



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 58th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. TUKAN (Jordan)

later: Mr. JANKOWITSCH (Austria)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 73: UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT
(continued)

AGENDA ITEM 61: OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued)

(a) UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (continued)

(b) UNITED NATIONS CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT FUND (continued)

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

AGENDA ITEM 62: UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME

OTHER MATTERS

* 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.

The meeting was called to order at 4 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 73: UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT
(continued) (A/C.3/32/L.88, L.90/Rev.1, L.96 and L.94)

Draft resolutions A/C.2/32/L.88 and A/C.2/32/L.90/Rev.1

1. The CHAIRMAN said that, following the new consultations held on the problem of the venue of the Conference, the opinion seemed to prevail among delegations that the matter should be decided by secret ballot, which would entail the withdrawal of the procedural motion submitted by Austria, Mexico and Argentina.
2. Mr. BARCELO (Mexico) did not agree with the Chairman and believed that the solution might lie in the Argentine proposal, which had the advantage that it would avoid having to vote against any specific country, because it would simply be a question of voting for a draft resolution, each delegation giving its name. That was an appropriate proposal which had moreover been submitted as a point of order, which gave it priority over earlier draft resolutions or proposals.
3. The CHAIRMAN said that, in view of the proposal of the Mexican representative, which in a way put back the situation to the starting point, he considered that rule 131 of the rules of procedure should apply, whereby if two or more proposals related to the same question, the Committee should vote on them in the order in which they had been submitted. Of course, according to that same rule, the Committee could decide otherwise.
4. Mr. KINSMAN (Canada) said that the Chairman was right in thinking that the great majority of delegations would prefer a secret ballot to decide the question. In order not to prolong the debate, he proposed that a vote should be taken immediately on the Austrian proposal, which unquestionably had priority, that the question should be deferred for consideration in plenary session and that it would be decided there how the voting was to take place.
5. Mr. FERRERE (Uruguay) said that the Committee had to decide, firstly, whether it was competent as he believed to deal with the item or not. If it did, it should decide immediately what proposals it was going to vote on and in what order. That would be the only way to avoid infringing the rights of those parties which disagreed with the proposed procedure, and no particular procedure could be adopted by interpreting a supposed consensus.
6. The CHAIRMAN insisted that, since three procedural motions had been submitted, they should be considered in the order of submission, under article 131.
7. Mr. BARCELO (Mexico) said that, as he understood it, in the prior consultations it had been agreed in principle that: (1) the question would be resolved immediately in the Committee itself; (2) it would be decided by a recorded roll-call vote, whether the Committee preferred a secret ballot or not; (3) a vote would be taken on the number of resolutions submitted by the various groups. That

/...

(Mr. Barcelo, Mexico)

expeditious procedure would make it possible to settle the question without taking away more time from other problems of vital importance.

8. The CHAIRMAN said that he considered that the representative of Mexico had submitted a fourth procedural motion, which should be considered in the order provided for in the rules of procedure.

9. Mr. BRECKENRIDGE (Sri Lanka) said that the subject of such prolonged debate was whether the proposals should be voted upon in the order of submission or whether the Committee should "decide otherwise". With regard to "deciding otherwise" the accepted practice was to consider the proposals on the basis of their distance from the question under discussion. In his delegation's opinion, the question farthest away from the item was whether the Committee should consider it itself or refer it to the plenary; the question of whether or not voting should be by secret ballot came second; only after resolving those questions, could the question of the relative priority of resolutions be dealt with.

10. Mr. QUENTIN (Italy) agreed with the Chairman that the proposals before the Committee should be considered in their order of submission. Accordingly, the Austrian proposal to defer the question to the plenary should be considered first. The plenary would then decide in due course whether or not the voting should be by secret ballot.

11. Mr. AKTAN (Turkey) said that he shared the view expressed by the delegation of Sri Lanka which should make it possible to save time.

