



CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 12: Report of the Economic and Social Council (<i>continued</i>) Report of the Second Committee	1
Agenda items 46 and 108: Review and appraisal of the objectives and policies of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade Reduction of the increasing gap between the developed countries and the developing countries Report of the Second Committee	1
Agenda item 105: Convocation of a world food conference under the auspices of the United Nations Report of the Second Committee	1

President: Mr. Leopoldo BENITES (Ecuador).

*In the absence of the President, Mr. Fack (Netherlands),
Vice-President, took the Chair.*

AGENDA ITEM 12

Report of the Economic and Social Council (*continued*)*

REPORT OF THE SECOND COMMITTEE (A/9400)

AGENDA ITEMS 46 AND 108

**Review and appraisal of the objectives and policies of the
International Development Strategy for the Second United
Nations Development Decade**

**Reduction of the increasing gap between the developed
countries and the developing countries**

REPORT OF THE SECOND COMMITTEE (A/9401)

AGENDA ITEM 105

**Convocation of a world food conference under the
auspices of the United Nations**

REPORT OF THE SECOND COMMITTEE (A/9403)

1. Mr. YAMADA (Japan), Rapporteur of the Second Committee: I have the honour to present to the General Assembly the reports of the Second Committee on agenda items 12, 46 and 108, and 105. These reports are contained in documents A/9400, A/9401 and A/9403, respectively.

* Resumed from the 2201st meeting.

2. In paragraph 63 of its report on the report of the Economic and Social Council [A/9400], the Second Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of nine draft resolutions.

3. Draft resolution I, "United Nations Revolving Fund for Natural Resources Exploration", was adopted, on a roll-call vote, by 98 votes to none, with 21 abstentions.

4. Draft resolution II, "The role of modern science and technology in the development of nations and the need to strengthen economic, technical and scientific co-operation among States", was adopted without a vote.

5. Draft resolution III, "Special measures related to the particular needs of land-locked developing countries", was adopted, on a recorded vote, by 101 votes to none, with 16 abstentions.

6. Draft resolution IV, "International years and anniversaries", was adopted without a vote.

7. Draft resolution V, "Permanent sovereignty over natural resources", was adopted, on a roll-call vote, by 99 votes to 1, with 15 abstentions.

8. Draft resolution VI, "Special session of the General Assembly devoted to development and international economic co-operation", was adopted without a vote. Here I should like to make a correction: in the second line of operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution VI the words "specialized bodies of the United Nations system" should be replaced by the words "specialized organs of the United Nations system".

9. Draft resolution VII, "Economic assistance to Zambia", was adopted without a vote.

10. Draft resolution VIII, "Special measures in favour of the least developed countries", was adopted without a vote.

11. Draft resolution IX, "Permanent sovereignty over natural resources in the occupied Arab territories", was adopted, on a roll-call vote, by 91 votes to 5, with 27 abstentions.

12. In paragraph 64 of its report, the Second Committee also recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of six draft decisions, all of which were adopted by the Committee without a vote.

13. I turn now to agenda items 46 and 108. In paragraph 20 of the report [A/9401], four draft resolutions have been recommended for adoption by the General Assembly.

14. Draft resolution I, "First biennial over-all review and appraisal of progress in the implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade", was adopted without a vote.

15. In the Second Committee the views of the various delegations were expressed on this document, and they are reflected in the summary records. However, in view of some editorial changes in the report, I will see to it that it and the summary record are so corrected as to correspond exactly to the paragraphs of documents to which various delegations referred.

16. Draft resolution II, entitled "Economic Co-operation among developing countries", was also adopted without a vote.

17. Similarly, draft resolution III, entitled "Preparations for the mid-term review and appraisal of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade", was adopted without a vote.

18. Finally, draft resolution IV, entitled "Quantification of scientific and technological activities related to development", also was adopted without a vote.

19. The Second Committee, in paragraph 21, of its report [A/9401], recommends

"... that the General Assembly should defer until its twenty-ninth session the consideration of agenda item 108, entitled 'Reduction of the increasing gap between the developed countries and the developing countries'."

20. In paragraph 5 of its report on the convocation of a world food conference under the auspices of the United Nations [A/9403], the Second Committee has recommended for adoption by the General Assembly a draft resolution entitled "World Food Conference". The Second Committee adopted that draft resolution without a vote.

21. Under the able leadership of its Chairman, Ambassador Gabre-Sellassie of Ethiopia, the Second Committee thus completed its consideration of all of the agenda items allocated to it by the General Assembly during the present session.

22. The PRESIDENT: We shall now consider that report of the Second Committee which relates to item 12, entitled "Report of the Economic and Social Council" [A/9400].

23. I call on the representative of the United Kingdom, who wishes to introduce an amendment to draft resolution V.

24. Mr. MACKENZIE (United Kingdom): I want to call attention to draft resolution V, entitled "Permanent sovereignty over natural resources". This subject has already been discussed at length and I wish to make only three points about it. In doing so, I wish to move one amendment to operative paragraph 1 and ask for a separate and recorded vote on paragraph 3.

25. The first of my three points is that we much regret the intemperate language of this draft resolution, all the more so

as it is so unspecific as to the foes it seeks to attack. We feel that this language is particularly unhelpful at a time when—as most of us hope—we are moving, albeit slowly, towards an era of better partnership in development and away from old style confrontation.

26. Secondly, I wish to refer to operative paragraph 1, to which we have an amendment. The representative of Iceland in the Second Committee said that this paragraph did not imply an affirmation of sovereignty over resources outside national jurisdiction and that the extent of jurisdiction over marine resources remained to be established by the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea. However, the paragraph as it is now drafted and as it was adopted in the Second Committee does seek, quite precisely, to determine the area of exercise of permanent sovereignty over marine resources. The extent of jurisdiction over the sea-bed and its subsoil is laid down by the Convention on the Continental Shelf.¹

27. To specify that sovereignty should be exercised over the resources in the superjacent waters is to lay down precisely which waters we are talking about: they are the waters over the continental shelf, as laid down in the Convention. To assert sovereignty over resources in these waters is to have the General Assembly, and not the Conference on the Law of the Sea, define new limits to national jurisdiction over marine resources, something which the delegation of Iceland claimed is not its intention. If wording of this sort in this paragraph is not an attempt to prejudge the Conference, then what is? In order to achieve what the sponsors claim to want, it would, in our view, be necessary to alter the wording of the paragraph in the way of our amendment, already made in the Second Committee: that is, in operative paragraph 1 the words "and in the superjacent waters" would precede the words "within their national jurisdiction", which would then come at the end of the paragraph and qualify the whole paragraph. This amendment was already put forward by us in the Second Committee, and is recorded in paragraph 31 of document A/9400.

28. This change would make it clear that there is no intention to try to create new rules covering the limits of national jurisdiction, a matter which is to be settled by the Conference and not by the General Assembly. This is the logical position which was recognized to a greater or lesser extent already by abstainers and opposers—by no fewer than 62 delegations in the vote in the Second Committee vote.

29. My third and last point concerns operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution originally proposed by the delegations of Algeria, Iraq and Syria. We were not surprised by the main sponsor's reluctance to accept this paragraph, which is so far divorced from reality, in our view, as to cast serious doubts on the value of debate in the United Nations. The developing countries—and, incidentally, not only the developing countries—need foreign investment, and most of them are actively seeking it. Naturally, they have devised or are devising mechanisms for controlling foreign ownership of certain sectors of their economy. But they are anxious to attract a sustained level of appropriate investment precisely because this is vital to their growth. And I ask, what rele-

¹ See United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 499 (No. 7302), p. 312.

vance to this reality is there in the ideologically sterile paragraph 3 now before us?

