



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 66th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. VALDES (Bolivia)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 65: REVISION OF THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY FOR THE SECOND UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT DECADE (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 66: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECISIONS ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS SEVENTH SPECIAL SESSION (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 67: ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AMONG DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (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 LX-2332.

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 10.55 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 65: REVISION OF THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY FOR THE SECOND UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT DECADE (A/C.2/31/L.49/Rev.2, A/C.2/31/L.86) (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 66: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECISIONS ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS SEVENTH SPECIAL SESSION (A/C.2/31/L.86, A/C.2/31/L.91) (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.2/31/L.49/Rev.2

1. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Committee) said that the third preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.2/31/L.49/Rev.2 should read:

"Disturbed by the stagnating flows of official development assistance which during the current Development Decade has remained at levels well below the target stipulated in the International Development Strategy".

2. The CHAIRMAN invited the representative of the Philippines to introduce on behalf of the sponsors draft resolution A/C.2/31/L.49/Rev.2, which had no financial implications.

3. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines) said that document A/C.2/31/L.49/Rev.2 contained the latest version of the draft resolution, which was the result of extensive consultations. As he did not feel that there had been sufficient agreement on that version to warrant its adoption by consensus, he requested that a recorded vote should be taken on it.

4. At the request of the representative of the Philippines, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/31/L.49/Rev.2.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, India, Indonesia, Iran, Israel, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Surinam, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Mongolia, Poland, Spain, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

/...

5. The revised draft resolution (A/C.2/31/L.49/Rev.2) was adopted by 74 votes to 1, with 19 abstentions.

6. Mrs. CARRASCO (Bolivia), Mr. HAMZA (Democratic Yemen), Mr. ALULA (Ethiopia), Mr. KOUADIO (Ivory Coast), Mr. BOU BOU (Niger), Mr. MBODJ (Senegal), Mr. LAWSON (Togo) and Mr. CAMACHO (Venezuela) said that they had been absent during the vote on draft resolution A/C.2/31/L.49/Rev.2 and that, had they been present, they would have voted in favour of the draft resolution.

7. Mr. KETLOGETSWE (Botswana), Mr. SINGH (Fiji) and Mr. DOUKOURE (Guinea) said that their votes had not registered on the voting board, but they had in fact voted in favour of the draft resolution.

8. The CHAIRMAN invited delegations wishing to do so to explain their votes on the draft resolution.

9. Mr. TEIXEIRA DA MOTTA (Portugal) said that had his delegation been present during the vote, it would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/31/L.49/Rev.2 in its entirety because of the importance it attached to the subject with which it dealt. His delegation had been able to agree to operative paragraph 4 because the wording "give serious consideration" was very mild. That paragraph should not prejudice UNCTAD resolution 150 (IV).

10. Mr. PATTISON (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had a number of difficulties regarding the specific measures listed in the draft resolution, in particular the target of 0.7 per cent of GNP for official development assistance and the provisions relating to access to capital markets. However, it was generally in favour of the search for ways and means of accelerating the transfer of real resources to developing countries on a predictable, assured and continuous basis. As it had not so far had sufficient time to reach conclusions on the basis of the Secretary-General's report and of other proposals on the subject, it felt that it was not an opportune moment to give more emphasis to some measures rather than others.

11. Mr. KUEN (Austria) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, as it was fully aware of the need for increased efforts in the field of international development assistance. However, his Government could not subscribe to a number of provisions contained in the resolution, in particular those of operative paragraphs 3 and 4. Those paragraphs required more detailed examination to determine whether and to what extent the suggestions they contained could be taken up and pursued further. Regarding operative paragraph 2, his Government would, within its economic and budgetary limits, make every effort to increase its official development assistance.

12. Mr. KANAZAWA (Japan) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote because the draft resolution did not reflect his Government's position on the matter under consideration. Regarding operative paragraph 2, his delegation

/...

(Mr. Kanazawa, Japan)

could not agree to a specific date for achieving the target of 0.7 per cent of GNP for official development assistance. However, his Government had made and would continue to make every effort to increase its official development assistance. Regarding operative paragraphs 3 and 4, his delegation could not accept an idea which might well lead to an automatic transfer of resources to the developing countries. However, it did agree that each country should make an effort to increase its official development assistance sizably and steadily in so far as its domestic circumstances permitted.