12. Mr. KUEN (Austria) considered that the proposal of the representative of Sri Lanka had the same intent as the Austrian proposal, since the latter requested that the draft resolutions A/C.2/32/L.88 and L.90/Rev.1 should be referred to the plenary and, at the same time, asked that that proposal should take precedence over the others.

13. The CHAIRMAN said that, in view of the four previous statements, he believed that a vote could be taken on the Austrian proposal to refer draft resolutions A/C.2/32/L.88 and L.90/Rev.1 for consideration to the General Assembly in plenary session.

14. Mr. BARCELO (Mexico) requested that the vote should be taken by roll call.

15. At the request of the representative of Mexico, a vote was taken by roll call.

16. El Salvador, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bulgaria, Burundi, Eyelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan,

/...

Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Malawi, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Senegal, Singapore, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Zambia.

Against: Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Honduras, Iraq, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Sri Lanka, Surinam, United Republic of Cameroon, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Burma, Cape Verde, Central African Empire, Chad, China, Congo, Cyprus, Egypt, Guyana, Iran, Jordan, Kenya, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zaire.

17. The Austrian proposal was adopted by 51 votes to 27, with 47 abstentions.

18. Mrs. WELLS (United States of America) said that her delegation understood that when the question of the Conference was considered in plenary session, it would be possible to decide between the three venues proposed.

19. Mr. BARCELO (Mexico) said that the problem of priority between the two draft resolutions still remained, and he asked whether the Committee could find a solution regarding the order in which they were to be considered in plenary session. He noted, moreover, that no decision had been taken on the United States offer to host the Conference.

20. The CHAIRMAN said that, as had been confirmed by the Office of Legal Affairs, the plenary would have to decide in what order the draft resolutions should be considered.

21. Mr. Jankowitsch (Austria) took the Chair.

Draft decision A/C.2/32/L.94

22. Mr. HALL (Jamaica), introducing draft decision A/C.2/32/L.94 on preparatory work for the United Nations Conference on Science and Technology for Development, said that, according to the draft decision, the Committee on Science and Technology for Development would meet from 23 January to 3 February 1978 acting as the Preparatory Committee for the Conference, and a recommendation was made to the Economic and Social Council that it should schedule the fourth session of the Committee on Science and Technology for Development from 6 to 10 February 1978. He hoped that the draft decision would be adopted by consensus.

23. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objections, he would take it that draft decision A/C.2/32/L.94 was adopted by consensus.

24. The draft decision was adopted without a vote.

AGENDA ITEM 61: OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued)

(h) UNITED NATIONS SPECIAL FUND FOR LAND-LOCKED DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (continued)
(A/C.2/32/L.70/Rev.2)

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

25. Mr. SIDDIQ (Afghanistan), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, who had been joined by Zambia, introduced revised draft resolution A/C.2/32/L.70/Rev.2, concerning the United Nations Special Fund for Land-Locked Developing Countries and said that the changes in the draft resolution contained in document A/C.2/32/L.70/Rev.1 were the deletion of the third preambular paragraph and its replacement by operative paragraph 1. He hoped that the draft resolution could be adopted without a vote.

26. Mr. XIFRA (Spain), pointing out that his delegation had had certain difficulties with the draft resolution, expressed appreciation to the sponsors, and particularly to the representative of Afghanistan, for their constructive and co-operative attitudes.

27. The CHAIRMAN announced that Bolivia, the Central African Empire, Chad, Malawi and Rwanda had become sponsors of the draft resolution.

28. Mr. SALIM (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that his country had always supported efforts in favour of land-locked developing countries and had therefore participated in and pledged its contribution at the Pledging Conference for the Special Fund. His delegation would support draft resolution A/C.2/32/L.70/Rev.2.