30. If I might give one example, I shall quote from *The New York Times* of 9 December 1973. Sheik Yamani, Saudi Arabian Minister of Petroleum and Natural Resources, is quoted as saying in Washington that he had been talking with American businessmen about ways of "helping Saudi Arabia become industrialized". He was seeking foreign private investment. Quoting again from the same issue of *The New York Times*, the Algerian Minister of Industry and Energy, Mr. Abdesalam, is reported as having replied:

"The situation differs considerably from country to country. The Arabian gulf countries produce oil very much in excess of their financial requirements. It is the reverse in Algeria. We don't produce enough to cover all our financial requirements. We need money for exploration."

31. I need hardly elaborate the inconsistency between the satisfying of that need and the repercussions the paragraph before us will have if passed. I must say that my delegation has the gravest doubts whether this wording does reflect the true position of the Governments of the overwhelming majority of the developing countries. There may, of course, be some countries which wish to expropriate and nationalize, with limited or no compensation, while at the same time trying to deny the rights of parties in international law, and thus to close their doors to foreign investors. Nobody can prevent them from claiming to be entitled to do so, even though that claim is manifestly ill-founded in international law. It is their privilege, if they wish to do so, to harm their own interests in this way. But where have such countries acquired the right to slam the door for others in detriment to the interests of those others and in disregard of the provisions of the International Development Strategy [resolution 2626 (XXV)]? My Government is honouring the obligation specifically incurred in the Strategy to encourage the flow of private capital to the developing countries. Details have already been published of the special measures we have taken in this regard. But we should naturally have to look again at this obligation if this disheartening but at the same time revealing paragraph is to be the response of the developing countries. Accordingly, I ask for a separate and recorded vote on operative paragraph 3, and I urge that before voting delegations should reflect on where their real interests lie and be alert to the risk of undermining the co-operation on which the International Development Strategy is based.

32. Finally let me remind the Assembly that last year the United Kingdom abstained in the vote on resolution 3016 (XXVII). The draft now before us has the same objectionable features as last year's resolution, plus the added features of intemperate and emotive language and the dangerous new operative paragraph 3 about which I have just spoken. If the draft resolution comes to a vote unamended, we shall vote firmly against it, as, we hope, will others who are concerned not only to uphold international law, as we are enjoined to do in the Charter of the United Nations, but also to create a positive climate for international investment.

33. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the United Kingdom has introduced an amendment to operative para-

graph 3 of draft resolution V and has asked for a separate and recorded vote on that paragraph. The Assembly will deal with the amendment when draft resolution V is taken up. In the meantime, delegations which wish to do so are at liberty to address themselves to the amendment proposed by the representative of the United Kingdom.

34. I now call on the representative of Morocco, who wishes to introduce an amendment to draft resolution VI.

35. Mr. BENNANI (Morocco) (*interpretation from French*): My statement is in explanation of vote, but as you have said, Sir, I should like at the same time to submit an amendment.

36. At a time where the international community, through this Assembly, is readying itself to accord development and economic co-operation on an international plane the place that it deserves by adopting unanimously—as the initial sponsors hope—draft resolution VI in document A/9400 on the holding of a special session of the General Assembly devoted to development and international economic co-operation, I should like, on behalf of those initial sponsors, to emphasize the major importance of such an event.

37. Due to take place in 1975, just before the thirtieth session of the General Assembly, and at an appropriate date to be proposed by the Economic and Social Council on the basis of the world-wide economic situation, the special session will acquire, by virtue of the high political level at which it will meet, a special character in view of the effective participation of the Foreign Ministers of Member States.

38. The political nature of the decisions that are to be taken on the basis of the political and other implications of the situation relating to development and international economic co-operation not only will encompass the extension of the dimensions and conception of world-wide co-operation but also and especially, on the basis of such development, will involve the elaboration of new options for the purpose of effectively promoting a solution of world-wide economic problems, and in particular those of the developing countries, while at the same time endeavouring to set up a system of world-wide economic relations based upon equality and common interest of all the States concerned.

39. In order to render this action even more effective, and for the purpose of having instruments for implementation that are constantly renewable, the General Assembly will have subsidiarily to start to make the necessary structural changes in the United Nations system itself. For this purpose, the Secretary-General, in elaborating his preliminary report, will have to enter into consultations with the specialized organs of the United Nations, including those which are directly involved in the promotion of development and international economic co-operation, such as the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, and others.

40. It is in this spirit that the sponsors propose a small amendment, which as a matter of fact goes in the same direction as the change proposed in the English text a few moments ago by the Rapporteur, when he suggested replac-

ing the word "bodies" by the word "organs". Our amendment seeks to have operative paragraph 2 begin as follows:

"Requests the Secretary-General to prepare, in consultation with the various specialized organs of the United Nations, a preliminary report..."

and the remainder would be unchanged.

41. The Economic and Social Council will consider the report in question at its fifty-seventh session and, after having prepared a draft agenda, will appoint, if necessary, a preparatory committee and will transmit that committee's report to the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly, together with proposals concerning the date for the special session. In the minds of the initial sponsors, the preparatory committee, if it is set up, will remain open to all States Members of the United Nations.

42. The adoption of such a draft resolution will have once again established the awareness of the international community concerning development and international economic co-operation, which cannot be dissociated from the interests of the international community.

43. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak on the nine draft resolutions, and the amendments submitted thereto, and on the six draft decisions recommended by the Second Committee. Those representatives wishing to explain their votes after the voting will be allowed to do so after the votes on all the draft resolutions have been taken.

44. Mr. SCHRAM (Iceland): I should like to make a few brief remarks as a rejoinder to what was just said by the representative of the United Kingdom on draft resolution V and on the amendment to operative paragraph 1 of that draft resolution which he submitted. This is nothing new to the members of the Second Committee who are present this morning, as the United Kingdom delegation proposed that these same changes should be made in operative paragraph 1 when the draft resolution was voted upon in the Committee on 4 December. At that time only 23 delegations supported the United Kingdom proposal while 53 voted against it, and it was rejected. The sponsors hope that an even greater number of delegations will vote for the paragraph, unaltered, here in the Assembly this morning than was the case in the Second Committee.

45. There are two reasons why the sponsors oppose the United Kingdom amendment to operative paragraph 1. First, in that paragraph we are reaffirming what the last session of the General Assembly did by adopting resolution 3016 (XXVII). We have, therefore, to reaffirm the same text as is found in that resolution, which was supported by most of the delegations present. We cannot change the text from last year's resolution without falsifying what we want to reaffirm. That should be obvious and therefore we cannot accept any change in the wording of operative paragraph 1.

46. Secondly, it has been maintained that operative paragraph 1 prejudices the outcome of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea. The sponsors certainly have nothing of that sort in mind and are indeed all actively involved in, and interested in the success of, the forthcoming Conference. The draft resolution we have here proposed is

not a juridical text aimed at creating marine law or establishing new boundaries on the ocean. Far from it. It is purely and simply a draft resolution dealing with economic matters and sovereignty over natural resources. That is why the limits of that sovereignty over natural resources are nowhere defined in the draft resolution, apart from the reference to the sea-bed area "within national jurisdiction". I should like to stress that nobody, however, knows today what "national jurisdiction" means in this respect and how far out from the coast it extends. That is not a matter for us to resolve in the Second Committee or here in the Assembly, but a matter which is solely up to the Conference. We are not dictating anything to the Conference in this respect or prejudging the issue, but are simply referring to the sea-bed area within national jurisdiction as it will later be defined by the Conference.