13. Mr. SHROFF (New Zealand) said that his delegation had accepted the target of 0.7 per cent of GNP for official development assistance and was striving to reach that target as economic circumstances permitted. Its current aid performance was already well above the average for members of the Development Assistance Committee of OECD. For that reason, it had voted in favour of the draft resolution. However, it wished to place on record that, while it welcomed the fact that consideration was to be given to the machinery referred to in operative paragraph 3, New Zealand's budgetary procedures limited the extent to which it could modify existing practices in that respect. His delegation also had doubts as to whether the establishment of a development tax as referred to in operative paragraph 4 would in practice facilitate the attainment of the general objectives of the draft resolution.

14. Mr. OLDAEUS (Sweden) said that, although his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, he wished to draw the Committee's attention to his Government's reservations concerning operative paragraph 4. The Swedish Government felt that a special development tax would not prove an effective instrument for accelerating the transfer of real resources to the developing countries. In its view, what really mattered was the total net transfer of resources, rather than the way in which such transfers were administered by individual countries.

15. Mr. BOEHMER (Federal Republic of Germany) said that some of the suggestions contained in operative paragraphs 3 and 4 of the draft resolution, which were aimed at ensuring that the transfer of resources to developing countries took place on a predictable, assured and continuous basis, were based on his Government's current practice in the matter of official development assistance, as described in the Secretary-General's report (A/31/186). For legislative and constitutional reasons, the other suggestions contained in those paragraphs would be impracticable in his country.

16. He wished to place on record that his delegation would have participated in a consensus on the draft resolution, simply reserving its position on operative paragraph 2 in order to maintain its commitment to the relevant provision of the International Development Strategy in the form in which it had been first adopted. However, as a recorded vote had been requested, his delegation had abstained from voting on the draft resolution.

17. Mr. ROSSI (Italy) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution. He wished to reiterate his delegation's position on the question of the transfer of real resources to developing countries, and in particular on the

/...

(Mr. Rossi, Italy)

official development assistance target of 0.7 per cent of GNP set out in the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade. Although his Government agreed to the target of 0.7 per cent of GNP, because of its current financial and economic problems it could not give any undertaking as to when it would be able to transfer in full the volume of assistance equivalent to 0.7 per cent of Italy's GNP. For the same reasons, it was unable to give serious consideration to the establishment of a development tax as referred to in operative paragraph 4.

18. Ms. TYERMAN (Canada) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it agreed with its general thrust and with the need to ensure a transfer of real resources to the developing countries on a predictable, assured and continuous basis. Although, at present, her Government did not comply with all the measures specified in operative paragraph 3, it felt that those measures deserved serious consideration, with a view to their being implemented in so far as the financial laws and regulations of donor countries allowed.

19. If a separate vote had been taken on operative paragraph 4, her delegation would have voted against that paragraph because of its views on the idea of a development tax. Canada already provided substantial official development assistance, which formed a significant part of its federal budget. Although such assistance came from general tax revenues, the Canadian Government was not currently contemplating the levy of a special development tax; indeed, it questioned the usefulness of such a tax, which in its view would not help to increase the amount of resources available for development assistance.

20. Her delegation could not totally accept operative paragraph 5, as the Canadian Government did not control flows of private capital investments.

21. Mr. SEIFMAN (United States of America) said that his delegation had been unable to accept the draft resolution, although with more time and less pressure a different outcome might have been possible. As it had already stated at the seventh special session of the General Assembly and elsewhere, his Government was determined to increase its official development assistance effectively. However, as it had also stated on numerous occasions, it had not accepted the target of 0.7 per cent of GNP for such assistance. Moreover, while it would like to see the transfer of real resources to developing countries take place on a predictable, assured and continuous basis, it felt that the adoption of specific methods for official development assistance increments was a matter for individual donor countries to decide in the light of their constitutional and budgetary procedures. While his delegation was prepared to study the Secretary-General's report, it could not endorse even implicitly any specific recommendations, including that for a development tax as referred to in operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution.

22. Mr. LOUDON (Netherlands) said that, although his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, he wished to state that his Government saw the development tax referred to in operative paragraph 4 as counterproductive so far as increasing the total volume of available assistance was concerned.