29. Draft resolution A/C.2/32/L.70/Rev.2 was adopted by 96 votes to none, with 17 abstentions.

30. Mr. KUEN (Austria) said that he had voted for the draft resolution because he felt it was necessary to intensify efforts in favour of the land-locked developing countries. At the previous session, his delegation had also voted for resolution 31/177, and, at the 1977 Pledging Conference, it had reserved part of its contribution to UNDP for projects for the benefit of the land-locked developing countries. However, the results of the Pledging Conference and of the vote which had just taken place indicated that it was necessary to give further study to the question of how assistance to those countries could be made more effective.

31. Mr. DE BEIR (Belgium), speaking on behalf of the member countries of EEC, said that they had abstained for the same reasons that led them to abstain in the vote on resolution 31/177 at the thirty-first session of the General Assembly.

32. Mr. OSVALD (Sweden) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote because it was not convinced of the need for or usefulness of the Special Fund. He was

(Mr. Osvald, Sweden)

aware of the grave problems facing the land-locked developing countries but felt that UNDP should be the principal source of assistance in dealing with those problems.

33. Mr. SEIFMAN (United States of America) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote because, although it was aware of the need to provide assistance to the land-locked developing countries, it felt that there was no need to establish a special fund for the purpose but that aid should flow through existing agencies. He had no objection to contributions being made to the Fund by other countries.

34. Mr. SCHROFF (New Zealand) said that his delegation had abstained for the same reasons that had compelled it to abstain with respect to resolution 31/177.

35. Mr. YEVDOKHEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his country was aware of the special needs of the land-locked developing countries, as could be seen from the relations it maintained with neighbouring land-locked countries and from the fact that it was a party to the Convention on Transit and Trade of Land-locked States. He had accordingly voted in favour of the draft resolution. He thanked the co-sponsors for the amendment which had been made and pointed out that it did not appear in the Russian version.

36. Mr. NAKAMURA (Japan) said that his delegation had abstained because, although it was aware of the special problems facing the land-locked developing countries, its position with respect to the Special Fund had not changed.

37. Mr. SMALL (Canada) said that he had abstained in the vote for reasons which were already known to the Committee. He understood that the land-locked developing countries had special problems and needs but felt that the proliferation of special funds for special purposes could prove counterproductive for the development of those very countries. Moreover, if a fund of that kind was to be established, the administrative and overhead costs should be financed by the fund itself and should not require any additional outlay by UNDP.

(b) UNITED NATIONS CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT FUND (continued) (A/C.2/32/L.92)

Draft decision A/C.2/32/L.92.

38. Mr. BOUBAKAR (Upper Volta) proposed that the phrase beginning "and that the administrative expenses ..." should be deleted from the draft decision.

39. Mr. MADEY (Yugoslavia), Mr. MWANGAGUHUNGA (Uganda), Mr. HALL (Jamaica) and Mr. BENHOCINE (Algeria) supported the draft decision as amended by the representative of the Upper Volta.

40. Mr. YEVDOKHEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he did not understand the reason for the amendment proposed by the Upper Volta, since the administrative expenses of special funds were normally met by voluntary contributions.

41. Mr. BOUBAKAR (Upper Volta) said that, unless the General Assembly decided otherwise, the practice followed thus far should be maintained.

42. Mr. SEIFMAN (United States of America), Miss COURSON (France), Mr. QUENTIN (Italy) and Mr. NEUHOFF (Federal Republic of Germany) expressed reservations regarding the amendment proposed by the representative of the Upper Volta and said that they would prefer to see the text of draft decision A/C.2/32/L.92 remain as it was.

43. Mr. DIARRA (Mali) said that the United Nations Capital Development Fund had been leading a provisional existence since its establishment and that, until the General Assembly adopted a definite decision on the subject, the rules governing the Fund should not be changed. He therefore supported the amendment proposed by the Upper Volta.

44. Mr. MADEY (Yugoslavia) recalled that the draft decision under consideration had been proposed by the Chairman and that such drafts did not normally lead to controversy. On the other hand, neither the decision adopted in 1976 nor previous decisions had contained the phrase whose deletion was proposed, and certain delegations, including his own, felt that there was no reason to change that practice.

