the consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.80. Although the consultations had brought out the desire of all delegations that the draft resolution should be approved by consensus, it had not been possible to reach agreement, despite the efforts made. He hoped that delegations would agree to hold further consultations or to follow some other procedure which would make progress on such an important question possible.
44. Mr. GREET (Australia) said that the draft resolution involved very important and complex questions and that the effort to reach consensus should not be abandoned. The consultations had demonstrated the desire of delegations to deal with the question by consensus and the need to provide all possible assistance to the Palestinian people. His delegation believed that the Committee should avoid any course which would lead to a polarization of positions, and consequently proposed that the adoption of a decision on draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.80 should be postponed until the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly. Precedents existed, such as the decisions taken at the current session in relation to draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.11 and the previous session's draft resolution on the international development strategy, which had been deferred until the current session.
45. Mr. OSVALD (Sweden) said that Governments should be given an opportunity to reflect on the most appropriate way for the United Nations system, on the basis of consensus, to channel assistance to the Palestinian people. His delegation therefore supported the proposal made by the delegation of Australia.
46. Mr. OULD SIDI AHMED (Mauritania) said that the sponsors of the draft resolution had demonstrated their desire to facilitate consensus but, despite their efforts, they had been unable to accept some amendments proposed during the consultations which implied fundamental alterations in the text. The sponsors of the draft resolution opposed the proposal for postponement submitted by the delegation of

/...

(Mr. Ould Sidi Ahmed, Mauritania)

Australia and asked on which rule of the rules of procedure it was based. Since it seemed impossible to reach consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.80, the sponsors requested that the Committee should take a decision on it.

47. Mr. KOCH (Federal Republic of Germany), speaking on behalf of the member States of the European Economic Community, said that it had not been possible to reach consensus during the consultations and that, although these States agreed with the main objectives of the draft resolution, they had difficulty in accepting some of its provisions. He believed that it was important that the draft resolution should be approved by consensus and that more time was needed for its preparation. He therefore supported the proposal made by the delegation of Australia.

48. Mr. SHAPOVALOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that in resolution 3236 (XXIX) the General Assembly had reaffirmed the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to self-determination without external interference, the right to national independence and sovereignty, and the inalienable right of the Palestinians to return to their homes and property. The Palestinian people was waging a just struggle for its inalienable rights, including the right to establish its own State. He quoted from a message from Mr. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and Head of Government of the USSR, to the Executive Committee of the PLO in which he had affirmed that, as a result of its determination and courage and the position it had taken in the long struggle, the PLO had gained international recognition as the sole representative of the Palestinian people, and gave assurances that the USSR would continue to support the Palestinian people in its struggle for its legitimate rights and would not abandon its principles of promoting an over-all settlement and establishing just and lasting peace in the Middle East. His delegation fully supported draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.80.

49. Mr. ARIYO (Nigeria) said that the draft resolution tried to reflect the feelings of the Arab people of Palestine, deprived of dignity, human rights and the right to live in a State of its own. In view of the need to continue the search for a settlement of the problem and to provide the Palestinian people with the assistance it needed, his delegation believed that the best course would be to adopt the proposal made by the delegation of Australia, since that would provide time for reflection.

50. Mr. HUMAIDAN (United Arab Emirates) said that the sponsors of the draft resolution had done everything possible to reach consensus, and he urged all Member States that supported peoples deprived their right to self-determination to oppose the proposal of the delegation of Australia, which would have the effect of postponing assistance to the Palestinian people.

51. Mr. EL-JEAAN (Kuwait) said that the rules of procedure provided no basis for the proposal for postponement submitted by the delegation of Australia; the

/...

(Mr. El-Jeaan, Kuwait)

precedents cited in support of the proposal did not apply to the case under consideration, since in those cases the sponsors themselves had decided to postpone consideration of draft resolutions. Furthermore, the differences of opinion regarding draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.80 were based on questions of principle. Consequently, his delegation requested that a decision should be taken on the draft resolution.

52. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia), referring to the procedural issue raised by the proposal to postpone the discussion of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.80, said that if the proposal were approved, all delegations would be deprived of the opportunity to express their views on the substance of the matter. He did not understand the apprehensions of some delegations; discussions on the item should continue so as to seek an equitable solution. Some delegations had received letters urging them to vote in a particular way and containing the veiled threat of the suspension of United States assistance to development programmes. Pressures of that kind were unacceptable in the United Nations. Similarly, it was not possible to support an unjust cause out of solidarity. The United Nations was composed of sovereign States, which had to make their own decisions. His delegation considered that the consideration of the subject should not be delayed and urged the Committee to reject the proposal for postponement.

53. Mr. KOMIVES (Hungary) said that his delegation firmly supported draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.80 and therefore requested that a decision should be taken on it immediately; he would vote against the proposal made by the delegation of Australia.

54. Mr. ZACHMANN (German Democratic Republic) said that his delegation was glad to join the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.80 and urged that it should be approved without delay, since to defer approval would mean deferring the provision of assistance, thereby allowing purely political considerations to affect a humanitarian matter.

55. Mrs. HIEN (Viet Nam) said that her delegation could not accept the proposal made by several delegations to defer consideration of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.80 until the following General Assembly session. As the representative of a people which had struggled and suffered a great deal, her delegation could not allow the postponement for an entire year of assistance aimed at alleviating a people's sufferings. Consequently, unless that proposal for postponement was withdrawn, her delegation proposed that it should be put to the vote immediately, and urged all to vote against it.

56. Mr. KHADER (Observer for the Palestine Liberation Organization) said that the attempt to have consideration of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.80, on assistance to the Palestinian people, deferred was a criminal manoeuvre against that people. It was a repetition of the situation in 1947 when, in order to secure the adoption of the iniquitous resolution on the partition of Palestine, one great Power had asked for voting to be delayed, had exerted all kinds of pressure and had resorted to

/...

(Mr. Khader, Observer, PLO)

blackmail and threats to have a resolution adopted that had served as a pretext for Zionist aggression, had given rise to the interminable Middle East conflict and was one of the basic reasons for the tragedy of the Palestinian people. Thirty years later the same unacceptable methods were being used to try to prevent the third-world countries from supporting a resolution on assistance to the Palestinian people. However, contrary to what had been true in 1947, those countries, more jealous of their independence and sovereignty, could no longer be coerced: they would not allow the Congress of a great Power to dictate their decisions, nor allow themselves to be cowed by threats such as that mentioned by the representative of Saudi Arabia.

57. In any case, the magnitude of that threat had been exaggerated. Although Senator Helms's amendment sought to prohibit certain appropriations from being made available to the United Nations or its specialized agencies for the purpose of providing technical assistance, that same Senator had also underlined the need to strengthen the role of UNDP. As to the probability that the United States Senate would adopt an amendment endangering the funding of UNDP, it should be borne in mind that that would be a very serious decision and would affect not only the third-world countries but also the policies of the United States and Western Europe which, through their financial participation, had so far managed to control UNDP and its activities. Moreover, a decision of that sort would be dangerous because assistance to the Palestinian people would not provide the sole justification for it.

58. The report of the United States Senate Committee on Appropriations voiced concern over the distribution of United Nations funds to such countries as Viet Nam, Cambodia, Laos, Uganda, Guinea and Cuba, and over the possibility of leakage of United Nations funds to Soviet-sponsored terrorist guerrilla organizations operating in Africa, such as SWAPO. That meant that the United States Senate would refuse to have its country's money used to help a State or a liberation movement with whose system or political ideology it disagreed.

59. Even if the United States were to reduce or stop its financial support to UNDP, the rich countries of the third world would not hesitate to shoulder their responsibility for financing the Programme. The Arab countries, which were contributing over a billion dollars to Arab-African co-operation and several billions to bilateral co-operation and the financing of international agencies, would not hesitate to take the necessary measures to enable UNDP to continue its activities.

60. The draft resolution under discussion had been submitted, in a more explicit form, to the Economic and Social Council. The PLO had no doubt that the member countries of the Group of 77 would support the version that was before the Committee, drawn up in more moderate terms in order to meet their concerns. Furthermore, the reason why the draft resolution was being submitted to the Assembly was that the resolution adopted by the Economic and Social Council was not binding on UNDP, with which the PLO had been in touch concerning the draft resolution.