47. The same may be said of the resources of the superjacent waters. Operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution does not prescribe any limit for the extent of coastal State jurisdiction in this respect. That is again for the Conference on the Law of the Sea to decide and not for us to dictate.

48. We are in this paragraph simply reaffirming the sovereignty of States over the resources of the superjacent waters as far out as the Conference will later decide. It is totally wrong, therefore, to maintain that by this wording we are prejudging the work of the Conference. The decision on the limits is left entirely to its discretion.

49. We are well aware of the fact that some States believe that the rights of coastal States over the superjacent waters extend only 12 miles out. Others maintain that the limit is 50 miles or even 200 miles. The draft resolution does not support any of these limits but leaves the issue open for the Conference on the Law of the Sea to decide.

50. The sponsors therefore hope that, with that in mind, delegations which have—understandably—been anxious to avoid any conflict with the work of the Conference can give their unreserved support to this very important draft resolution before us now, just as they did at the last session of the General Assembly and as they have now done in the Second Committee this year. The sponsors consequently appeal to all delegations to oppose the amendment put forward by the United Kingdom to operative paragraph 1 and vote in favour of the draft resolution unchanged, as recommended by the Second Committee.

51. Mr. AL-KHUDHAIRY (Iraq): Draft resolution V was labelled as intemperate and it was said that it was unspecific about the foes it seeks to face. This type of language and conclusions is, to say the least, hasty and demonstrates clearly that these delegations which oppose the draft resolution do so out of an ignorance of its purposes and thrust. The representative of Iceland has clarified the intent of the draft resolution as a whole. For my part I should like to say a few words on operative paragraph 3 in order to dispel any clouds of misunderstanding and misinterpretation that have been intentionally cast around it. Nothing in this paragraph can be construed as being an obstacle on the path to the era of better partnership in development between the developing and developed countries, to which some delegations have alluded.

52. First of all I should like to state clearly that the original sponsors of the draft resolution accepted the inclusion of operative paragraph 3 without the "reluctance", of which the representative of the United Kingdom spoke. On the contrary, the great majority of the sponsors welcomed the inclusion of the paragraph in question. Do I need to remind delegations that it was the representative of Iceland who, on behalf of the other sponsors, accepted that amendment while he rejected the amendment proposed by the delegation of the United Kingdom. Can this be called reluctance?

53. We cannot envisage how under any circumstances operative paragraph 3 can be described as being divorced from reality. What is reality? Reality is that the right of States to permanent sovereignty over their natural resources has been acknowledged, accepted and reaffirmed by numerous resolutions and decisions of the United Nations which represent the will of the international community. The right of a State to adopt all measures necessary to supervise and control the exploitation of its natural resources cannot be questioned or disputed.

Mr. Ibingira (Uganda), Vice-President, took the Chair.

54. The report of the Working Party on Review and Appraisal, which was accepted by consensus in the Second Committee and which we hope will also be so accepted in the plenary, stated clearly that internal economic and social structural changes are necessary for the achievement of the major goals and objectives of development. The report states the following:

"... These structural changes, which are a prerequisite for any integrated development process, include *inter alia* the control and sovereignty over natural resources...". [A/C.2/L.1329, para. 33.]

The report further states the need to

"... reaffirm the vital importance of the full"—I stress "full"—"exercise of national sovereignty over natural resources in the interests of development and in accordance with the objectives of the Strategy and to proclaim the right of each State to exercise control"—again we have the word "control"—"over its natural resources and exploit them in accordance with the interests of the country". [*Ibid.*, para. 35.]

What is meant by the word "control"? I leave it to other representatives to answer this plain and simple question.

55. The representative of the United Kingdom attempted to fish in muddy waters and to create division and a weakening of ranks among the delegations of the developing countries, and in particular the delegations of the non-aligned countries. This type of subversive attempt coming from the representative of the United Kingdom is not uncommon or unexpected. His country has for centuries practised a policy founded on the dictum of "divide and rule".

56. He said in his statement that he had grave doubts whether operative paragraph 3 reflected the true position of the Governments of the overwhelming majority of the developing countries. To this false allegation I need only say that operative paragraph 3 was taken, word for word, from the "Action Programme for Economic Co-operation" adopted

at the Fourth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Algiers from 5 to 9 September 1973 [A/9330 and Corr.1, p. 85]. I emphasize that it was adopted by 73 Heads of State or Government, that is, the highest authorities of independent and sovereign States from all corners of the world. And yet the representative of the United Kingdom dares to say that operative paragraph 3 does not reflect the true position of the overwhelming majority of the Governments of developing countries. Are we to understand that all those Heads of State who met in Algiers and solemnly and freely accepted and adopted the decisions of that Conference did so half-heartedly or that they did not take seriously what they accepted? Or, are we to understand that they had no intention of implementing their own decisions?

57. The representative of the United Kingdom endeavoured in his statement to cast the act of nationalization in a very negative light and tried to show it to be a self-destructive act. Recent examples prove otherwise. Let me assure my fellow representatives that operative paragraph 3 can in no sense be interpreted as a call on developing countries to nationalize forthwith, purely for the sake of nationalization, the foreign concerns in their countries. Its purpose is mainly to have the General Assembly affirm the right of States to nationalize as an expression of their sovereignty, and I cannot see how anyone can object to this.

58. I wish to emphasize here and place on record what my delegation has already stated in the debate in the Second Committee, that is, that draft resolution V—and in particular its operative paragraph 3—should not and must not, in any way or under any circumstances, be interpreted as being directed against foreign private investment or as creating an unfavourable climate for constructive international investment.

59. My country, for one—and I am sure this is the case with many other developing countries—welcomes foreign private investment. This has been made clear on a number of occasions by our highest officials. Such investment must, however, be subject to prior authorization and to a system of centralized government control; it must also supplement the domestic effort and be consistent with the national development plans, incorporate appropriate technology, lead to the further development of technology, generate employment, and involve management that is decentralized from the parent company. In other words, it must be investment of a positive and constructive nature that is mutually beneficial to both the State and the foreign private investor.

60. So let there be no more attempts at depicting the thrust of this draft resolution and its paragraphs as being directed against, and as a deterrent to, private foreign investment. We reject this false and devious interpretation of the intent.

61. I therefore urge all representatives to give careful thought to the importance of operative paragraph 3 and to the draft resolution as a whole and not to forget—especially the representatives of non-aligned countries—that their Heads of State accepted it. Furthermore, I should like to remind my fellow representatives that operative paragraph 3 was adopted by 81 votes in the Second Committee.

62. My delegation requests that a roll-call vote be taken on operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution V.

63. I wish to turn now to draft resolution IX. My delegation will vote in favour of that draft resolution, as we firmly believe that it is intolerable that people and States should be deprived of exercising sovereignty over their natural and national resources; and that if they are wrongfully and unjustly prevented from exercising their right because of external circumstances beyond their control—such as foreign occupation of their territories or their being subjected to colonial rule or racist régimes—then it becomes imperative that they should be compensated for the losses they incur from such illegal actions.

