

38. Mr. SURENA (United States of America) said that the amendments to draft resolution A/C.2/L.1386 had been formulated in a spirit of negotiation. He stated that the amendments, in many regards, did not reflect the preferred position of his Government, but were being advanced in a spirit of compromise. He hoped that other delegations would regard them as such and would act accordingly.

39. Mr. BARCELO (Mexico) thanked delegations for the spirit of compromise they had shown.

The meeting was suspended at 3.50 p.m. and resumed at 4.10 p.m.

40. Mr. FRAZÃO (Brazil) said that his delegation was prepared to support the draft Charter as a whole but had serious reservations concerning article 3, relating to the exploitation of natural resources shared by two or more countries. That article, if interpreted in an extensive way, could give rise to serious problems between States and involve a violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the entire doctrine of the Organization. The provision relating to the system of information and consultation was defective and affected the principle of the sovereignty of States over their natural resources. The draft did not draw a clear distinction between shared resources and those within the exclusive jurisdiction of a State, and it did not give a precise definition of the objective of "optimum use", which

is a technical concept of an imprecise nature and without juridical value. Furthermore, instruments drawn up for achieving that objective were not sufficiently explicit and did not provide safeguards for State sovereignty. It was regrettable that countries which advocated those principles had not acted in accordance with the very system they sought to impose on others.

41. His delegation was a signatory of the Declaration of Asunción, which, so far as the countries of the River Plate Basin were concerned, had defined a clear, specific norm in respect of natural resources shared by two or more States, and thus took precedence over all norms of a general nature.

42. For all those reasons, his delegation would request a separate vote on article 3 of the draft Charter and would vote against it.

43. Mr. CAKPO (Dahomey) pointed out that article 15 of the draft Charter referred to a very controversial issue. His country was a strong supporter of disarmament, but, bearing in mind the desirability of the adoption of the Charter by consensus, he suggested that that provision should be deleted.

The meeting rose at 5 p.m.

1645th meeting

Thursday, 5 December 1974, at 10.50 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Jihad KARAM (Iraq).

A/C.2/SR.1645

AGENDA ITEM 12

Report of the Economic and Social Council [chapters II, III (sections A to D), IV, VI (sections A to D and G) and VII (sections 1 to 3)] (*continued*) (A/9588, A/9592, A/9599, A/9633, A/9648, A/9649, A/9656, A/9699, A/9716 and Corr.1, A/9761, A/9813, A/9855, A/C.2/289, A/C.2/291, A/C.2/L.1342, E/5425 and Corr.1 and Add.1, E/5467, E/5473, E/5499, E/5501, E/5519, E/5585 and Corr.1, E/5587 and Add.1-4, E/C.8/21)

SPECIAL SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY DEVOTED TO DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (*concluded*) (A/C.2/L.1374/Rev.1 AND 1420)

1. Mr. BENNANI (Morocco) said that, in paragraph 2 (a) of the draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1374/Rev.1), concerning the seventh special session of the General Assembly, the words "not later than March" should be replaced by "in early March". He also drew attention to the need for changes in the translation in paragraphs 4 and 6 of the French text of the words "comprehensive report" and "supportive policy measures".

2. Mr. TANK (United States of America) said that, primarily because it considered the draft resolution one of the most important to be dealt with at the current session, his delegation could agree to its adoption by consensus despite the fact that the text fell considerably short of its expectations. The objective of the seventh special session of the General Assembly should continue to be that indicated in General Assembly resolution 3172 (XXVIII), namely, examining the political and other implications of the state of world development and international economic co-operation, rather than dealing with selected issues from a particular programme. The report to be prepared by the Secretary-General pursuant to paragraph 4 of the draft resolution should focus on constraints on development including those occasioned by national limitations in natural, human and financial resources, economic and administrative structures and capacity to utilize imported technology. Previous United Nations studies of the constraints on development had given too little attention to the situations that existed in the developing countries themselves. Thus, "focusing on constraints of a general policy nature" would be too narrow an approach. His Government did not accept any obligation to implement the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New Economic Order

beyond the degree to which it was reflected in the International Development Strategy, and its acceptance of the draft resolution by consensus did not change in any way its previously stated reservations on the Programme of Action.