/...

23. Mr. DORUM (Norway) said that, as his delegation's vote had not been registered by the mechanical voting system, he would like it to be recorded as having voted in favour of the draft resolution.

24. Norway had gone a long way towards meeting the objectives of the draft resolution, particularly in matters of budgetary policy, as was clear from the Secretary-General's report (A/31/186). However, from its own experience, it was not convinced that earmarking a special tax for international development aid would serve any useful purpose, and it therefore had reservations regarding operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution. Development assistance was an integral part of the national budget and consequently there should be no difference between the allocation of funds for that purpose and any other purpose. Singling out international development assistance for special taxation would not help to increase the transfer of real resources to developing countries.

25. Mr. KJELDGAARD (Denmark) said that one of the long-standing aims of his Government, which hoped to reach the target of 0.7 per cent of its gross national product for official development assistance by the end of 1980, was to ensure that its transfer of resources was predictable, continuous and increasingly assured. Consequently, it endorsed the fundamental aims of the draft resolution and had voted for it. However, it had reservations regarding the recommendation in operative paragraph 4 that a special development tax should be earmarked for international development assistance, which it considered would have a negative effect on the attitude of the population towards such assistance.

26. Mr. LAWLESS (Australia) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution. His Government was still committed to a target of 0.7 per cent of its gross national product for official development assistance, although, owing to its economic circumstances, it was unable at present to set any date for the attainment of that target. With regard to operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, his delegation considered that the call to Governments to consider specific suggestions should be extended to all countries in a position to provide assistance. It further considered that subparagraphs (b) and (c) should be viewed within the context of the domestic economic constraints which countries faced in maintaining real flows. Moreover, those two provisions were not compatible with Australia's budgetary procedures. Lastly, his delegation could not accept the proposal for a development tax to be earmarked for international development assistance.

27. Mr. TARLAN (Turkey) said that Turkey, as a developing country, attached special importance to the transfer of real resources to developing countries on a predictable, continuous and assured basis, which it considered would make a significant contribution to the efforts of those countries to accelerate their economic development. His delegation had therefore voted in favour of the draft

(Mr. Tarlan, Turkey)

resolution. However, it would have abstained on operative paragraph 4 if a separate vote had been taken on it, since it dealt with a question within the exclusive competence of Governments.

28. Mr. AL-JEAN (Kuwait) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution. Although Kuwait was a developing country, it had, like many other members of OPEC, contributed well over 8 per cent of its gross national product for development assistance, and it trusted that developed countries would reach the target of 0.07 per cent of their GNP before the end of the decade.

29. Mr. AN Chih-yuan (China) said that his delegation supported the draft resolution in principle. The poverty and backwardness which afflicted developing countries were the result of exploitation by imperialists, colonialists and, in particular, the super-Powers. The developing countries must rely largely on their own efforts, but the developed countries had an inescapable duty to provide them with every assistance. The recommendations for increasing the transfer of real resources to developing countries, as set forth in the draft resolution, should be further explored and, as suggested in document A/31/186, the possibility of using funds produced by savings from disarmament should be studied. The super-Powers were actively engaged in stepping up their arms production and preparing for war, which was a totally unrealistic approach.

30. Miss RICO (Spain) said that her delegation would have liked to vote in favour of the draft resolution, since it agreed with the basic objectives of the International Development Strategy and with the need to increase the transfer of real resources to developing countries. It had, however, felt obliged to abstain, since it considered that the introduction of a development tax was not the best way of guaranteeing an increased flow of resources. Although Spain had not achieved full development it had been making greater efforts to render financial assistance to developing countries, but it could not contemplate any such measure.

31. Mr. CLARKE (Ireland) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on the draft resolution, as it had difficulty in accepting operative paragraph 3. Although Ireland's overseas development assistance had many of the features provided for in that paragraph, its provisions were not sufficiently flexible, particularly where long-established administrative and budgetary procedures were concerned.

32. Mr. KOSSEV (Bulgaria), speaking on behalf of the delegations of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR, said that the financial relations between those countries and the developing countries, including the transfer of real resources, were based on the premise that the measures evolved between developed capitalist States and developing countries were not applicable. The position of the socialist countries was determined by considerations of

/...

