



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 40th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. HARLAND (New Zealand)

CONTENTS

- AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 80: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued)
- (d) ECONOMIC AND TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION AMONG DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)
- (j) HUMAN SETTLEMENTS (continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 82: TRAINING AND RESEARCH (continued)
- (a) UNITED NATIONS INSTITUTE FOR TRAINING AND RESEARCH (continued)
- (b) UNITED NATIONS UNIVERSITY (continued)

*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room IX 2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

84-57567 7639S (E)

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.2/39/SR.40
16 November 1984

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

/...

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)
(A/C.2/39/L.17, L.18/Rev.1, L.19)

Draft decision A/C.2/39/L.17

1. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Committee), informed the Committee of the following revisions introduced by the sponsor of the draft decision: the new title should read "Israeli economic practices in the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories"; paragraph (a) should be deleted and, at the end of former paragraph (b), which was now paragraph (a), a comma and the words "as adopted" should be inserted.
2. Mr. HILLEL (Israel) said that his delegation intended to vote against the draft decision for several reasons. Firstly, General Assembly resolution 38/144, from which the draft decision derived, was itself based on questionable premises and therefore predetermined the one-sided outcome of any report by the Secretariat. Secondly, the comparative study requested in the draft decision was to elaborate on a previous Secretariat report (A/38/265-E/1983/85), the findings of which his country had rejected because its terms of reference were biased and politically motivated, its methodology was questionable, the postulates on which it was based were incorrect and distorted, and it contained unaccepted interpretation of international law. Thirdly, the draft decision had been submitted for purely political motives, in complete and deliberate disregard of the economic and social welfare of the inhabitants of the administered territories. Finally, his country had repeatedly explained the situation regarding the utilization of natural resources in the territories and the manner in which it fulfilled all its obligations and responsibilities in accordance with international law.
3. The CHAIRMAN noted that a recorded vote had been requested.
4. A recorded vote was taken on the draft decision.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand,

/...

Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, 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, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

5. Draft decision A/C.2/39/L.17, as orally revised, was adopted by 115 votes to 2.

6. Mr. MURRAY (Ireland), speaking in explanation of vote on behalf of the States members of the European Economic Community, said that they had voted in favour of the draft decision, which requested the Secretary-General to prepare a useful study. However, they maintained their position of principle with regard to General Assembly resolution 38/144 on permanent sovereignty over national resources in the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories.

7. Mr. KANEKO (Japan) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft decision because it was sympathetic to the position of the Arab States with regard to the problem of natural resources, which would, it was to be hoped, be solved by the parties concerned in accordance with international law.

8. Mr. GAYAMA (Congo), Mr. FAREED (Pakistan), Mr. FALTZ (Luxembourg), Mr. SANGARE (Mali), Mr. BORG (Malta), Mr. VALLENILLA (Venezuela), Mr. ABDUL-GANI (Yemen), Mr. TOURE (Guinea), Mr. HAYFORD (Ghana), Mr. DIENTE (Guinea-Bissau), Mr. YAGAO-NGAMA (Central African Republic), U TIN PE (Burma) and Mr. SAVIC (Yugoslavia) said that, had they been present during the vote, they would have voted in favour of the draft decision.

9. Mr. BASAGA (Turkey) said that he too would have voted in favour of the draft decision, in keeping with his Government's views on the Middle East and Palestine.

Draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.18/Rev.1

10. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Committee) announced the following revisions to the draft resolution introduced by the sponsors: the last preambular paragraph should be deleted and in operative paragraph 2, the words "interest in establishing" should replace the words "need to establish".

11. Mr. HILLEL (Israel) said that the ports of Ashdod and Haifa were entirely at the disposal of the inhabitants of Judea, Samaria and the Gaza District. Products originating in the administered territories had free access to external markets, and development projects were considered solely on the basis of their economic merits. His delegation therefore rejected the far-reaching political connotations and motivations of the draft resolution and would vote against it.

/...

12. The CHAIRMAN noted that a recorded vote had been requested.

13. A recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, 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, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Cameroon, Canada, Finland, Iceland, Ivory Coast, Norway, Paraguay, Sweden.

14. Draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.18/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted by 115 votes to 2, with 9 abstentions.

