

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-SECOND SESSION  
Official Records\*



SECOND COMMITTEE  
55th meeting  
held on  
Wednesday, 7 December 1977  
at 10.30 a.m.  
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 55th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. JANKOWITSCH (Austria)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 61: OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued)

(f) UNITED NATIONS CHILDREN'S FUND (continued)

(h) UNITED NATIONS SPECIAL FUND FOR LAND-LOCKED DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 70: ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AMONG DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 72: TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION AMONG DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION AMONG DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 62: UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME (continued):

(a) REPORT OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL (continued)

(c) UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON DESERTIFICATION (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.2/32/SR.55  
9 December 1977

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 11.05 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 61: OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued)

(f) UNITED NATIONS CHILDREN'S FUND (continued)

(h) UNITED NATIONS SPECIAL FUND FOR LAND-LOCKED DEVELOPING COUNTRIES  
(continued)

Draft resolution A/C.2/32/L.66/Rev.1

1. The CHAIRMAN announced that the draft resolution (A/C.2/32/L.66/Rev.1) had no financial implications.
2. Mr. TUKAN (Jordan) introduced the revised draft resolution and announced that Qatar, Senegal and Tunisia were also sponsoring it. Paragraph 1 had been revised in the light of comments from delegations.
3. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objections, he would take it that the Committee approved the draft resolution without a vote.
4. It was so decided.
5. Mr. LADOR (Israel) said that the survey proposed in the draft resolution might turn out to be a procedure to politicize a purely humanitarian issue. Questions relating to refugees should be referred to UNRWA, which was the body established by the General Assembly to deal with such matters. Constructive co-operation between host countries could best be achieved through the participation of Jordan and some of the other sponsors in the dialogue which had started in the region in recent weeks rather than by continuing to manipulate the refugee problem for political purposes. His delegation had nevertheless participated in the consensus since its achievements in the provision of health services for refugee children were a matter of record.
6. Mr. TUKAN (Jordan) said that his delegation considered the resolution a purely humanitarian one and did not wish to politicize any issue. While his delegation appreciated the efforts made by UNRWA, it felt that there were some health dangers for children of Palestine refugees. It was for that reason that the draft resolution had been submitted in the Second Committee.

Draft resolution A/C.2/32/L.70/Rev.1

7. Mr. SIDDIQ (Afghanistan), introducing the revised draft resolution (A/C.2/32/L.70/Rev.1), announced that Laos and Lesotho had become sponsors. He said that the word "voluntary" should be added after "generous" in paragraph 1.
8. Owing to the regrettable failure by the developed and other potential donor countries to respond constructively at the recent pledging conference, the Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries could not become operational as yet.

/...

(Mr. Siddiq, Afghanistan)

In view of that fact, the sponsors were urging developed countries and other potential donors to contribute to the Fund. The purpose of the draft resolution was accordingly, to have the Administrator of UNDP, together with the Secretary-General of UNCTAD, propose interim arrangements to implement the Fund's aims and purposes, which could be summarized as compensating land-locked countries for their additional transport and transit costs. The arrangements would, of course, be subject to approval by the UNDP Governing Council.

9. He expressed the hope that the draft resolution could be approved without a vote.

10. Mr. LOQUET (Belgium) suggested that the draft resolution should be put to the vote.

11. Mr. KIFRA (Spain) pointed out that the third preambular paragraph and paragraph 1 referred specifically to developed countries, whereas the wording used in General Assembly resolution 31/177, on the Statute of the Special Fund, referred to "all international organizations and financial institutions, as well as potential donor countries ...". It seemed in fact, that the Fund had not become operational because of the failure of all three categories of donor to respond to the appeal for funds. The sponsors might therefore wish to revise paragraphs in question in order to make them consistent with paragraph 4 of resolution 31/177.

12. Mr. AHIRDIVANI (Iran) said that the draft resolution posed very serious problems for his Delegation and requested that the Committee's decision on it should be deferred.

13. Mr. SIDDIQ (Afghanistan) supported that request; the sponsors needed time to consider the suggestion of the Spanish representative.