64. My delegation is dismayed and astonished to note that certain countries have chosen to practise one form of racial or ethnic discrimination in the forms of the United Nations. In the Second Committee some delegations voted in the affirmative on operative paragraph 4, while they either voted against or abstained in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole. The only possible interpretation of such action is that those delegations practise discriminatory policies against one people and a group of countries. For, on the one hand, they voted in favour of the applicability of the principle of compensation to all States, territories and peoples, while, on the other, they denied its application to the Arab peoples and States. We cannot understand the logic behind such a stand. This is simple and flagrant discrimination which is directed against the Arab people and States and which cannot be explained away by any excuse or argument.

65. Let those delegations ponder the gravity of such hostile stands and the consequences of this form of covert discrimination and compartmentalization of peoples and States. My delegation, for its part, cannot accept these cynical two-faced policies and double standards.

66. It is time for all those delegations that believe in the inalienable rights of peoples—all peoples—to exercise sovereign control over their national resources and to be compensated for the illegal exploitation and plunder of these resources by the occupational forces of a foreign Power to stand up and be counted.

67. It is for that reason that I ask for a roll-call vote on operative paragraph 4 separately and on the draft resolution as a whole.

68. Mr. HAQ (Pakistan): My remarks will be addressed to draft resolution VI. My delegation supports the amendment proposed by the representative of Morocco to draft resolution VI, namely, to delete the word "system" in operative paragraph 2 of that text.

69. A special session of the General Assembly would be a major event in the history of the United Nations. The session would consider, among other extremely important issues, new concepts and options for the effective promotion of the solution of world economic problems, assist in the evolution of world economic relations and for these purposes initiate the necessary and appropriate structural changes in the United Nations system.

70. It is our view that for such an important undertaking the Secretary-General must, in the preparation of his report, enjoy the broadest freedom of action. While he should be

free to hold consultations, if he deems it necessary, with independent experts, academic and governmental circles, international organizations and specialized agencies, his hands should be completely free in drawing up such a report. He should have full freedom to present necessary facts and recommendations to the fifty-seventh session of the Economic and Social Council and, later, to the special session of the General Assembly. That is why we support the proposal to delete the word "system".

71. In the history of the United Nations, the examples of the Capacity Study by Sir Robert Jackson and the report of the Pearson Commission prove that only studies carried out independently may bring changes and advancement in solving important international development problems.

72. As the General Assembly is aware, the Economic and Social Council, with a view to strengthening the coherence of the system, decided in its resolution 1768 (LIV) to review the existing agreements between the United Nations and the specialized agencies. For that purpose, it requested the Secretary-General to submit an independent report. The Secretary-General correctly brought to the attention of the summer session of the Council that it was not enough for the various pieces of the United Nations system to work well each by itself; what was needed was the over-all coherence and direction of the system. He remarked also that the growth of the United Nations system had been erratic and marked by centrifugal tendencies resulting in more and more central autonomy at both the inter-governmental and sectoral level. He added, "I think the time has come for governments seriously to explore ways to halt and to reverse this trend".²

73. As the delegation which had the honour of introducing during the fifty-fourth session of the Economic and Social Council, the draft resolution which eventually was adopted as Council resolution 1768 (LIV), we wish to state that we agree with that view. I would also wish to clarify that, in our view, that resolution and the present one have different objectives and address themselves to different problems. Hence, we would look forward to the separate reports of the Secretary-General prepared in response to the resolutions in question. We welcome the proposal of the Secretary-General to set up a high-level expert panel to prepare the report requested in operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution VI. In our view, such a panel should comprise personalities of known independence and standing in the socio-economic field and the report of the Secretary-General must contain some specific proposals regarding the restructuring of the United Nations system to make it a more effective instrument of world economic co-operation and for the implementation of the International Development Strategy.

74. Mr. VAN GORKOM (Netherlands): My delegation would like to explain its vote before the voting with respect to draft resolution III on the special measures related to the particular needs of the land-locked developing countries.

75. While the Netherlands delegation in the Second Committee abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1310/Rev.2, it will now vote in favour of draft resolution III contained in document A/9400.

² See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fifty-fifth Session, 1859th meeting, para. 34.*

76. The Netherlands Government is fully aware of the special problems that confront the land-locked developing countries, and gives all possible attention to these measures to meet these problems. My delegation is therefore supporting the studies undertaken pursuant to Economic and Social Council resolution 1755 (LIV) relating to the special problems encountered by the land-locked developing countries, in particular in the field of transportation, which may promote the necessary measures to be taken. As the Netherlands delegation has repeatedly stressed, we feel that such measures can best be undertaken through existing development assistance institutions and programmes. The establishment of a special fund is, in my delegation's view, not desirable because it would, among other things, contribute to the further proliferation of special purpose funds.

77. While casting an affirmative vote on draft resolution III, my delegation wishes to stress its understanding that the request in operative paragraph 2 for the undertaking of a complete study on the establishment of a fund in favour of the land-locked developing countries in implementation of Economic and Social Council resolution 1755 (LIV), will bring forth "all possible alternatives" that may result from the consultations of the Secretary-General as provided for in operative paragraph 2 of that resolution. Therefore, the draft resolution is considered by my delegation to be without prejudice to the outcome of the study and we shall be happy to vote in favour of it.

78. Mr. ELIASHIV (Israel): I wish to address myself to draft resolution IX recommended by the Second Committee in document A/9400 now before the Assembly. It is regrettable that the Arab delegations and their supporters have involved the Second Committee in highly sensitive political subjects which not only are extraneous to it but have been fully dealt with in other bodies of the General Assembly and in the Security Council.

79. Furthermore, as all delegations know, the specific questions which are related to the areas administered by Israel since 1967 have been extensively and repeatedly discussed in the Special Political Committee. We maintain that it was inappropriate and out of order to take up the same matters again in the Second Committee. Consequently, the adoption of the draft resolution is likely to constitute a negative step and may place grave obstacles in the path of the future work of the Second Committee which up to now has at least tried to observe its tradition of dealing with economic questions without engaging in bilateral political disputes or complicating the pursuit of peaceful relations.

80. The draft resolution before us not only singles out an issue which cannot be divorced from the whole complex Middle East problem, but attempts to attribute to Israel exclusive responsibility for all the consequences of the continuous aggression committed by Arab States against it ever since 1948, ignoring the responsibility of the Arab States, which cannot escape the outcome of their own aggression against Israel.

81. In effect, the major bodies of the United Nations repudiated the fallacious Arab thesis that aggression and the state of war which the Arab States have practised and proclaimed against Israel conferred upon them the right to blockade, boycott, threaten, intimidate and engage in politi-

cal warfare and terror, while requiring Israel to resign itself to its destruction, openly promised and planned by the Arab States in one form or another since 1948.

82. The representative of Pakistan, when introducing this draft resolution in the Second Committee, and several other representatives relied extensively on the report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories. But allow me to recall the nature of the Special Committee. That Committee was established in an unconstitutional manner and with a mandate which prejudged the issue. It became notorious for the lack of impartiality of its members, both individually and as representatives of the States from which they came and which appointed them.

83. Furthermore, as our delegation has previously shown in detail when discussing the Special Committee's report, no validity whatsoever can be attached to the findings and conclusions of that Committee. Anyone who carefully scrutinizes its report must reach the unavoidable conclusion that it is based on preconceived ideas, irrelevant assertions, baseless allegations, selective quotations and so-called findings which have no foundation whatever.