/...

(Mr. Khader, Observer, PLO)

61. Specifically, the resolution called for assistance for the Palestinian people. No one could say that a displaced, exiled, persecuted, exploited and occupied people did not need it. The great Power which was threatening to deprive UNDP of \$115 million on account of its giving minimum assistance to the Palestinian people had no hesitation about supplying Israel, an occupying country, an aggressor and oppressor, with annual assistance exceeding \$3 billion.

62. It was logical and natural that assistance to the Palestinian people should be provided in consultation with and through the PLO, since the PLO was their sole legitimate representative. Only political blindness or outright hostility to the Palestinian people could explain the denial of that fact, which was recognized not only by the Arab countries and the non-aligned countries, the members of the Islamic Conference, several international conferences and the General Assembly itself, but also, above all, by the Palestinian people themselves. Indeed, the support they gave to their liberation movement surpassed by far the backing that the Governments of some so-called democratic countries had.

63. It was inconceivable that anyone should maintain that assistance to the Palestinian people should be channelled through UNRWA, an agency that cared for refugees. The PLO was asking for assistance for the Palestinian people as a whole, and the Palestinian people rejected any guardianship. The attempt to have voting on the draft resolution deferred was no more than a delaying tactic concealing an obvious hostility to the Palestinian people and a disdain for the will of the overwhelming majority of the delegations present.

64. Mrs. WELLS (United States of America) said that her delegation had requested informal consultations on draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.80 in the hope of reaching consensus; those who had participated in the consultations understood the difficulties of the United States and other delegations. She deeply regretted that consensus had not been reached and reiterated unequivocally that her Government supported the idea of granting assistance to the Palestinian people going far beyond current programmes. Since there was no consensus on the draft resolution, her delegation supported the proposal of the representative of Australia.

65. Mr. GREET (Australia) said that the motives that had led his delegation to submit a proposal for postponement were, first, the impression, based on consultations, that many delegations believed that consensus was impossible and, secondly, the fear of a polarization of positions.

66. Mr. ABOUL-NASR (Oman) pointed out that the Australian delegation had been asked on which rule of procedure its postponement proposal was based.

67. Mr. GREET (Australia) said that rule 119 might serve as a basis for the proposal submitted by his delegation, but that he was seeking the opinion of the Legal Counsel on the subject.

68. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said that, on the basis of his own experience with questions of procedure, he thought that any delegation had the right to present a postponement proposal and that the best course would be to submit the proposal to a vote.

/...

69. Mr. OULD SIDI AHMED (Mauritania) said that a question of principle was involved and that the Committee should take a clear stand on it. The delegation which had proposed postponement of the debate had been asked what the legal basis for its proposal was.
70. Mr. EL-JEAAAN (Kuwait) said that the Australian delegation's proposal lacked any legal foundation; in the precedent he had cited all the co-sponsors had agreed to the postponement of the debate.
71. The CHAIRMAN said that, in view of the statements just made, it would be advisable to have the opinion of the Legal Counsel.
72. Mr. SUY (Legal Counsel) said that for the moment no specific question had been asked and he requested that the question he was to answer should be clearly stated.
73. Mr. OULD SIDI AHMED (Mauritania) said that his delegation had not been informed that the Legal Counsel had been called in. There had been a request that draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.80 should be put to the vote, but there was before the Committee a proposal for postponing the debate, the legal grounds for which were uncertain.
74. Mr. EL-JEAAAN (Kuwait) said that the Australian delegation had submitted a proposal that consideration of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.80, under agenda item 12, should be deferred. Rule 119 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly referred to adjourning the debate, not on draft resolutions, but on the item under discussion.
75. Mr. SUY (Legal Counsel) said that, in his opinion, the rule that applied to the case under discussion was rule 116 and not rule 119. At first glance, rule 116 made it no easier to answer the question, since the text of that rule was somewhat ambiguous. The French version referred to "une question", the English to "any matter" and "the item", and the Spanish to "cualquier asunto" and "el tema". That ambiguity had raised problems on earlier occasions.
76. Although he had not been able to get the references on all the precedents for the case under discussion, he was in a position to cite the three most recent precedents, which had occurred at the thirtieth and thirty-second sessions. In one case, at the thirty-second session, the Third Committee had decided to defer a vote on a draft resolution until the thirty-third session. In another case, the General Assembly had decided, on 19 December 1977, to defer consideration of a draft resolution on a broader matter which, in turn, had arisen in connexion with its consideration of the report of the Economic and Social Council.
77. Those precedents, in his view, authorized the conclusion that the terms of rule 116 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly were interpreted to mean that discussion of a draft resolution which formed part of a broader item of the agenda could be deferred.