45. The CHAIRMAN said that he regarded the amendment proposed by the representative of the Upper Volta as appropriate and suggested that the final part of draft decision A/C.2/32/L.92 should be deleted.

46. Mr. HALL (Jamaica) proposed that, as in previous years, the Committee should adopt by consensus the draft decision as orally amended by the Chairman.

47. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee decided to adopt draft decision A/C.2/32/L.92, as orally amended, by consensus.

48. The draft decision, as orally amended by the Chairman, was adopted without a vote.

49. Mr. YEVDOKHEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had joined in the consensus on the basis of the statement he had made before the vote.

50. Mr. SEIFMAN (United States of America) said that he reserved his position with respect to the phrase that had been deleted.

51. Mr. NEUHOFF (Federal Republic of Germany) said that he interpreted the consensus in the light of the comments his delegation had made before the adoption of the draft decision.

52. Miss COURSON (France) said that her delegation reserved the position it would take in the Fifth Committee.

53. Mr. NAKAMURA (Japan) said that he had joined in the consensus but that, in his judgement, the last phrase should have been retained.

(a) UNITED NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (continued) (A/C.2/32/L.93)

Draft resolution A/C.2/32/L.93

54. Mr. HALL (Jamaica) introduced the draft resolution and said that its essential purpose was to provide UNDP with sufficient financial resources for the Second Programming Cycle and to enhance the effectiveness of its activities as much as possible. He pointed out that the draft resolution under consideration was the product of intensive consultations, and, in view of the spirit of compromise shown by the different groups and interests, the Group of 77 was confident that it could be adopted by consensus.

55. Mr. NEUHOFF (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation considered draft resolution A/C.2/32/L.93 acceptable and was prepared to join in a consensus for its adoption even though it did not satisfy all of his delegation's wishes. What mattered was to increase the resources of UNDP. In that connexion, he announced that the contribution of the Federal Republic of Germany for 1978 would be 104 million marks, subject to final parliamentary approval. That sum represented an increase of 14.3 per cent over 1977, a percentage which would be still higher if the sum was expressed in dollars. The Federal Republic's contribution to UNFPA for 1978 would be 25 million marks, i.e. 39 per cent more than the year before.

56. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

57. Draft resolution A/C.2/32/L.93 was adopted without a vote.

58. Mr. DALTON (United Kingdom) welcomed the adoption by consensus of so important a resolution and expressed his appreciation for the manner in which the sponsors had taken into account the suggestions of delegations. The unanimous approval of the measures initiated by the Governing Council of UNDP would be an encouragement to the Council in its efforts to enhance the effectiveness and impact of the Programme and would strengthen the Administrator's mandate in that crucial area.

59. Mr. VAN TOOREN (Netherlands) expressed satisfaction at the consensus which had been achieved and thanked the sponsors for taking into account the views of his delegation. The measures initiated by the Governing Council of UNDP had the full support of his delegation. He was pleased that the Economic and Social Council had endorsed those measures in its resolution 2110 (LXIII). It was also encouraging to note the approval expressed in the draft resolution for the efforts of the Governing Council to define the role and activities of the Programme, which was of such great importance, embracing as it did the entire United Nations system.

60. Mr. SMALL (Canada) also expressed satisfaction at the consensus and at the attitude taken by the sponsors. The draft resolution, which endorsed the work of the Governing Council of UNDP, would ensure that the necessary procedures were initiated to adapt the management of UNDP to the requirements of an expanding programme.

/...

61. Mr. SEIFMAN (United States of America) said that his delegation had been pleased to join in the consensus on the draft resolution, which represented an important step forward on the course begun with the measures adopted by the Governing Council of UNDP on the role and activities of the Programme.