3. The Secretary-General should also take account of current trends in the international economic situation which would, in the immediate future at least, impose serious limitations on the ability of the international community to maintain the momentum previously achieved by developing countries; he should solicit the views of Member States on the current economic outlook and on special issues which they felt should be discussed at the special session, and those views should be made available to the Preparatory Committee in summary form as early as possible.

4. Little guidance had been provided, during the discussions on the draft resolution, as to what work would be carried out by the small group of high-level experts to be appointed under the terms of paragraph 5. His delegation found it difficult to be optimistic about the utility of the results, but hoped that events would prove it incorrect.

5. His Government had great difficulty with the statement in paragraph 6 that the special session would take decisions that should give impetus to strategies for development on the basis of targets and supportive policy measures for their achievement within a time-bound framework. Although his Government had recognized the utility of selected targets in the International Development Strategy it did not believe that rigid targets across the board were very useful, as they might well prove unrealistic and discourage action to promote development. The recommendations of the Preparatory Committee should be more broadly based than was indicated by the language of paragraph 6. The issue of targets itself should be discussed by the Committee on Review and Appraisal and subsequently by the Economic and Social Council.

6. His delegation would be prepared to participate fully in the Preparatory Committee, within the framework of the over-all responsibilities of the Economic and Social Council. It would also seek to ensure that the documentation for the special session took full account of the analyses of all aspects of development available to the Council in the course of its various reviews, including in particular the review and appraisal of the International Development Strategy.

7. Mr. SCHLAFF (Budget Division, Office of Financial Services) drew attention to the statement of the administrative and financial implications (A/C.2/L.1420) of the draft resolution.

8. Mr. AMIRDZHANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation would not object to the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus. However, it could not accept the concept of general responsibility implied in the sixth preambular paragraph. That paragraph placed the socialist countries on a par with the capitalist countries, which had plundered the developing countries during the colonial era and were continuing to do so. The

concept of responsibility was presented in the text in a manner which was contrary to paragraph 3 of the Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order.

9. The concept of responsibility for development was correctly reflected in article 7 of the draft Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States (A/C.2/L.1386) and in the joint statements submitted by the socialist countries at the twenty-fifth¹ and twenty-eighth² sessions of the General Assembly concerning the Second United Nations Development Decade and the review and appraisal of the implementation of the International Development Strategy respectively.

10. The Soviet Union had a long tradition of providing assistance to the developing countries to promote their economic and social development.

11. Mr. NEUFELDT (Federal Republic of Germany) said that, although his delegation viewed draft resolution A/C.2/L.1374/Rev.1 as one of the most important before the General Assembly and would participate fully in the preparatory work for the seventh special session, it had reservations concerning the text which would have compelled it to abstain if a vote were taken.

12. The studies called for in paragraphs 4 and 5 of the draft resolution unduly narrowed the scope of the special session as defined in General Assembly resolution 3172 (XXVIII). His delegation felt that the terms of reference for the report of the Secretary-General were limiting the Conference to a discussion of economic problems, leaving out other constraints for development. Moreover, the request in paragraph 4 for a study focusing on constraints of a general policy nature which faced the implementation of the Programme of Action failed to take into account the reservations which had been expressed concerning the Declaration and the Programme of Action. In the opinion of his delegation, the consensus reached at the sixth special session on the Declaration and the Programme of Action consisted not only of the two resolutions but of the reservations to those resolutions as well. They were part and parcel of the consensus. That fact was not appropriately reflected in the wording of paragraph 4; those reservations must also be reflected in the study.

13. Mr. BRITO (Brazil) said that the second session of the Preparatory Committee for the seventh special session must be long enough to permit that Committee to deal adequately with the substantive aspects of its work. The success of the seventh special session would depend in large measure on the outcome of the Preparatory Committee's deliberations. At its organizational session in January 1975, the Economic and Social Council should consider eliminating the meetings of one of its subsidiary bodies whose work had less priority than that of the Preparatory Committee, with a view to enabling the latter to hold a longer session in June.

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fifth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 42, document A/8074.

² A/9389.

14. Mr. HEMANS (United Kingdom) said that it was for the General Assembly, and not the Economic and Social Council, to decide on any adjustment of the calendar of conferences. He asked the representative of the Budget Division whether non-United Nations conference facilities could be rented near the United Nations buildings in New York or Geneva and, if so, whether the cost would be prohibitive.