78. Mr. EL-JEAAI (Kuwait) said that he doubted whether the cases mentioned by the Legal Counsel referred to a postponement of debate or to the postponement of a decision on a draft resolution.

79. At the request of the representative of Saudi Arabia, a recorded vote was taken on the Australian proposal.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Luxembourg, Malawi, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Singapore, Sweden, Thailand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Against: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Empire, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Abstaining: Bhutan, Bolivia, Burma, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Fiji, Gabon, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Lesotho, Mexico, Nepal, Portugal, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Trinidad and Tobago, United Republic of Tanzania, Zaire.

80. The Australian proposal was rejected by 65 votes to 36, with 30 abstentions.

81. Mr. KOCH (Federal Republic of Germany), speaking on behalf of the member States of the European Economic Community, said that those countries could not vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.80, even though they agreed that assistance should be given to the Palestinian people through the United Nations system, because that draft resolution called for the implementation of other resolutions with which their delegations disagreed. Furthermore, the approval of the draft resolution might have an adverse effect on United Nations assistance programmes.

82. Mr. OROM (Israel) said that the economic and social bodies of the United Nations had been subjected to continuing pressure by some Arab States and some of their allies to grant their maximalist demands, regardless of the consequences for

/...

(Mr. Oron, Israel)

developing countries and for the entire international community, as in the case of the draft resolution under consideration.

33. Resolution 1818 (LV) of the Economic and Social Council, adopted in 1973, had been a gross violation of the Charter rules pertaining to sovereign equality of States and the universality of the United Nations, and of the right of all Member States to participate in the activities of the Organization, because that resolution had established the Economic Commission for Western Asia under conditions that allowed only the Arab States, and not Israel, to be members.

34. Not having been able to join the United Nations in the only legal way, the so-called Palestine Liberation Organization had come in by the back window by obtaining membership in a subsidiary organ, ECWA, and the draft resolution under discussion was a similar manoeuvre for its entry into other organizations and specialized agencies of the United Nations system.

35. By alluding to resolutions of the Economic and Social Council, the draft resolution was reserving a decisive role for the PLO in its implementation, even though that organization blatantly discriminated against a State Member of the United Nations by denying its right to self-determination and national sovereignty.

36. His delegation would vote against draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.80 because, in its judgement, that document did not reflect a sincere preoccupation with the Palestinians' social and economic conditions, which could be improved greatly by the huge surplus financial resources at the disposal of some Arab oil-producing countries. If the intentions of the sponsors were genuine, they would raise their contributions to UNRWA, which was the United Nations agency for assisting Palestinian Arabs, instead of promoting a draft resolution inspired by narrow political interests.

37. Mrs. WELLS (United States of America) said that her delegation would be forced to vote against draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.80, despite the efforts made to tone down its text. The draft resolution, in its view, sought to use United Nations assistance programmes for political ends. She observed that the representative of the sponsors had referred to assistance to the PLO, not to the Palestinian people, and that the amendments proposed by her delegation had been rejected, even though they had dealt only with references to earlier controversial documents without in any way modifying the operative part of the draft resolution.

38. She urged the governing bodies of the United Nations system, which would have to interpret that resolution, to take no steps that would give the political interests of any group precedence over those of the Palestinian people themselves and of the developing countries as a whole. Her Government supported assistance for the Palestinian people, but it rejected the Economic and Social Council resolutions that had been instrumental in heightening the political importance of a group.

39. At the request of the representative of Iraq, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.80.

/...

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Empire, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Canada, Israel, Malawi, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Burma, Chile, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Portugal, Singapore, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay.

90. Draft resolution A/C.2/33/L.80 was approved by 93 votes to 5, with 33 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.