AGENDA ITEM 70: ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AMONG DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.2/32/L.64/Rev.1

14. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the statement of the financial implications of draft resolution (A/32/312/Add.1).

15. The meeting was suspended at 11.25 a.m. and resumed at 11.45 a.m.

16. Mr. HALL (Jamaica), introducing the revised draft resolution (A/C.2/32/L.64/Rev.1), drew attention to the changes in paragraphs 2 and 5 of the documents, the references to the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination and to the decisions based on the Programme of Action adopted at the Third Ministerial Meeting of the Group of 77 had been revised. He expressed the hope that the draft resolution could be adopted by consensus.

/...

17. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objections, he would take it that the Committee decided to approve draft resolution A/C.2/32/L.64/Rev.1 without a vote.

18. It was so decided.

19. Mr. LOQUET (Belgium), speaking on behalf of the member States of the European Economic Community, reiterated the support of those countries for the concept of economic co-operation among developing countries and hence for draft resolution A/C.2/32/L.64/Rev.1. Referring to paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, he stressed the need for full co-operation among all Member States of the United Nations in any discussions held on the subject in pursuance of that paragraph.

20. Ms. LADD (United States of America) reiterated the reservations expressed by her delegation at the thirty-first session of the General Assembly with regard to the subject-matter of paragraph 4. Her delegation interpreted the words "in accordance with their established procedures and practices" to mean that the support measures in question would be the provision of meeting-rooms and interpretation services at United Nations Headquarters for the United Nations body concerned and for all United Nations Members of that body.

21. Mr. ZACHMANN (German Democratic Republic), speaking on behalf of the delegations of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and his own delegation, said that the socialist countries had always supported the efforts of developing countries to strengthen and defend their political and economic independence and to raise their cultural, social and economic levels. They were prepared to assist such countries on the basis of mutual co-operation in trade and other areas. Moreover, they had an understanding of some related concepts dealt with in other resolutions on economic co-operation among developing countries, in particular the concepts of interdependence and the responsibility of the developed countries for the economic development of developing countries, on which they had already stated their position.

22. The socialist countries hoped that increased co-ordination of United Nations activities in the area of economic co-operation among developing countries would be achieved by finding the most effective ways of organizing activities in that area, rather than by using funds from the regular budget or increasing the number of Secretariat posts. That end could be achieved by better co-ordinating activities within the Secretariat, within the United Nations system as a whole and with organizations representing the developing countries. If such steps were taken, Secretariat activities in pursuance of the draft resolution could be made effective without incurring excessive budget expenditures.

23. Mr. BROWN (Australia) said that his delegation had expressed reservations at the thirty-first session concerning the subject-matter of paragraph 4, and

(Mr. Brown, Australia)

expressed the hope that the executive heads of the specialized agencies would exercise restraint in implementing that paragraph.

24. Mr. DELIVANIS (Greece) said that his delegation had joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/32/L.64/Rev.1 in the belief that world development would be greatly enhanced by economic co-operation among developing countries.

AGENDA ITEM 72: TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION AMONG DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION AMONG DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.2/32/L.63/Rev.1

25. Mr. HALL (Jamaica), introducing the revised draft resolution (A/C.2/32/L.63/Rev.1), drew attention to paragraph 1, which had been revised to show that the recommendation of the Working Group on Technical Co-operation among Developing Countries had been modified. Paragraphs 2, 4 and 6 had had to be revised accordingly. He drew attention to the new phrase at the end of paragraph 4 and to the content of paragraph 5.

26. Mr. TARLAN (Turkey) said that his delegation wished to be a sponsor of the revised draft resolution.

27. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee approved the draft resolution without a vote.