15. Mr. SCHLAFF (Budget Division, Office of Financial Services) said that the problem concerning a June meeting at Headquarters was not the availability of premises, but the availability of conference service staff. It would not be possible to provide the required language services except during the week of 23-27 June, as indicated in the statement of administrative and financial implications. In Geneva, neither premises nor conference service staff would be available to accommodate the Preparatory Committee outside that period.

16. Mr. HEMANS (United Kingdom) proposed that the Committee should adopt draft resolution A/C.2/L.1374/Rev.1 and forward it to the Fifth Committee with a report indicating that the amount of time allotted for the second session of the Preparatory Committee in June was inadequate and that the period set aside for the third session—18-22 August—was unacceptable, as it did not reflect the understanding that had permitted the preparation of a draft resolution which could be adopted by consensus. The report should also request the Fifth Committee to decide how the calendar of conferences should be adjusted to permit the implementation of paragraph 2 (a) of the draft resolution.

17. Mr. BENNANI (Morocco) endorsed the United Kingdom proposal, and said that the report to the Fifth Committee should also emphasize the importance of paragraph 3 of the draft resolution.

18. Mr. CORDOVEZ (Secretary of the Committee) pointed out that, in accordance with established procedure, the report in question must take the form of a letter from the Chairman of the Second Committee, which would be transmitted by the President of the General Assembly to the Chairman of the Fifth Committee.

19. Mr. BRITO (Brazil) stressed that the duration of the June session of the Preparatory Committee should be two weeks. With regard to the adjustment of the meetings schedule, he had suggested what seemed to him to be the easiest solution, but he was prepared to agree to the broader approach proposed by the United Kingdom representative.

20. The CHAIRMAN said that he would act in accordance with the procedure referred to by the Secretary.

21. Mr. MURIN (Czechoslovakia) said that he was prepared to agree to the adoption of the draft resolution without a vote, but wished to place on record his endorsement of the Soviet representative's interpretation of the concept of responsibility in connexion with the sixth preambular paragraph.

22. The CHAIRMAN announced that Australia, Ghana, the Niger and Sweden had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1374/Rev.1. He said that if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

The draft resolution was adopted.

23. Mr. PETRONE (Italy) said that he welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution and hoped that the special session would act as a spur to new developments in the economic and social fields. Among the topics to be considered at that session, he would have liked to see more emphasis on the rationalization of the structure and methods of work of the United Nations. With regard to paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, his delegation had some doubts on some of the issues to be dealt with in the Secretary-General's report, because they were still controversial and were being discussed in different forums. On the other hand, the list contained in paragraph 4 did not include such urgent problems as population policies, food production and the over-all commodities situation. His delegation's acceptance of paragraph 4 was without prejudice to the reservations it had expressed on some parts of the documents adopted at the sixth special session. He hoped that the Secretary-General would solicit the views of all Member States before producing the report requested in that paragraph.

24. Mr. HEMANS (United Kingdom) also urged the Secretary-General to consult all Member States before producing the report on policy constraints called for in paragraph 4 of the draft resolution. Moreover, in reporting on constraints affecting the implementation of the International Development Strategy, he should not duplicate the review and appraisal process. The reservations expressed by Member States on the Programme of Action also constituted an element of constraint which obliged the Secretary-General to look into the substantive programmes surrounding the Programme of Action. With regard to the timing of the sessions of the Preparatory Committee, he pointed out that the draft resolution did not instruct the Secretary-General to arrange for a session in August 1975, much less on the dates assumed in the statement of administrative and financial implications.

25. Mr. BENNANI (Morocco) said that he viewed the adoption of the draft resolution as a restatement of the determination of the international community to achieve economic co-operation for development. He was confident that the seventh special session would be a success, and hoped that it would be marked, especially at the working level, by the active participation of many Ministers for Foreign Affairs.

26. Mr. WILDER (Canada) said that his delegation had had great difficulty in agreeing to the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus. It was not convinced of the need for three sessions of the Preparatory Committee, particularly if the third came immediately before the special session. Two sessions would be adequate for the preparatory work, and the first need not be organizational in nature. With regard to paragraph 4, his delegation still had reservations on both the Programme of Action and the International Development Strategy. For legislative reasons,

it did not consider itself committed by paragraph 6 to the achievement of new targets within a time-bound framework.