(Mr. Kossev, Bulgaria)

principle which were embodied in many United Nations documents and had been explained at the fourth session of UNCTAD and the current session of the General Assembly and in the Soviet Union's suggestions for restructuring economic relations (A/C.2/31/2). The delegations of those countries had therefore abstained from voting on the draft resolution, since its basic recommendations were not applicable to economic relations between socialist and developing countries.

33. Mr. MUBAREZ (Yemen) said that his delegation, as a sponsor of the draft resolution, would of course have voted in favour of it if it had been present when the vote had been taken.

34. Mr. FLEMING (Argentina) said that the draft resolution was a positive step forward in implementing the recommendations of the Pearson report prepared under the auspices of the World Bank. In the past, international development assistance had been regarded as a purely moral obligation; however, it was now generally accepted that a country's obligation to increase its assistance depended on its financial capacity to do so. With regard to operative paragraph 6 of the draft resolution, his delegation considered that the Secretary-General should hold consultations with developed countries and, if necessary, report on the reasons why the measures recommended in the resolution had not been implemented.

35. Mr. ROUGE (France) said that the increased transfer of real resources on a predictable, continuous and increasingly assured basis was mainly a question of political will. His own Government's political will could not be questioned, but it did consider that budgetary procedures for attaining set targets was a secondary matter and should be dealt with by individual countries according to their own regulations and circumstances. His delegation had therefore abstained from voting on the draft resolution, as it had reservations with regard to operative paragraphs 3, 4 and 5. Those reservations had already been expressed by a number of other delegations, particularly those of the States members of OECD which had nevertheless voted for the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.2/31/L.86

36. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on draft resolution A/C.2/31/L.86, which he said had no financial implications.

37. At the request of the representative of Pakistan, a recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta,

/...

Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Surinam, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Belgium, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Japan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

37. Draft resolution A/C.2/31/L.86 was adopted by 105 votes to 1, with 7 abstentions.

38. Mr. LOQUET (Belgium), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had abstained in the vote for the reasons explained when it had submitted its amendments to section I, paragraph 6, of the draft resolution. However, his delegation supported the draft resolution in its broad lines and trusted that the same will which had made it possible to arrive at the text would be displayed in the complicated negotiations aimed at improving international economic relations. His delegation had always played a constructive part in those negotiations but, if tangible results were to be achieved and the economic situation of developing countries improved, all parties involved would have to display the necessary political will and realism.

39. Mr. ROUGE (France) said that, if the Committee had been able to take a decision on the draft resolution without a vote, his delegation would probably not have stood in the way of a consensus. France had no ideological prejudice against the idea of a new international economic order, and his Government was favourably disposed towards the exercise envisaged in the seventh operative paragraph of the draft resolution. His delegation would be pleased to take part in the discussion on the item, which would be on the agenda of the Economic and Social Council at its summer 1977 session and of the General Assembly at its next session. The Council and the Assembly would thus have the opportunity not only to examine the progress made with regard to the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, but also to carry out a review and appraisal of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade, to consider the implementation of General Assembly resolution 3362 (S-VII), and the results achieved in the fields covered by such other relevant United Nations documents as the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States and the declarations and programmes of action adopted at recent world conferences and, in general, to make an over-all review of the progress achieved in international economic co-operation. His Government understood the developing countries' impatience at the slow progress towards an equitable international order and was responsive to the appeal made to the international community in general and the developed countries in particular in section I, paragraph 6, of the draft resolution.

(Mr. Rouge, France)

40. However, his delegation could not accept the unduly pessimist judgements of the global effort at economic co-operation, which, despite difficulties, all Governments had a duty to encourage. He regretted that it had not been possible to draft the sixth preambular paragraph and section I, paragraph 4, of the draft resolution, which were essentially political, in a generally acceptable form. Also, he was surprised that so many delegations had accepted without protest the view expressed in the seventh preambular paragraph, namely, that the Governments of developed countries generally - and consequently their own Governments - were not complying with their commitments and obligations. His delegation, for its part, could certainly not accept any such judgement.