84. We have explained our position and the factual situation on many occasions in different organs, including the Second Committee, the Special Political Committee and the General Assembly, and refuted baseless allegations made in the report of the Special Committee, as well as all the tendentious and baseless charges and misrepresentations directed at us by a number of delegations in the course of the debate. We are not going to take up the General Assembly's time by going into all this again.

85. I will simply say this. What the draft resolution is calling for is in fact a restoration of the sad and unbearable situation which prevailed before 1967 when, for example, during 19 years of oppression and persecution the inhabitants of Gaza were kept in deplorable conditions by the Egyptian military authorities. No amount of fanciful allegations and distorted reports will deter Israel from pursuing its positive policy of economic and social progress in the administered areas, maintaining the laws in force in the territories and conducting its administration in accordance with the relevant rules of international law and binding international conventions, until a just and durable peace is achieved.

86. With reference to the issue of the so-called exploitation of natural resources, we reiterate that there is no basis in international law precluding the orderly use of resources available in the area.

87. In conclusion, the draft resolution before us is completely uncalled for. It seeks to prejudge the forthcoming peace talks in Geneva and will contribute absolutely nothing to the concerted efforts in the quest for peace in our area. We do appreciate that a number of other delegations share our views in this respect and we sincerely hope that many delegations will cast their vote against the draft resolution and will not support it. For the reasons presented by my delegation in the Second Committee and here in the Assembly, we utterly reject the draft resolution before us and will vote against it.

88. Mr. FASLA (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): It has been proposed that operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution V, "Permanent sovereignty of States over their natural resources", should be deleted. We believe it states a fundamental principle. It is part of the principle of the permanent sovereignty of States over their natural resources. That was clearly reaffirmed by the Conference of Heads of States or Government of Non-Aligned Countries at Algiers.

89. For decades our wealth served only foreign interests and régimes which barely exist today. Now the countries of the third world wish to recuperate their wealth and use it for their people.

90. It has been said that this is contrary to international interests, that it discourages foreign investment, and so forth. But what international law is being referred to? European centrist law, which has always been prepared against us, in spite of us? Of course we are opposed to that form of law. We are prepared to adhere to progressive international law which truly represents the interests of all, and which particularly represents the interests of the developing countries.

91. Paragraph 3 of draft resolution V is certainly justified by that form of law. It could certainly not be a brake on foreign investment, as some have suggested. Just to take my country as an example, after nationalization there was a good deal of investment even by countries which had contested our nationalization actions.

92. The representative of the United Kingdom thought that there were contradictions in the statement by Arab leaders concerning natural resources, but that in no way affects our countries' policies concerning foreign investment. The separate vote which has been requested on this paragraph will, we are convinced, serve only to bring out the value of the principle which is contained in it.

93. Mr. OLIVERI LÓPEZ (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation would like to comment on draft decisions III and IV in paragraph 64 of document A/9400. First, draft decision III concerns the outflow of trained personnel from developing to developed countries. We attach considerable importance to that problem. The significance of resolution 3017 (XXVII), sponsored by the delegation of Cuba, is clear. This provided an opportunity to have a thorough consideration of a problem which affects all developing countries, although it affects some in particular.

94. At the summer session of the Economic and Social Council, we said that this matter should be considered at the second session of the Committee on Science and Technology, to be held in March. We would like to ask the Secretariat to reproduce, as has been done in other cases, the replies sent by Governments to the note of the Secretary-General requesting opinions on this subject. That is particularly necessary, we believe, because of the surprising basic document which was used by the Group of Experts that considered this matter in Geneva towards the end of this year. A specialist guided that body, and he had recently been an official of the developed country which has absorbed per-

haps more brain power from the developing countries than any other country.

95. My second comment concerns draft decision IV. We have already said that the United Nations initiative which led to a World Plan of Action, and to regional action, is worthy of praise; in fact this initiative has led to concrete action.

96. This initiative, which was supposed to have such a profound effect on the economies of developing countries, was prepared without those countries having been properly consulted. We are concerned over that fact. The World Plan of Action, after all, can be only a way of defining the true needs of the international community in terms of science and technology, and the priorities of the developing countries clearly expressed by their Governments must be the central part of any such plan. When the matter was discussed at the first session of the Committee on Science and Technology for Development, my delegation was very active, together with those of other developing countries. Draft resolution II was finally adopted at the summer session of the Economic and Social Council as Council resolution 1823 (LV), section II, and it provides for machinery to revise and bring up to date the World Plan of Action, which must be brought into line with the priorities of the developing countries. The delegation of Argentina is confident that that resolution and the debate which led to its adoption will be duly borne in mind. They must be borne in mind if the World Plan of Action is to be "a means of strengthening the scientific and technological components in international co-operation", to use the words of the decision we are about to adopt on this subject.

97. Mr. HOSNY (Egypt): My delegation will vote for draft resolution IX, pertaining to the occupied Arab territories, the objective of which is to affirm that Egypt, Syria and Jordan, and the Arab populations in the occupied territories, are also among the States and peoples whose right of permanent sovereignty is to be safeguarded. Draft resolution IX is a logical sequence of the resolute support declared in operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution V for

"... the efforts of the developing countries and of the peoples of the territories under colonial and racial domination and foreign occupation in their struggle to regain effective control over their natural resources".

That support is based upon the illegality of all those acts—that is foreign occupation and racial and colonial domination. Once we agree that all those acts are illegal, then we shall only be wasting ink and paper merely to draft resolutions if the losses resulting from those illegal acts are not fully compensated.

98. With respect to the peace efforts which were advanced as a pretext for voting against, or for abstaining in the vote on, draft resolution IX, my delegation would like to put this question to the General Assembly: What would be the role of the United Nations if its weight were not felt in any peace effort and if the Charter and previous resolutions were not applied?

99. The Charter of the United Nations and the resolutions of the General Assembly should be the terms of reference of

any peace initiative. This is what has been proclaimed by almost every delegation in this Assembly. My delegation previously asserted in the Second Committee that that Committee was the appropriate United Nations body to deal with draft resolution IX because it was that same Committee that adopted all previous resolutions on permanent sovereignty over natural resources. Why should the Second Committee then shy away from its responsibility when we have asked it to act upon violations of resolutions adopted by that very Committee, the Second Committee? I must say that the pretext that draft resolution IX should have been dealt with in other Committees is not convincing. Neither could it convincingly be put forward as a reason for not voting for that draft resolution. Furthermore, we have now come to the General Assembly and it is irrelevant to put forward the argument that the draft resolution should have been discussed in the Second Committee or in some other Committee. We are now before the General Assembly.

100. With respect to some allegations that were put forward during this debate, I should like to inform the delegations that Israel, far from abiding by the previous resolutions of the United Nations, the provisions of international law and conventions, and the United Nations Charter, is, on the contrary, plundering the natural wealth of the occupied Arab territories, together with their human resources in the form of cheap manpower and discriminating wages. In 1972 alone, Israel looted from the petroleum resources of Sinai crude oil to the estimated amount of 35.7 million barrels, the value of which is about \$US 82.5 million. Moreover, it is evident that Israel is pursuing its exploitation of the oilfields of Sinai without any regard to their future productivity. Its only interest is to loot all the wealth it can.