STUDY OF THE PROBLEMS OF RAW MATERIALS AND DEVELOPMENT (A/C.2/L.1342)

27. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should decide to recommend to the General Assembly that it take note of the decision adopted by the Economic and Social Council concerning the four draft resolutions contained in document A/C.2/L.1342.

The draft decision was adopted.

28. Mr. ROUGE (France) said that his delegation fully agreed with the decision taken by the Committee, as it shared the general desire not to initiate a debate at the present stage on the part of the Economic and Social Council's report relating to the four draft resolutions submitted to the *Ad Hoc* Committee of the sixth special session. However, as France had been the sponsor of two of those draft resolutions, including one calling for consideration of the possibilities of concerted action in respect of raw materials and development, he would like to avail himself of the opportunity to explain the reasons for the recent initiative taken by the President of the French Republic in proposing a conference of oil-exporting and oil-importing countries.

29. That initiative had been motivated by France's desire to promote international co-operation and to advance the search, on a basis of mutual interest and reciprocal concessions, for balanced and progressive solutions to the grave problems of economic adjustment confronting the world, more specifically in the energy field. A multilateral dialogue on energy problems in all their aspects had become urgent because of accelerated inflation, spreading unemployment and balance-of-payments deficits in many industrialized countries, and the accumulation by the oil-exporting countries of dollars whose purchasing power was being steadily eroded by world-wide inflation and whose use was limited by the absorptive capacity of the financial markets in industrialized countries. The developing countries were also seriously affected by those imbalances, since producers and consumers alike would suffer from a generalized economic crisis. It was with a view to avoiding the climate of confrontation which might be created by that inevitable chain reaction that the French Government had proposed a conference of all interested parties. It had the impression that all Governments currently appreciated the gravity of the situation and the political risks involved much more than they had at the time of the sixth special session.

30. At the proposed conference, the participants would be able first to state without constraint their grievances, their concerns, and their aspirations, and then to join together in objectively analysing the situation, its dangers and its future prospects. Finally, the conference could seek to define principles and objectives, and specific agreements through which, by mutual concessions, those objectives could be attained. The third-world countries were primarily concerned with their prospects for development; the industrial-

ized countries were seeking to strengthen the foundations of their complex, and therefore vulnerable, economies. Those divergent and often conflicting concerns could be and must be reconciled; since the two groups were interdependent, there was in reality a convergence of interests, and in the long run the misfortune of one group could not benefit the other.

31. It would be only natural for each participant to want to discuss its own priorities at the proposed conference; in particular, the countries of the third world would certainly want to raise the question of the terms of trade. However, the French Government considered that the conference should concentrate on energy, and specifically on oil, which at present accounted for more than three quarters of the world trade in raw materials and which raised by far the most acute and most urgent problems.

32. The French Government was, of course, open to suggestions concerning practical arrangements for the conference, particularly suggestions for highlighting the direct relationship between the work of the sixth special session and the proposal made by the President of the French Republic on 24 October. It was also open to suggestions concerning the number of participants, the date and the venue. It believed that the dialogue should focus in succession on the following three issues: first, evolution of the supply and demand and the prices of energy throughout the world; secondly, economic co-operation—industrial and agricultural—and transfer of technology; and thirdly, the regular functioning of international financial machinery, bilateral and multilateral.

33. The generally very favourable reaction to the French proposal confirmed his Government in its opinion that the dialogue which it advocated was timely. Various groups of countries were already consulting together on the subject in their respective organizations. For its part, his Government intended to pursue its diplomatic contacts, in the hope that they would lead to the materialization of a project that it believed would be in the interest of all the parties concerned.

34. Mr. FASLA (Algeria) said that Algeria appreciated the French initiative, and contacts had already been established between the two Governments on the subject. However, the conference should not be limited to a discussion of energy problems; it would be more balanced if it also dealt with other questions, such as raw materials generally and capital development, and with the interrelationship between them.

AGENDA ITEM 47

Reduction of the increasing gap between the developed countries and the developing countries (A/C.2/L.1396)

35. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to draft resolution A/C.2/L.1396 and said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt it without a vote.

The draft resolution was adopted.