41. Mr. KANAZAWA (Japan) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on the draft resolution for the reasons which it had already explained in detail during the informal negotiations. While it continued to regard the International Development Strategy as one of the most important undertakings of the United Nations and was ready to lend its full support to the cause of development, its fundamental reservations regarding General Assembly resolutions 3201 (S-VI), 3202 (S-VI) and 3281 (XXIX) remained unchanged. The difficulty arose from the fact that the draft resolution dealt not only with the International Development Strategy and the cause development, but also with a new international economic order about which his delegation had serious reservations. His Government would continue to do its utmost in the cause of development and international economic co-operation, but could not support the concept of promoting development within the framework of a new international economic order. In particular, his delegation had difficulty with the third preambular paragraph and with section I, paragraphs 3 and 6, of the draft resolution. It considered that developed and developing countries should combine their efforts to achieve a better world and that economic problems required careful examination and a practical and gradual approach.

42. Mr. KOSSEV (Bulgaria), speaking on behalf of the delegations of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR, said that those delegations had supported the draft resolution in affirmation of the principles embodied in the Declaration adopted by the Political Consultative Committee of the States members of the Warsaw Pact, held in Bucharest on 25 and 26 November 1976. That Declaration called for the restructuring of international economic relations on a basis that would be just and equitable for all States without exception, and expressed support for the programmes of international economic co-operation drawn up by the developing and non-aligned countries. The socialist countries saw draft resolution A/C.2/31/L.86 primarily as a reflection of the concern of developing countries at the slow rate of progress in achieving an equitable international economic system. They had already made their position clear when

/...

General Assembly resolutions 2626 (XXV) and 3517 (XXX) had been adopted and in various statements at the fourth session of UNCTAD. They would maintain that position in future.

43. Mr. KJELDGAARD (Denmark) said that his Government continued to attach the utmost importance to the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade. However, it considered that one of the main reasons for the value of that document was that it had been agreed by consensus, and his delegation would have preferred that the lengthy negotiations leading to draft resolution A/C.2/31/L.86 might also have resulted in a consensus. It would also have liked to see further improvements in a number of paragraphs, and it had doubts as to the advisability of including paragraphs which dealt with controversial political issues in a resolution concerned with economic matters. Nevertheless, it had voted in favour of the draft resolution as an expression of support for the International Development Strategy and as an incentive to continue the necessary deliberations on the Strategy as provided for in section II of the draft resolution.

44. Mr. BASSIN (Finland) said that he had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/31/L.86. He recalled that the Finnish delegation's unreserved support for General Assembly resolution 3202 (S-VI) had not meant that Finland would not have to face certain difficulties in trying to meet its responsibilities under that resolution. Finland, although an industrialized country, was still heavily dependent on imports of capital because of structural weaknesses in its economy. Those weaknesses had been accentuated by the current economic situation to the point where it was difficult to fulfil all the requests made in draft resolution A/C.2/31/L.86. However, by voting in favour of that draft resolution, his delegation had wished to indicate that its Government would continue to attach the greatest importance to the implementation of the principles of the new international economic order, which indeed were essential for the political, economic and social development of the world community on an equitable basis.

45. Mr. GOUMAS (Greece) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it agreed with the decision to assess during the thirty-second session the progress made in the implementation of the resolutions referred to in section II, paragraph 1. The establishment of more equitable international economic relations could proceed only through co-operation among all nations, rich and poor. Every effort conducive to the development of a constructive dialogue should therefore be maintained.

46. Mr. ROSSI (Italy) said that progress towards international co-operation for development was possible only on the basis of decisions which all Member States could support. He was confident that the spirit of understanding prevalent at the seventh special session would be maintained, so that further progress could be made. His delegation regretted that a consensus had not been achieved with regard

(Mr. Rossi, Italy)

to the draft resolution. The negotiations had been influenced by the awareness that many delegations were unable at the current stage to accept such commitments. His delegation had therefore been obliged to abstain.

47. With reference to the seventh preambular paragraph and section I, paragraph 6, his delegation did not believe that the failure to implement the decisions in question had been due to a lack of political will; rather, it had been due to the financial hardship currently faced by certain developed countries, mainly as a result of the difficult world economic situation. The fact was that many complex issues were involved in the realization of a more just economic order, a goal which his Government sincerely sought to achieve. He felt confident that his delegation's abstention would not arouse doubts with regard to its attitude of goodwill and understanding in seeking to build a better framework for international economic co-operation and to establish a more equitable international economic order.