62. Inasmuch as operative paragraph 4 urged the Governing Council to take action in line with the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly at its sixth special session, his delegation reiterated its reservations regarding those resolutions.

63. Mr. OSVALD (Sweden), speaking on behalf of Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden, said that the delegations of those countries were gratified at the consensus and wished to express their appreciation to the sponsors with regard to the consultations on the text. The decision taken by consensus at the twenty-fourth session of the Governing Council of UNDP had had the full support of the countries for which he spoke, and they were glad that the Economic and Social Council and the Second Committee had supported that decision. That meant that the Governing Council of UNDP would have the full backing of the General Assembly in its efforts to modernize the administrative management of the Programme and to improve the co-ordination of technical assistance in co-operation with the executing agencies. It would also be possible to strengthen the financial position of UNDP.

64. Mr. YEVDOKHEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, although his delegation had joined in the consensus, the position stated by the USSR at the twenty-third and twenty-fourth sessions of the Governing Council of UNDP and at the sixty-third session of the Economic and Social Council remained unchanged. In its view, financing should be entirely voluntary and no obligatory growth rate could be set. It was also to be hoped that the Administrator of UNDP would make arrangements to use the contributions of the USSR more effectively.

65. Mr. KRYZHANOVSKY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said the fact that his delegation had not opposed the adoption of the draft resolution did not mean that it fully agreed with all its provisions. He appreciated the efforts of the representative of the Group of 77 to reach an agreement, but must point out that some delegations, including his own, had not been informed that consultations were being held; if they had participated, they would have been able to help in substantially improving the draft resolution.

AGENDA ITEM 62: UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME (continued)
(A/C.2/32/L.27/Rev.1, L.91 and Add.1, L.97)

Draft resolution A/C.2/32/L.97

66. Mr. TUKAN (Jordan), Vice-Chairman of the Committee, introduced draft resolution A/C.2/32/L.97 concerning the report of the United Nations Conference on Desertification and said that it was the result of informal consultations on draft resolution A/C.2/32/L.27/Rev.1, which was accordingly withdrawn. The statement of financial implications appeared in document A/C.2/32/L.91 and Add.1. Actually, draft resolution A/C.2/32/L.97, which was issued as a draft resolution submitted by the Vice-Chairman, should have appeared as document A/C.2/32/L.27/Rev.2, sponsored by the Group of 77. He would not like the procedure followed in the present case to constitute a precedent.

/...

(Mr. Tukan, Jordan)

67. The changes in relation to draft resolution A/C.2/32/L.27/Rev.1 consisted of the inclusion of a third preambular paragraph and amendments to operative paragraphs 1, 3, 6, 8, 9, 13 and 15. It had not been possible to reach agreement on the special account, owing to the fact that the same delegations which had not supported the idea in Nairobi had again opposed it. For that reason, separate votes should be taken on paragraphs 11 and 12.

68. At the request of the representative of Mali, separate votes were taken on paragraphs 11 and 12.

69. Paragraph 11 was adopted by 82 votes to 16, with 18 abstentions.

70. Paragraph 12 was adopted by 80 votes to 11, with 20 abstentions.

71. At the request of the representative of the German Democratic Republic, on behalf of the socialist countries, a vote was taken on the draft resolution as a whole.

72. The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 104 votes to none, with 12 abstentions.

73. Mr. ZACHMANN (German Democratic Republic), speaking on behalf of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR, said that, although the delegations of those countries had supported the major decisions adopted at the United Nations Conference on Desertification and included in the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification, it should be borne in mind that the Plan of Action was an advisory document containing recommendations. Some of the provisions of the Plan were very important, especially those which referred to the need to ensure that all measures adopted took into account the development objectives of the countries where they were to be carried out.