101. In view of the Israeli characteristics, it was not surprising to many observers when Israel further expanded its territorial demands in August 1973 to cover the major part of Egyptian Sinai, making sure that the part to be annexed included the oilfields of the peninsula. Israel is still declaring, at the highest government levels, that it does intend to annex parts of the occupied territories, and it is continuing its programme envisaging the economic integration of the occupied territories.

102. With respect to allegations put forward against the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories, my only remark is that it is a committee of the United Nations and must be respected by all Members of the United Nations.

103. With respect to certain allegations about the aggression of Arab States against Israel, representatives are fully aware of the unprovoked Israeli aggression against Egypt in 1956 with the objective of seizing one of Egypt's major resources, the Suez Canal. All delegations are also fully aware of the plight of the Palestinian people who, in 1948 and again in 1956 and again in 1967, were expelled from their homes, lands and orchards by Zionist-Israeli terrorism.

104. My fellow representatives cannot be tricked by the allegations of the Israeli representative, when all delegations know quite well who started the treacherous pre-emptive attack against Egypt, Syria and Jordan in 1967 and who has

since practised the long-arms policy of repeated acts of aggression, including State terrorism, against the Arab countries. This has been demonstrated in 1973 alone by the cold-blooded Israeli military raid carried out in the midst of Beirut, the capital of Lebanon, in February. It has also been demonstrated by the repeated treacherous air attacks on Syria all year round, and the shooting down of the Libyan civilian airplane over Egypt, with the loss of 113 innocent lives. Those are but a few examples of Israeli acts of aggression and terrorism. In order to save the time of the Assembly, I shall not go into further details in this statement.

105. Mr. JOSEPH (Australia): Addressing myself to draft resolution V on the subject of permanent sovereignty over natural resources, I wish to say that Australia itself is dedicated to asserting control over its own not insubstantial natural resources. Having said that, we, too, regret some of the intemperate turns of phrase in the draft resolution, believing that the sponsors would have achieved no less by using less strident and emotive language.

106. None the less, my delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution in the Second Committee, and we shall do so again today, because it embodies principles—even though not expressed in quite the language we would have used—that my Government does hold dear.

107. As regards operative paragraph 1, we note that in the Second Committee and here again today speakers have acknowledged that it is not meant by this paragraph to prejudice in any way the eventual decisions of the Conference on the Law of the Sea in regard to the limits of national jurisdiction. My delegation concurs in this interpretation, and this has helped make it possible for us to support the draft resolution.

108. Our support, however, derives also from the fact that the paragraph expresses in general terms the direction in which we believe international law on this subject is moving and should move.

109. As regards the amendment to operative paragraph 1 proposed by the United Kingdom delegation—namely, to relocate the words “and in the superjacent waters” before the phrase “within their national jurisdiction”—my delegation voted against that amendment in the Second Committee when it was proposed by that same delegation. We have, however, now had a fresh look at the matter and have decided that in the plenary Assembly we shall change our vote to an abstention. This is because the policy of my Government with respect to the natural resources in the superjacent waters falls between the position taken by the United Kingdom amendment and the position set out in operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution V. My country at present exercises jurisdiction with respect to fisheries only out to a distance of 12 miles. However, my Government has also announced that at the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea it will be seeking as part of any new régime on the law of the sea an economic zone extending out to 200 miles, this to be in addition to the maintenance of the existing rights of coastal States with respect to the resources of the continental shelf. Such an economic zone would, of course, include the resources of the superjacent waters.

110. My delegation also abstained in the separate vote on operative paragraph 3 of this draft in the Second Committee, for reasons which we elaborated at length there, and which need not be repeated here.

111. While I have the floor, I should just like to say with regard to draft resolution III, dealing with special measures relating to the particular needs of the land-locked developing countries, that we will be voting in favour of this draft; but in doing so I should like to associate my delegation with the observations of the representative of the Netherlands, and in particular with the view concerning a special fund for the land-locked countries. Australia is not convinced that a special fund would be the best way of extending assistance to the land-locked, believing that this can be best met through existing institutions.

112. Mr. EVANS (United States of America): The United States sincerely and strongly supports the right of each State to exercise permanent sovereignty over its natural resources. This is almost a sacred right; I am sure that on this we are in complete agreement. My Government fully supports resolution 1803 (XVII). We believe that that resolution expresses the concept in a balanced way, emphasizing that permanent sovereignty must be exercised within the norms of international law.

113. Now, with reference to draft resolution V, the United States will abstain in the vote, since, frankly in our view the draft resolution deviates from the true interests of the nations that make up the international community—or, as I like to term it, the family of nations. We support the view so articulately and succinctly stated by the United Kingdom representative Mr. Mackenzie, and support the amendment proposed by him.

114. In the separate vote on operative paragraph 3, we will cast a negative vote, since, despite the reassurances of the original sponsors of the paragraph, we firmly believe, we genuinely believe, that the paragraph will have the effect of discouraging private investment and, therefore, weaken a central pillar of the development policy of many States. Now, in addition, the paragraph, in our view, runs counter to the spirit of the International Development Strategy. Make no mistake: we believe that operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution V is motivated by sincere and good and noble intentions on the part of the developing nations. Realistically, and pragmatically, however, investing companies, in this country and other investing countries, are made up of individuals—large and small investors or stockholders—the world over. I think we will all recognize that nothing really happens without seed-money investment in many of the developing countries.

115. Now, I am asking you, is it not logical to assume that paragraph 3 will frighten those investors, who would be most reluctant to invest in developing countries knowing that the chances of success are highly doubtful for their investment? Let me ask this question, Would you, as a developing nation, if you were going to invest, be interested in investing in another nation having such questionable attitudes?

116. We feel that this paragraph could be highly counter-productive. A very renowned American philosopher by the

name of Ralph Waldo Emerson once gave calls for serious reflection when he urged his readers: "Be careful what you want, because you might get it".

117. Mr. RYDBECK (Sweden): The Swedish delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution V on permanent sovereignty over natural resources as an expression of our conviction that all countries must have the right to control their natural resources. This right is of special importance to developing countries struggling for economic independence and self-reliance.

118. The international community should, in our view, respond positively to their determined efforts to build their societies in accordance with the needs and wishes of their peoples and to break away from such economic ties as hamper the full mobilization of internal resources. The international community must accept these changes and co-operate in finding solutions. Economic and commercial pressures should not be allowed to jeopardize such solutions or stand in the way of an evolution towards economic independence, of which permanent sovereignty over natural resources is a major attribute. However, the draft resolution contains certain elements which make it necessary to make the following reservations.

119. As regards operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution V, my delegation shares the opinion of some other delegations that the law of the sea aspects of this paragraph should be dealt with by the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea. The outcome of that Conference should not be prejudged through resolutions adopted by other organs. Accordingly, we will abstain on this paragraph as well as on the amendments submitted to it.

120. Regarding operative paragraph 7 and the sixth pre-ambular paragraph, I wish to state that the Swedish Government supports in principle the thesis that co-operation, among the developing countries should be strengthened in order to safeguard their exercise of sovereignty over natural resources. However, my Government does not see all forms of co-operation, as referred to, as integral elements of the principle of permanent sovereignty over natural resources *per se*. The legitimate interests of other countries and peoples should also be taken into account.