28. It was so decided.

29. Mr. OSVALD (Sweden), speaking on behalf of the Nordic delegations, said that those delegations had from the outset fully supported the concept of technical co-operation among developing countries as a major complement to traditional North-South technical co-operation and believed that a vigorous and determined pursuit of self-reliance by such means would be an important step towards the achievement of a new international economic order. They also viewed technical co-operation among developing countries as an important vehicle for effectively utilizing the unique development experience of third world countries and of creating new knowledge and know-how of relevance for those countries. At the same time, however, the Nordic countries shared to some extent the apprehensions expressed during the second session of the Preparatory Committee about the size and complexity of the problems that had gradually emerged in the debates on the subject. Nevertheless, they were looking forward to the Conference.

30. The Nordic countries hoped that in the preparatory work of the United Nations the fundamental conceptual problem of the exact role of developed countries in the new form of technical co-operation could be solved. In that respect, the role of "silent partners" whose only contribution would be in the form of funds was insufficient; even the idea of "untying" aid so as to permit a much wider

/...

(Mr. Osvald, Sweden)

selection of development inputs, which had in fact been practised in the Nordic countries' development co-operation for some time, was not sufficient in itself to define the role of developed countries. It was also doubtful whether their own experience in co-operation could adequately justify their participation. In one respect, however, their role was clear: in all decisions affecting policies and procedures of the United Nations system, the views of all Members of the Organization had to be taken into account. The problem affected them as individual members of the world community, and it was as such that their roles were not satisfactorily defined. The Nordic delegations therefore hoped that that problem could be settled at the third session of the Preparatory Committee.

31. Mr. CHAO Kung-ta (China) said that his delegation supported draft resolution A/C.2/32/L.63/Rev.1. Reference was made in paragraphs 1, 2 and 6 to the report of the Working Group on Technical Co-operation among Developing Countries which, taken as a whole, reflected certain just proposals and reasonable demands of the developing countries. However, paragraph 40 of that report reproduced the clichés regularly trumpeted by one super-Power to the effect that resources released by disarmament should be used for development. That super-Power paid lip-service every year to disarmament, yet it was consistently engaging in unbridled arms expansion. As everyone knew, China had always been opposed to that type of deceptive propaganda.

32. Mr. YEVDOKHEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Soviet Union attached great importance to technical co-operation among developing countries in the context of the development programmes of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies. Its principled attitude to the expansion and intensification of that co-operation determined its unchanging and consistent support for the efforts of developing countries to defend their political and economic independence, to restructure international economic relations on just and democratic foundations, and to strengthen their national economies on the basis of independent development.

33. The Soviet Union attached great importance to the sovereign right of Governments of developing countries to decide for themselves on the type of technical co-operation best suited to them. That co-operation should also be linked with national development plans. Technical co-operation among developing countries should be broad and comprehensive and should not be limited to one group of countries; countries with different social and economic systems should take part in it. The Soviet Union had reaffirmed its position on technical co-operation at the twenty-third and twenty-fourth sessions of the Governing Council of UNDP. Nevertheless, it believed that the recruitment of experts and consultants, the placing of fellows, the award of subcontracts and the purchase of equipment should be carried out on the basis of the principle of equitable geographical distribution, taking into account the experience of all countries, regardless of their social systems. It reaffirmed its view that the

/...

(Mr. Yevdokeyev, USSR)

dissemination of information on technical co-operation among developing countries should be carried out by the United Nations Secretariat, which had information services equipped to do that work.

34. Although the draft resolution had not been available in Russian, the Soviet Union, in order to save time, had not opposed the taking of a decision on it. However, it did not want its co-operation in that instance to set a precedent.

35. Mr. XIFRA (Spain) thanked the sponsors for taking into account the views his delegation had expressed and so enabling it to join in the consensus on the draft resolution. It believed that the approval of the draft resolution represented a positive step towards the objectives which were sought by all, namely, the full and equitable utilization of the potential of all participants in the international development process.

36. Mr. QUENTIN (Italy) said that his country had always been in favour of technical co-operation among developing countries, as a new dimension of vertical trade co-operation and one which enabled the experience of developed countries to be sought and utilized by developing countries.