74. The socialist countries had always been in favour of strengthening international co-operation, especially with developing countries, on the basis of just and equitable relations and in the interest of international peace and détente, and they had provided and would continue to provide voluntary bilateral assistance to developing countries. They had also participated in various United Nations programmes and activities for the benefit of developing countries, particularly ones financed from voluntary funds. He drew attention to the decision on the method of financing the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification, which indicated that greater use should be made of the organizations and organs of the United Nations system, and expressed the view that implementation of the Plan should be financed from voluntary contributions and not from the regular budget. He was not sure that the creation of a special account would help to increase resources for development or to ensure more efficient use of voluntary contributions. The socialist countries were opposed to any attempt to include provisions relating to compulsory contributions or to the establishment of an automatic funding system.

/...

(Mr. Zachmann, German Democratic Republic)

75. He could not accept the principle embodied in operative paragraph 10, because it was contrary to United Nations practice and to the principle of equitable geographical distribution. The delegations for which he spoke reserved the right to discuss whatever financial implications there might be in the Fifth Committee. They had therefore voted against paragraphs 11 and 12 and had abstained from voting on the draft resolution as a whole. If separate votes had been taken on paragraphs 10 and 13, they would have voted against them.

76. Mr. RAMONDT (Netherlands) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution as a whole and had abstained from voting on paragraphs 11 and 12.

77. His delegation had already expressed its views on the Plan of Action at the Conference on Desertification and on various occasions during the current session of the General Assembly. It considered that, in view of the great divergency of the countries and regions affected by desertification, action should be taken at the national, subregional and regional levels through multilateral and bilateral arrangements, and in particular through the establishment of consortium arrangements focusing on small-scale projects and involving a relatively small number of donor and recipient countries and multilateral agencies. He thanked the sponsors of the draft resolution for reflecting that approach in operative paragraph 9.

78. In the view of his delegation, the creation of a special account for implementing the Plan of Action was not only unnecessary but might be counterproductive, since it would lead to dispersion of the available resources. His delegation would have preferred to have the question of establishing such an account included in the terms of reference of the small group of high-level specialists in international financing of projects and programmes referred to in operative paragraph 13. It could have been covered by the study of additional measures and means of financing for the implementation of the Plan of Action.

79. Mr. NAKAMURA (Japan) said that his delegation had not changed its position with regard to the special account referred to in paragraphs 11 and 12 of draft resolution A/C.2/32/L.97 and that it had accordingly abstained in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole. Japan did, however, fully support the remainder of the content of that draft resolution.

80. Mr. BROWN (Australia) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/32/L.97 as a way of showing his Government's satisfaction with the results of the United Nations Conference on Desertification. His delegation thanks the sponsors for accepting its amendments to paragraphs 9 and 13 of the original version. His delegation's position with regard to the special account had been explained at the Nairobi Conference and had not changed, and it had accordingly abstained in the vote on paragraphs 11 and 12.

81. Mr. QUENTIN (Italy) observed that document A/C.2/32/L.97, in its efforts to implement the resolutions of the Nairobi Conference, was treating on the same footing matters on which there had been general agreement and others which had given rise to problems. His delegation believed that the establishment of

/...

(Mr. Quentin, Italy)

special funds or accounts was not advantageous to the countries concerned because, among other unfavourable consequences, it led to the diversion of funds and to duplication of work. His delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole but, for the reasons he had explained, had voted against paragraph 11 and abstained in the vote in paragraph 12.

82. Mr. LADOR (Israel) said that his country had voted in favour of resolution A/C.2/32/L.97. Israel had participated actively in the preparations for the Conference and in its deliberations, and its experience of desertification was acknowledged by other countries. On another matter, he wished to place on record his delegation's indignation about the politically-inspired passages of the Secretary-General's report (A/32/257) which reflected Conference resolution 7, a resolution that had caused the consensus reached on all other questions to be breached. He asked that his delegation's observations should be reflected in the summary record.