48. Mr. SEIFMAN (United States of America) emphasized that his delegation's position on draft resolution A/C.2/31/L.86 should not be interpreted as reflecting any diminution in his country's determination to contribute to development and international co-operation. On the contrary, it remained committed to the dialogue between developed and developing countries with a view to attaining substantial results. The United States sought more equitable economic relations in the interests of all, especially the developing nations.

49. His delegation had voted against the draft resolution for several reasons. First, the text contained several unacceptable references to a new international economic order and related matters, support for which could be interpreted as indicating a change in his country's position. Section I, paragraph 6, read either alone or together with the paragraphs in section II, could be taken to mean not only that his Government was committed to the "new international economic order" but that it was prepared to accept criticism for failure to implement the measures in question. For related reasons, his delegation considered that section II, paragraph 1, would complicate rather than facilitate future assessments.

50. What was known as the new international economic order was embodied in certain General Assembly resolutions that included, but were not limited to, those of the sixth special session. It was also embodied in certain declarations or other documents adopted at meetings outside the United Nations to which the United States had not been a party. His delegation appreciated the aspirations of developing countries, but continued to have fundamental reservations and objections to portions of the doctrine embodied in the documents of the "new international economic order", as well as to a number of the specific policies or measures involved. Repeated efforts to have the United States delegation endorse those documents did not contribute to the cause of development or international co-operation. The United States was prepared to set aside ideological and policy differences in order to concentrate on practical problems; it was not prepared, however, to entertain criticism for alleged failure to carry out commitments it had not accepted.

/...

(Mr. Seifman, United States)

51. His delegation also had other difficulties with the draft resolution. For example, with regard to the sixth preambular paragraph and section I, paragraph 4, it considered in general that the inclusion of statements on political issues was inappropriate in resolutions of the Second Committee.

52. While his delegation regretted the adoption of the draft resolution, it was not surprised. It did not expect that other delegations or groups would necessarily agree with it on all issues. On the other hand, in view of the common desire to promote consensus by persuasion, his delegation's well-known and firmly held views should at least be taken into account in draft resolutions which were presented as the basis for the Committee's work.

53. Mr. PATTISON (United Kingdom) regretted that his delegation had been unable to join in supporting draft resolution A/C.2/31/L.86. In its view, a directive concerning work to be undertaken in the years ahead must be adopted by consensus. Despite the broad measure of agreement with regard to the substance of the draft resolution, there were in it points of conceptual approach and judgement which a number of delegations did not share. He did not believe, however, that those differences would substantially affect future work, in which his delegation looked forward to participating fully.

54. Mr. YORK (Federal Republic of Germany) said that considerable efforts had been made by all sides, including his own delegation, to reach agreement on a text, and important improvements had been made, particularly to section II, which constituted the substance of the draft resolution. His delegation agreed that the assessment to be undertaken in 1977 should embrace all aspects of the discussion on development and international economic co-operation, giving all participants an opportunity to present their views, but it regretted that agreement on practical steps was again hampered by unnecessary conceptual differences. Despite all efforts made during the consultations, the text still contained formulations which his delegation could not support, and it had therefore had to abstain.

55. With regard to the sixth preambular paragraph and to section I, paragraph 4, which had specific political implications, his delegation had made its position known in the context of other resolutions dealing with those political problems. As to the seventh preambular paragraph and section I, paragraph 5, his Government understood the impatience and concern of the developing countries but could not identify itself with the expression of regret at not having displayed the political will to fulfil commitments and obligations. It had always given clear indications as to which of those commitments and obligations it was willing to accept, and those which it had accepted had indeed been fulfilled. In that context, his delegation understood that the commitment referred to in section I, paragraph 1, did not imply a commitment to take the new international economic order as the only possible basis for seeking to achieve the objective in question. As to section I, paragraph 6, his delegation was willing to work for concrete results with regard to practical problems and to achieve urgent solutions which might well be in line with the new international economic order. That did not, however, imply a general acceptance of the doctrine and of an obligation to implement every single element of the catalogue of policies and measures contained in the concept of the new international economic order. His Government's position with regard to that catalogue had been repeatedly expressed.

/...

Federal Republic of Germany)

96. The Federal Republic of Germany's abstention on the draft resolution was an expression of its right not to agree with all its formulations. It was prepared, however, to contribute constructively to the promotion of development and international economic co-operation.