AGENDA ITEM 62: UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME (continued):

(a) REPORT OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL (continued)

(c) UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON DESERTIFICATION (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.2/32/L.19/Rev.1

37. Ms. OLDFELT (Sweden) introduced draft resolution A/C.2/32/L.19/Rev.1 on behalf of the sponsors, and announced that Bangladesh, Denmark and Finland had joined the list of sponsors.

38. Draft resolution A/C.2/32/L.19/Rev.1 was approved without a vote.

39. Mr. DONNELLY (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had been glad to join in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/32/L.19/Rev.1 and thanked the sponsors for taking into account several of its suggestions. With regard to paragraph 5, however, his delegation had already stated that it would co-operate bilaterally with any country with respect to material remnants of wars but that it did not consider it appropriate for UNEP to become involved in the question. His Government would therefore decline the invitation in paragraph 5.

40. Mr. SEIFMAN (United States of America) said that his Government considered that the subject of paragraph 5 was not appropriate for consideration by UNEP.

41. Mr. NELLI FEROCI (Italy) said that the position of his delegation on the

/...

(Mr. Nelli Feroci, Italy)

question of material remnants of wars had been expressed on a number of occasions. It considered that international co-operation with respect to the material remnants of wars, particularly mines, should be based essentially on bilateral relations between the countries concerned. That was in accordance with the recommendation of the Secretary-General in his report (A/32/137) that all States which were responsible for the presence of remnants of wars on the territory of other States should provide the latter, through convenient arrangements, with all information which could be useful in the rehabilitation of the environment. Although Italy strongly preferred to deal with the matter on a bilateral basis, it had in February 1977 sent the Executive Director of UNEP an exhaustive report on the subject prepared by the Italian Chief of Staff of the Army.

42. With regard to paragraph 1, on the report of the Governing Council of UNEP, his delegation hoped that the establishment of a programme activity centre for regional seas, mentioned in paragraph 207 of that report, would not mean that the UNEP office in Geneva would be closed down, as it was carrying out an important function in assisting in the substantive work of intergovernmental bodies concerned with environmental matters affecting the Mediterranean.

43. Mr. VALLE (Brazil) said that, with regard to paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.2/32/L.19/Rev.1, his delegation reaffirmed its position that questions relating to the utilization of shared natural resources were too complex to be dealt with within the framework of UNEP. The legal implications of the subject should be referred to the International Law Commission. Since it had been decided to reconvene the Intergovernmental Working Group of Experts, his delegation believed that that group should concentrate on purely environmental aspects and that its conclusions should not be binding.

44. Ms. COURSON (France) said that her Government favoured a bilateral approach to the problem of material remnants of war. It therefore could not associate itself with paragraph 5.

45. Mr. CHAO Kung-ta (China) said that his delegation supported draft resolution A/C.2/32/L.19/Rev.1. Nevertheless, it felt bound to point out that China had not participated in the vote on decision 101 (V) at the fifth session of the Governing Council. China's position on that decision remained unchanged.

46. Mr. LOQUET (Belgium) said that, for the reasons that had been expressed by other delegations, Belgium had reservations about paragraph 5.

47. Mr. RUCKTESCHELL (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation had joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/32/L.19/Rev.1 because of its favourable attitude towards UNEP. With respect to paragraph 5, it endorsed the statements made by the United Kingdom, the United States, Italy, France and Belgium. His Government was prevented by the agreement on the external debts of the Federal Republic of Germany signed on 27 February 1953 in London, from agreeing to any obligations on claims resulting from World War II outside a general regulation. Furthermore, it believed that UNEP was not the competent body to deal with such complex legal problems. His Government had repeatedly declared its willingness to engage in bilateral discussions, where appropriate. It could not participate in any co-operation within the framework of UNEP as envisaged in paragraph 5.

/...



48. Mr. EL SILIBANI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) observed that, in the course of the consultations which had led to the revision of draft resolution A/C.2/32/L.19, some Western European delegations had objected to the wording of the final phrase of paragraph 5, which, in the original version, had read "urges Governments to co-operate with the Executive Director of the Programme in the implementation of the decision" (decision 101 (V)). In the view of his delegation, the fact that delegations had sought to amend or delete or had expressed reservations about that phrase did not alter the fact that the material remnants of war, particularly mines, had an adverse effect on the environment and that the problem called for the co-operation of all members of the international community, in particular those countries which for historical reasons were best able to contribute to its solution.