83. Miss COURSON (France) said that her delegation regretted that it had had to abstain in the vote; its abstention did not, of course, mean that it was opposed to the aims of the Conference but merely that it did not approve of the creation of special accounts, the effect of which could only be to divert necessary funds and thereby hamper the attainment of the goals sought.

84. Mr. DONNELLY (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had opposed the special account at the Conference on Desertification. It had done so as a matter of principle, in the belief that existing machinery should be used and the diversion of funds and administrative resources to new funds or institutions avoided; such diversion, moreover, made co-ordination more difficult and was costly in administrative terms. For that reason his delegation had voted against paragraphs 11 and 12 and abstained in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole. The United Kingdom would, however, take an active part in the implementation of other parts of the draft resolution.

85. Mr. HAQ (Pakistan) said that his country was in favour of the draft resolution, including paragraphs 11 and 12; with regard, however, to paragraph 8 as it stood, it wished to point out that the wording gave the impression that the Governing Council of UNEP, the Executive Director and the Environment Co-ordination Board were at the same level and had similar responsibilities. That was not the case, since it was clear from recommendation 27, read in conjunction with paragraph 2 of the report of the Conference, that the Executive Director and the Board were subordinate to the Governing Council, which held overriding responsibility. His delegation wished its interpretation of that issue to be placed on record.

86. Mr. VON RUCKTESCHELL (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole but had abstained on paragraphs 11 and 12. His delegation, in common with many others, did not approve of the creation of a special account, because, among other reasons, such an account would serve no purpose since significant contributions almost certainly would not be received; it was unfortunate that the sponsors of the draft

/...

(Mr. von Ruckteschell, Federal Republic of Germany)

resolution had decided to keep that provision. With regard to paragraph 1, his delegation understood the word "adopts" as referring to the parts of the report of the Conference on which there had been agreement.

87. Mr. BRECHER (United States of America) said that his delegation had been gratified to support the draft resolution because the Conference had been a success and had made an important contribution to the consideration of a problem of world scope. Obviously, there had been points of divergence. As had been stated at the Conference, his delegation had reservations about the consultative group and the special account referred to in the Plan of Action. Although his delegation maintained the opinions that it had expressed at the Conference, it attached importance to getting the implementation of the Plan of Action under way. Moreover, it accepted the wording of paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, which, in its view, satisfactorily reflected the substance of the deliberations.

88. Miss KIRSHEN (Belgium) said that her delegation had unfortunately had to abstain in the vote; it believed that paragraphs 11 and 12 did not advance the aims of the struggle against desertification. The best course would be to use existing financing machinery.

89. Miss OLDFELT (Sweden) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it supported the Plan of Action, although it was not in agreement with the special account. Her Government's position that financial requirements could be met through existing machinery had been explained at the Conference.

90. Mr. XIFRA (Spain) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on paragraphs 11 and 12 but had supported the draft resolution as a whole because it recognized that desertification was a crucial problem.

91. Mr. BERG (Norway) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution; it had serious reservations about paragraphs 11 and 12, however, because, in its opinion, the establishment of additional machinery would not add to the efficiency of the work. Funds for the larger programmes and projects contemplated in the Plan of Action should come from the general assistance allocations of donor countries and decisions on them should be made in the context of the country programmes and priorities of the countries concerned.

92. Miss LOJ (Denmark) said that her delegation had abstained on paragraphs 11 and 12 because of the reservations expressed by her country at Nairobi with regard to the special account. The Plan of Action should be funded through existing machinery, especially that of UNDP. Her delegation had, however, voted in favour of the draft resolution because it held that all other aspects of the Plan of Action should be implemented promptly.

OTHER MATTERS

93. Mr. QUENTIN (Italy) stated that, although the fact was not recorded on the relevant printed sheet, his delegation had abstained in the vote at the 57th meeting of the Committee on draft resolution A/C.2/32/L.51, on the living conditions of the Palestinian people, for the reasons explained by the Belgian representative on behalf of the members of the European Community.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.