AGENDA ITEM 50

Quantification of scientific and technological activities related to development, including the definition of the quantitative targets contemplated in paragraph 63 of the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade (A/9603, chap. IV, sect. K; A/C.2/L.1397)

36. Mr. BRITO (Brazil), introducing draft resolution A/C.2/L.1397 on behalf of the sponsors, to which Colombia should be added, recalled that at its first session the Committee on Science and Technology for Development had recommended a revision of paragraphs 60, 61 and 63 of the International Development Strategy (General Assembly resolution 2626 (XXV)), concerning targets in the field of science, with particular reference to the targets mentioned in paragraph 63 for assistance to developing countries in science and technology and for a percentage share of

research in the developed countries which was of special interest to the developing countries. Since those targets had not been considered for quantification at the time of the first biennial review by the Committee on Review and Appraisal, the purpose of the draft resolution was to request that Committee, through the Economic and Social Council, to take whatever action it deemed appropriate. The operative paragraph should begin: “*Requests* the Economic and Social Council . . .”, so that the text was in fact a draft resolution, and not a draft decision.

37. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Syrian Arab Republic had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1397; he suggested that the draft resolution should be adopted without a vote.

The draft resolution, as orally revised, was adopted.

The meeting rose at 12.05 p.m.

1646th meeting

Thursday, 5 December 1974, at 8.45 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Jihad KARAM (Iraq).

A/C.2/SR.1646

AGENDA ITEM 12

Report of the Economic and Social Council [chapters II, III (sections A to D), IV, VI (sections A to D and G) and VII (sections 1 to 3)] (continued) (A/9588, A/9592, A/9599, A/9633, A/9648, A/9649, A/9656, A/9699, A/9716 and Corr.1, A/9761, A/9813, A/9855, A/C.2/289, A/C.2/291, A/C.2/293, A/C.2/L.1342, E/5425 and Corr.1 and Add.1, E/5467, E/5473, E/5499, E/5501, E/5519, E/5585 and Corr.1, E/5587 and Add.1-4, E/C.8/21)

WORLD POPULATION CONFERENCE (*concluded*)*
(A/C.2/L.1388/REV.2 AND 1392/REV.1)

RESEARCH INTO THE INTERRELATIONSHIPS AMONG POPULATION, DEVELOPMENT, RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT (*concluded*)* (A/C.2/L.1389/REV.1, 1393 AND 1418/REV.1)

1. Mr. SINGH (Malaysia), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1388/Rev.2, said that the revised documents incorporated amendments proposed by a number of delegations. Referring to the amendments proposed in document A/C.2/L.1392/Rev.1 he explained that the sponsors of the amendments had not acted in good faith by including in the document amendments which were still being negotiated under the chairmanship of the Vice-Chairman. He also explained that the sponsors of the revised draft resolution had accepted a number of the amendments proposed in document A/C.2/L.1392, the first, the third, the sixth and the seventh. However, they were unable to accept the rest of the amendments because

they sought to alter the thrust of the draft resolution and also because they were incomplete quotations from the World Population Plan of Action. He pointed out that the representative of Brazil was taking upon himself the task of changing the delicate consensus reached during the World Population Conference at Bucharest, by attempting to tamper with the resolutions adopted there. This was not acceptable to the sponsors of the draft resolution.

2. He also questioned the motives of the representative of Brazil in submitting the fifth amendment, calling for a new paragraph after operative paragraph 3. He explained that on draft resolutions pertaining to UNITAR, technical co-operation among developing countries, IMF, the developing island countries and the World Food Conference and on a number of other draft resolutions, it had been possible to work out a consensus on the reference to the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order. However, the representative of Brazil was not prepared to accept a consensus on the formula of the draft resolution on the World Population Conference. He (Mr. Singh) wondered whether it was the intention of the representative of Brazil to cause a split among the sponsors of the draft resolution, as it was one of the few texts that had been co-sponsored by a large number of developed and developing countries.

3. Mr. BRITO (Brazil) said that it was not surprising that his delegation had presented amendments to the draft resolution, as it had not been invited to participate in its preparation. The mere fact that his delegation and that of Uruguay had revised their amendments showed clearly that they were not being intransigent. They were grateful to the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1388/Rev.2 for in-

* Resumed from the 1642nd meeting.