49. His delegation did not wish to place the countries concerned in an awkward situation; instead, it appealed to them to help to solve a problem which was continuing to cause serious human and material damage. In the preamble to the Charter of the United Nations, Member States had pledged to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war; accordingly, co-operation to remove the material remnants of war, particularly mines, had to be regarded as an international priority. His delegation was not attributing a legal responsibility to certain countries, but it did believe that all countries had a moral obligation to help to eliminate a problem which caused both human suffering and environmental damage.

50. Mr. PHAM DUONG (Socialist Republic of Viet Nam) expressed reservations on the final phrase of paragraph 5. In his view, any country which was responsible for waging a war of aggression against another country should be held completely responsible for removing all material remnants of that war which continued to cause human and material damage.

51. Mr. VAN BUUREN (Netherlands) said that, although his delegation had joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/32/L.19/Rev.1, it shared the view expressed by a number of delegations, namely, that the United Nations Environment Programme should not increase its involvement in the matters referred to in paragraph 5. That problem was best handled through direct contacts between the Governments concerned.

draft resolution A/C.2/32/L.37/Rev.1

52. Mr. SIDDIQ (Afghanistan), introducing draft resolution A/C.2/32/L.37/Rev.1 on behalf of the sponsors, explained that, following informal consultations, all references to land-locked developing countries had been removed from the draft resolution, in order to make it consistent with the resolution adopted by the United Nations Conference on Desertification and thereby to enable consensus to be reached. The draft resolution was, in fact, a follow-up to the resolution adopted by the United Nations Conference on Desertification, paragraph 2 of which had recommended that the General Assembly should request the Secretary-General to report on the implementation of that resolution at the thirty-third session of the General Assembly. He hoped that the Committee would approve the draft resolution by consensus.

53. He announced that the delegations of Bolivia, Botswana, Democratic Yemen and the Niger had become sponsors of the draft resolution.

54. Mr. DONNELLY (United Kingdom) pointed out that the "decisions" of the United Nations Conference on Desertification referred to in paragraphs 1 and 2 had in fact been recommendations.

55. Mr. SIDDIQ (Afghanistan) said that the sponsors agreed to replace all references to decisions in those paragraphs by references to recommendations.

56. Mr. RUCKTESCHELL (Federal Republic of Germany) drew the Committee's attention to the fact that the "additional international and bilateral assistance" referred to in paragraph 2 was not in fact available.

57. Mr. BROWN (Australia) said that his delegation, among others, had suggested changes to draft resolution A/C.2/32/L.37 which had not been taken into account in the revised version. For instance, they had raised objections to paragraph 2 of the draft resolution because in proposing additional assistance it went further than the recommendations of the United Nations Conference on Desertification. Accordingly, his delegation expressed its reservations with regard to the word "additional".

58. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objections, he would take it that the Committee decided to approve draft resolution A/C.2/32/L.37/Rev.1, as orally revised, without a vote.

59. It was so decided.

60. Mr. SEIFMAN (United States of America) said that his delegation wished to make it clear that it accepted the reference, in the third preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, to the principle of the permanent sovereignty of States over their natural resources only in so far as the application of that principle was compatible with international law.

61. Mr. YEVDOKHEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation fully supported the draft resolution, as it was his country's position of principle that assistance to the developing countries, particularly the least developed countries, should be increased. On the recommendations of the United Nations Conference on Desertification referred to in paragraph 2, his delegation's position was identical with that expressed by the Soviet Union at the Conference itself.

62. Mr. DE BEIR (Belgium), speaking on behalf of the member States of the European Economic Community, stressed that the principle of permanent sovereignty of States over their natural resources, referred to in the third preambular paragraph, had to be applied in strict conformity with international law.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.