97. Miss RICO (Spain) said that her delegation had supported draft resolution A/C.2/31/L.86 because of the need to maintain a constructive spirit when all countries were engaged in transforming international economic relations. She noted, however, that the seventh preambular paragraph did not reflect the compromise necessary for promoting co-operation. Furthermore, her delegation did not consider section I, paragraph 3, to be appropriate, since it prejudiced current negotiations. With regard to paragraph 6, her delegation would have preferred inclusion of the Belgian amendment.

98. Mr. BRUCE (Canada) said that his Government had been seeking a positive way of meeting the objectives of the developing countries, and understood their impatience to press ahead with the implementation of the decisions adopted at the seventh special session. While he was glad that draft resolution A/C.2/31/L.86 had been able to obtain majority support, his delegation lacked enthusiasm for the draft resolution, because it contained negative elements and some unpractical proposals. It made no positive reference to the efforts of the developed countries to support the economic changes under discussion. The extensive participation of his Government in those efforts to reshape the international trade and payments system needed widespread public support, which an acknowledgement of the positive efforts made would have helped to produce.

99. His delegation could not support the characterization of the debts of many developing countries as unmanageable, despite its sympathy for the debt problems of individual developing countries. That was why Canada had supported the convening in 1977 of a conference on debt, at which it would be represented. An inflated description of the indebtedness of some countries, or any other factor that might reduce confidence, was not in the interests of any country. World economic growth would be sustained only if all decisions contributed to an orderly reshaping of the international trade and payments system, including the management of debt and credit. As to the Paris Conference on International Economic Co-operation, his delegation remained convinced that the final Ministerial Meeting would achieve the concrete results expected.

100. With regard to section I, paragraph 4, of the draft resolution, his delegation was unsure of the meaning of the second part of the paragraph, the whole of which was in any event of doubtful practicality and questionable relevance to a resolution of the Second Committee. He recalled his Government's position on the resolutions adopted at the sixth special session of the General Assembly and on the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States.

101. Mr. QADRUD-DIN (Pakistan), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, said that the chances of a consensus on the draft resolution might have been better if all

/...

(Mr. Qadrud-Din, Pakistan)

delegations had taken part in the consultations. His delegation had joined in the near-consensus because the text - including the sixth preambular paragraph and section I, paragraph 4 - took a comprehensive view of the issues relating to economic development and reflected most of the considerations propounded by the developing countries.

62. Mr. BOUBACAR (Upper Volta) said that, if his delegation had been present during the vote on draft resolution A/C.2/31/L.86, it would have voted in favour of it.

63. Mr. LAWLESS (Australia) recalled that, at the time of adoption of the resolutions referred in draft resolution A/C.2/31/L.86, interpretative statements had been made by a number of delegations, including that of Australia. Nevertheless, his delegation, believing that the existing inequality in economic relations was a cause for deep concern, had voted in favour of the draft resolution.

64. Mr. ELIASHIV (Israel) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on draft resolution A/C.2/31/L.86, since the text contained extraneous political elements. He wished, however, to reaffirm his delegation's support for the constructive principles embodied in General Assembly resolutions 2626 (XXV), 3202 (S-VI) and 3281 (XXIX).

65. Mrs. ALLAM (Egypt) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution. It was a cause for deep concern that the delegations of some developed countries, in explaining their votes, had expressed the view that the text of the draft resolution was not the appropriate place for references to the need to eliminate political obstacles to the economic emancipation of the developing countries, and to the detrimental effects of those obstacles on international co-operation and on peace and security. It should be noted that the resolutions of an economic nature, referred to in draft resolution A/C.2/31/L.86, while laying the foundations for a new economic order, had given priority to the elimination of those obstacles and had referred to the dangers which the continuation of the practices in question represented for international co-operation. Consequently, the ideas expressed in the sixth preambular paragraph and in section I, paragraph 4, were an integral part of the draft resolution.

Draft decision A/C.2/31/L.91

66. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the draft decision contained in document A/C.2/31/L.91.

67. Mr. MARSHALL (United Kingdom) asked whether the fact that the General Assembly was simply to take note of the preliminary study referred to in subparagraph (a) of the draft decision meant that no action would be taken on that study. With regard to subparagraph (c), he pointed out that there was a later report on the same subject, which was contained in document A/31/282, and asked why no reference was made to that report in the draft decision.