121. As regards operative paragraph 3, which states

"... that each State is entitled to determine the amount of possible compensation and the mode of payment, and that any disputes which might arise should be settled in accordance with the national legislation of each State carrying out such measures",

my Government still holds to the view, which is in conformity with General Assembly resolution 1803 (XVII), namely, that in cases where national means of justice have been exhausted, and the result of this process still appears unsatisfactory to a foreign State, there exists a dispute on the international level, a dispute which, in the well-known view of the Swedish Government, should be settled by an international court. Indeed, as between two States which are parties to the optional clause of the International Court of Justice, such procedures for a settlement of disputes are readily available. The same is true for States parties to the conven-

tions on the settlement of investment disputes between States and nationals of other States.

122. In this connexion I should like to comment briefly also on draft resolution III, regarding special measures in favour of land-locked developing countries. My delegation will be happy to vote in favour of that draft resolution. We fully realize that these countries have their special problems and we support the efforts to elaborate measures geared towards the particular problems which are directly connected with their geographical position. In view of our reservations regarding special funds, expressed on many other occasions, we cannot, however, support operative paragraph 2 concerning the establishment of a special fund in favour of the land-locked developing countries. We shall therefore have to abstain should there be a separate vote on that paragraph.

123. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on the nine draft resolutions recommended by the Second Committee in paragraph 63 of its report [A/9400]. The Assembly will vote first on draft resolution I, entitled "United Nations Revolving Fund for Natural Resources Exploration". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, Gabon, Germany (Federal Republic of), Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Nigeria, Norway, Peru, Poland, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics,

Draft resolution I was adopted by 106 votes to none, with 18 abstentions (resolution 3167 (XXVIII)).

124. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to draft resolution II, entitled "The role of modern science and technology in the development of nations and the need to strengthen

economic, technical and scientific co-operation among States". Since draft resolution II was adopted by the Second Committee without a vote, may I take it that the General Assembly adopts it also?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 3168 (XXVIII)).

125. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now vote on draft resolution III, entitled "Special measures related to the particular needs of the land-locked developing countries". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, Congo, Dahomey, Denmark, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany (Federal Republic of), Italy, Ivory Coast, Luxembourg, Pakistan, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Draft resolution II was adopted by 110 votes to none, with 15 abstentions (resolution 3169 (XXVIII)).

126. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now consider draft resolution IV, entitled "International years and anniversaries". That draft resolution was adopted by the Second Committee without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly adopts draft resolution IV?

Draft resolution IV was adopted (resolution 3170 (XXVIII)).

127. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution V is entitled "Permanent sovereignty over natural resources".

128. An amendment to its operative paragraph 1 has been submitted by the representative of the United Kingdom. In accordance with rule 92 of the rules of procedure we shall vote first on that amendment, which seeks to have the

phrase "and in the superjacent waters", which now appears at the end of operative paragraph 1, inserted instead after the phrase "the subsoil thereof". I put the amendment to the vote. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Greece, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Nepal, Netherlands, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Singapore, South Africa, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Against: Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Bhutan, Brazil, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Jamaica, Kenya, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico, New Zealand, Nigeria, Peru, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Abstaining: Australia, Barbados, Botswana, Burma, Burundi, Chad, Denmark, Equatorial Guinea, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Lebanon, Malawi, Malta, Morocco, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Romania, Rwanda, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Zambia.

The amendment was rejected by 59 votes to 29, with 37 abstentions.

129. The PRESIDENT: Separate votes have been requested on operative paragraphs 2 and 3 of draft resolution V. If there is no objection, we shall proceed accordingly.

130. I now put to the vote operative paragraph 2. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mon-

golia, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Israel, Italy, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution V was adopted by 108 votes to none, with 14 abstentions.

131. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution V. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Bhutan, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain.

Against: France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Israel, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Belgium.

Abstaining: Canada, Denmark, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Philippines, Rwanda, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Australia, Austria, Barbados.

Operative paragraph 3 of the resolution V was adopted by 86 votes to 11, with 28 abstentions.

132. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote draft resolution V as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain,³ Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Abstaining: Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Greece, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Portugal, South Africa, United States of America.

Draft resolution V as a whole was adopted by 108 votes to 1, with 16 abstentions (resolution 3171 (XXVIII)).⁴

133. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to draft resolution VI, entitled "Holding of a special session of the General Assembly devoted to development and international economic co-operation".

134. In this connexion an amendment has been submitted by the representative of Morocco. The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of draft resolution VI is contained in document A/9458. In accordance with rule 92 of the rules of procedure we shall first take a decision on the amendment and then on draft resolution VI, amended or not. The amendment is to replace the word "bodies" by the word "organs" and to delete the word "system" in operative paragraph 2. May I take it that the Assembly agrees to that amendment?

The amendment was adopted.

³ The delegation of Spain subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as an abstention.

⁴ The delegation of Colombia subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

135. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote draft resolution VI, as amended. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Draft resolution VI, as amended, was adopted by 123 votes to none (resolution 3172 (XXVIII)).

136. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to draft resolution VII entitled "Assistance to Zambia". The Second Committee adopted that draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly also adopts it?

Draft resolution VII was adopted (resolution 3173 (XXVIII)).

137. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution VIII, entitled "Special measures in favour of the least developed countries", was adopted without a vote by the Second Committee. May I take it that the General Assembly adopts draft resolution VIII?

Draft resolution VIII was adopted (resolution 3174 (XXVIII)).

138. The PRESIDENT: We come now to draft resolution IX, entitled "Permanent sovereignty over national resources in the occupied Arab territories".

139. A roll-call vote has been requested on operative paragraph 4 and on the draft resolution as a whole. I put to the vote first operative paragraph 4.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

The Netherlands, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal.

Against: Nicaragua, Portugal, United States of America, Israel.

Abstaining: Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Canada, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Haiti, Honduras, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi.

Operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution IX was adopted by 93 votes to 4, with 24 abstentions.⁵

140. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on draft resolution IX as a whole.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Morocco, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bahrain, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Lebanon,

Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia.

Against: Nicaragua, United States of America, Bolivia, Dominican Republic, Israel.

Abstaining: Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Canada, Costa Rica, Denmark, El Salvador, Finland, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Malawi.

Draft resolution IX as a whole was adopted by 90 votes to 5, with 26 abstentions (resolution 3175 (XXVIII)).⁶

141. The PRESIDENT: I now invite members to turn their attention to the six draft decisions recommended by the Second Committee in paragraph 64 of its report [A/9400].

142. The Second Committee adopted draft decision I entitled "Measures to improve the organization of the work of the Council" without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt draft decision I?

Draft decision I was adopted.

143. The PRESIDENT: Draft decision II is entitled "Reports on protein." That decision also was adopted in the Committee without a vote. May I take it that draft decision II is endorsed by the Assembly?

Draft decision II was adopted.

144. The PRESIDENT: Draft decision III, entitled "Outflow of trained personnel from developing countries to developed countries", was adopted by the Second Committee without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly endorses it?

Draft decision III was adopted.

145. The PRESIDENT: Draft decision IV is entitled "'World Plan of Action for the Application of Science and Technology to Development' as a means of strengthening scientific and technological components in international co-operation and in national development plans". The Second Committee adopted that draft decision without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft decision IV was adopted.

146. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to draft decision V, entitled "Economic and social consequences of disarmament". That draft decision was adopted by the Second Committee without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft decision V was adopted.

147. The PRESIDENT: Finally we come to draft decision VI, entitled "The problem of mass poverty and unemployment in developing countries". In the Second Committee

⁵ *Idem.*

⁶ *Idem.*

draft decision VI was adopted without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly will do likewise?

Draft decision VI was adopted.

148. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

149. Mr. GONZÁLEZ DE COSSÍO (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Mexico voted in favour of draft resolution IX. We believe that it is in accordance with a guiding principle of our foreign policy, namely, the obligation not to recognize any territorial acquisition resulting from the illegal use of force, and that prohibition extends also to the consequences of that form of occupation. We wish to state, however, that we still have doubts about the implications of some of the ideas contained in that resolution, such as "restitution", which would seem rather difficult to implement, especially within the broad context defined in operative paragraph 4 of the resolution.

150. Mr. SINGH (Malaysia): I should like to address my remarks to resolution V, which was just adopted, and in particular to its paragraph 3. My delegation abstained in the vote on that paragraph, as it did in the Second Committee. In the discussion in that Committee we explained why we abstained, and my delegation would like to have its views reflected in the record of this meeting.

151. Mr. CHRISTIANS (Venezuela) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Venezuela wishes to explain its vote on resolution IX. We wish to state that we support the general principles underlying the resolution, but our vote in favour of the resolution does not jeopardize the strictly neutral position of the Government of Venezuela on the Middle East problem as a whole.

152. Mr. JABER (Jordan): The delegation of Jordan voted in favour of operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution V. Our affirmative vote should not be taken as reflecting any change in our economic policy, which encourages private investment, both foreign and domestic, and under which we will continue to seek foreign capital. In fact, we have an investment encouragement law, which provides foreign investors with tax exemptions, guarantees of transfer of capital and profits, and other privileges. However, we believe that each country has the right to choose its economic and social system. Thus, some countries might find it to their advantage to strengthen their public sector and nationalize certain enterprises. We believe that such action is an expression of the permanent sovereignty over their natural resources. We have supported operative paragraph 3 in that context.

153. Mr. HACHANI (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): In explaining our vote on draft resolution V, I should like to recall the explanation our delegation gave after the vote in the Second Committee and to reiterate that our affirmative vote on this resolution should not be interpreted as a denunciation by my country of the bilateral, multilateral or international obligations that it has freely accepted and continues to accept or which it will in future freely accept. It was on that understanding in particular that we voted in favour of operative paragraph 3 concerning nationalization. Let me recall in this connexion the position

stated on numerous occasions by my delegation that, in its view and in the interest of respect for our sovereignty, we would prefer friendly solutions to confrontations.

154. Mr. MAKEYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): The Soviet delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution V in document A/9400. The position of the Soviet Union on the issue of the developing countries' permanent sovereignty over their natural resources is well known. Our country actively defends the interests of the developing countries by opposing any attempts to exert pressure, directly or indirectly, upon States which, after a difficult struggle, have won their right to independent development and are now building their national economies, carrying out progressive social and economic changes and defending their rights to control the natural resources which they own.

155. Guided by its position of principle of protecting the permanent sovereignty of the developing countries over their natural resources, the delegation of the Soviet Union voted, in the Second Committee and at today's plenary meeting, in favour of the draft resolution entitled "Permanent sovereignty over natural resources", as contained in document A/9400, on the understanding that this draft falls within the general context of the resolutions on this subject that were adopted earlier by the General Assembly and that are enumerated in the fourth preambular paragraph. On that understanding, the Soviet delegation at the same time considers that, in accordance with contemporary international law, the sovereign rights of any given State over the natural resources of the sea-bed within the limits of national jurisdiction extend to the resources of the continental shelf and the subsoil thereof. In this connexion, the words "within their national jurisdiction" contained in paragraph 1 of this draft resolution are understood by us in the sense defined in the 1958 international Convention on the Continental Shelf.

156. As for sovereign rights over natural resources in coastal waters, the Soviet delegation feels that these rights extend also to the resources of the territorial sea, the breadth of which, according to international law, should not exceed 12 nautical miles.

157. We are also of the view, that the inclusion in paragraph 1 of provisions concerning the resources in the superjacent waters is premature because it is in fact designed to prejudge one of the issues to be considered at the forthcoming Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea in 1974.

158. For the foregoing reasons, the Soviet delegation, as is known, voted at the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly for the relevant amendment submitted by Afghanistan, and at the current session of the Assembly it has voted for the United Kingdom amendment.

159. We consider that, in the light of the statements by the sponsors that the inclusion in the resolution of provisions on these issues does not, as they say, prejudge the results of the consideration of such issues at the Conference on the Law of the Sea to be held in 1974, it might have been possible at the present session of the General Assembly to agree on formulations which would not have given rise to any conflicting interpretations.

160. In conclusion, the Soviet delegation would like to record the fact that it was pleased to support and vote in favour of the inclusion in the draft resolution of the amendment of Algeria, Iraq and the Syrian Arab Republic, which is now incorporated in paragraph 3 of the resolution. The fact that this amendment was adopted by an overwhelming majority, both in the Second Committee and at today's plenary meeting of the General Assembly, means that one of the most fundamental and equitable provisions, reflecting the interests of the developing countries above all, has been accepted and confirmed and is interpreted by us as the expression of the permanent sovereignty of States over their natural resources. We view the affirmative vote on this provision as at least partial compensation to the developing countries for the extensive damage that was done to them as a result of colonial domination and that is now being done to them as a result of neo-colonialist methods of exploitation. The socialist countries have confirmed their loyalty to this principle at the present session of the General Assembly, in particular in the joint statement of the socialist countries on the first review and appraisal of the International Development Strategy, which is contained in document A/9389 of 6 December 1973.

161. Mr. AKSOY (Turkey): My delegation had the opportunity to explain its vote on draft resolution V, when it was being discussed in the Second Committee. Therefore, I have no intention of repeating what my delegation has already stated.

162. My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution since it affirms the right of each State to exercise fully permanent sovereignty over its natural resources, a right which Turkey has always supported and considered essential for achieving positive results in development.

163. However, I would like to put on record the reasons behind the votes my delegation cast on operative paragraphs 1 and 3 of draft resolution V. My delegation, which does not have any difficulty with the wording of operative

paragraph 1 and does not oppose the limits set on the application of permanent sovereignty over all natural resources, abstained in the vote on the understanding that the resolutions we adopt should not prejudice the work carried out by competent bodies of the United Nations system. In this case, we believe that the Conference on the Law of the Sea has the competence to define and bring clarity to the limits of permanent sovereignty over the seabed, the subsoil thereof and the superjacent waters, and to the related concepts.

164. On the other hand, my delegation abstained in the vote on operative paragraph 3 on the understanding that that paragraph excludes the possible applicability of international law even in cases of dispute over the amount and mode of payment of compensation in nationalization. Turkey considers that each State has the right to choose the economic and social system it deems best for the development and well-being of its people, and to adopt the development objectives and the means to achieve these objectives, which does not exclude nationalization or foreign private investment. The relevant Turkish legislation affirms the competence of our national jurisdiction in determining the amount and the mode of payment of compensation in cases of nationalization. Besides, it permits the possibility of making use of the provisions of international law in cases of dispute. Therefore, the vote of my delegation could easily have been in the affirmative had the wording of the paragraph been more compatible with Turkish legislation.

165. Mr. SHEMIRANI (Iran): With reference to draft resolution V, I should like to stress that the positive vote of my delegation on operative paragraph 3 of that resolution should not be construed as meaning any change in our policy with regard to foreign investments in my country. We shall continue to encourage foreign investment in accordance with the provisions of our existing regulations.

The meeting rose at 1.45 p.m.