/...

68. Mr. GORITZA (Romania) asked whether subparagraph (a) meant that no group of experts would be established and, if so, what future action would be taken with regard to the preliminary study.

69. Mr. BOEHMER (Federal Republic of Germany) recalled in connexion with subparagraph (e) of the draft decision that a draft resolution had already been adopted on the establishment of a network for the exchange of technological information, and asked whether there was any need for the present draft decision to take note of the Secretary-General's report on such a network.

70. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Committee), replying to the question put by the United Kingdom representative, said that only one of the two reports on the Paris Conference on International Economic Co-operation was by the Secretary-General; an earlier draft resolution had taken note of the other.

71. Replying to the representative of Romania, he said that it was for the Committee to decide what future action should be taken on the preliminary study. Although the Committee had adopted no text in connexion with that study, it must take note of it in the present draft decision.

72. Replying to the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany, he said that the draft decision contained a reference to the Secretary-General's report (E/5839) because the draft resolution on the establishment of a network for the exchange of technological information had not taken note of that report.

73. The draft decision contained in document A/C.2/31/L.91 was adopted without a vote.

AGENDA ITEM 67: ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AMONG DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/C.2/31/L.62/Rev.1) (continued)

74. Mr. QADRUD-DIN (Pakistan), introducing draft resolution A/C.2/31/L.62/Rev.1 on behalf of the Group of 77, said that the revised text was the result of extensive consultations. Although the changes made in the text were substantive they were acceptable to all delegations, and he therefore hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

75. The CHAIRMAN said that the revised draft resolution had no financial implications.

76. Draft resolution A/C.2/31/L.62/Rev.1 was adopted without a vote.

77. Mr. KOSSEV (Bulgaria), speaking on behalf of the delegations of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR, said that the socialist countries were ready to give the maximum support possible to the developing countries, which hoped to use the opportunities for mutual economic co-operation to increase their economic and political independence by raising their economic and cultural levels. However, the socialist countries wished to place on record

/...

(Mr. Kossev, Bulgaria)

that they had their own understanding of certain issues which were referred to in the documents on economic co-operation with developing countries adopted at the fourth session of UNCTAD and in other forums. Such issues included the concept of interdependence and the question of the responsibility of the developed countries for the economic development of the developing countries. The socialist countries had stated their position on those issues on previous occasions, for instance at the Nairobi Conference, and that position remained unchanged.

78. Mr. LAWLESS (Australia) said his delegation hoped that, in making the arrangements required by operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, the executive heads of the specialized agencies and other United Nations organizations would exercise an appropriate sense of responsibility and act in accordance with their established financial procedures and regulations.

79. Mr. MYERSON (United States of America) said that, if the draft resolution had been put to a vote, his delegation would also have reserved its position on operative paragraph 4 and would have preferred to add a further sentence to that paragraph, reading: "It is understood that such support measures would consist of the provision of room and interpretation facilities at the headquarters of the United Nations body in question, for meetings organized in connexion with the activities of that United Nations body, and that such services will be available to all United Nations members of the body in question". His delegation also believed that the Committee should not prejudge the work of the Fifth Committee with regard to that paragraph.

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (A/C.2/31/L.88)
(continued)

80. Mr. GORITZA (Romania), Vice-Chairman, introducing draft resolution A/C.2/31/L.88 on preparations for a new International Development Strategy, which he had submitted on the basis of informal consultations on draft resolution A/C.2/31/L.36 - which was now withdrawn - announced that, as a result of further consultations, paragraphs 1 and 2 of the new text had been revised. Paragraph 1 would now read:

"Requests the Secretary-General, in consultation with the Committee for Development Planning as well as ACC and other organs and organizations concerned of the United Nations system, to collect data and information that are relevant to the formulation of a new International Development Strategy, taking fully into account the above-mentioned resolutions on the establishment of a New International Economic Order and the other above-mentioned resolutions".

In paragraph 2, the words "through the Economic and Social Council at its resumed sixty-third session" should be inserted after the words "thirty-second session".

81. Draft resolution A/C.2/31/L.88 was adopted without a vote.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.