15. Mr. MURRAY (Ireland), speaking in explanation of vote on behalf of the States members of the European Economic Community, said that although they had voted in favour of the draft resolution, that did not imply any specific commitment on their part. Economic development could play an important role in the region as long as development projects were economically and technically viable and designed to enhance the well-being of all concerned.

16. Mr. SCHILLER (Sweden), speaking on behalf of Finland, Iceland, Norway and his own country, said that the four countries agreed with the sponsors of the draft resolution on the desirability of economic development in the occupied territories. However, they had abstained from voting because in the absence of documentation on the specific projects referred to in the draft resolution, delegations had been unable to take an informed decision.

/...

17. Mr. MANN (Canada) said that, although his delegation supported the general thrust of the draft resolution which was designed to provide assistance to the Palestinian people, it had abstained because the projects referred to specifically had not been adequately justified.

18. Mr. LEIFER (Austria) said that, in view of its long-standing concern for the welfare and economic development of the Palestinian people, his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, however, because of inadequate information provided on the specific projects, its affirmative vote did not imply any judgement on their economic, technical and financial aspects.

19. Mr. SANGARE (Mali), Mr. BORG (Malta), Mr. HAYFORD (Ghana) and U TIN PE (Burma) said that, had they been present during the vote, they would have voted in favour of the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.19

20. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary) announced that paragraph 5 of the draft resolution had been revised by the sponsors to read:

"5. Draws the attention of the international community, the United Nations system and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations to the need to disburse their aid to the occupied Palestinian territories only for the benefit of the Palestinian people;"

21. Mr. HILLEL (Israel) said that the draft resolution ignored, for purely political reasons, the fact that his country was currently the only State engaged, directly and actively, in promoting the well-being, safety and socio-economic development of the Palestinian Arabs of Judea, Samaria and Gaza. During the 18 years of Israeli administration, they had made spectacular progress and their situation was many times better than that of most neighbouring countries.

22. The resolutions adopted each year on the subject presented his country as systematically opposed to international aid to the Palestinians, and as obstructing such aid through administrative means. However, it welcomed assistance extended through legitimate channels, and would continue to co-operate, as it had in the past with the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East and UNDP. Israel categorically rejected the political connotations and implications given to the debate. The main purpose of the draft resolution was to emphasize the role of the so-called Palestine Liberation Organization, to which it attributed capabilities and influence not possessed by that terrorist organization. Ironically, the countries that most actively promoted such resolutions were those that gave the least assistance, or none at all, to the Palestinians. His delegation would therefore vote against the draft resolution, which would in no way promote assistance to the Palestinian Arabs.

23. The CHAIRMAN noted that a recorded vote had been requested.

24. A recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution.

/...

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, 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, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

25. Draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.19, as orally revised, was adopted by 131 votes to 2.

26. Mr. KASRAWI (Jordan), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his country was in favour of all assistance given to the Palestinian people in the Gaza Strip and the West Bank and to the Palestinian refugees. However, his delegation expressed reservations with regard to paragraphs 7 and 8 of the draft resolution. Consultations regarding the assistance referred to in paragraph 7 should include Jordan, in order to achieve a balance between paragraphs 7 and 8. Any assistance provided to Palestinian refugees in his country should be subject to consultations with and the approval of the Jordanian authorities.

27. Mr. HASSOU (Democratic Yemen) said that his delegation's vote in favour of the draft resolution should be interpreted in the light of his Government's well-known position on the issue.

/...

28. Mr. KANEKO (Japan) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution. However, his Government maintained its position, expressed at the thirty-third session of the General Assembly, concerning United Nations assistance to national liberation movements.

29. Miss OSSAKEDJOMBO-NGOUA (Gabon) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution. However, the views of her Government, as conveyed to the General Assembly by its Minister for Foreign Affairs, were well known. Her delegation's affirmative vote on the draft resolution by no means called those views into question.

30. Mr. MURRAY (Ireland), speaking on behalf of the States members of the European Economic Community, said that they had voted in favour of the draft resolution. The Community had been increasing its assistance to improve the plight of Palestinians not only in the occupied territories but also in Lebanon and elsewhere in the region. Its members continued to provide that assistance directly, through the Community and through the United Nations system, which was able to determine itself the most appropriate channels for assistance.

31. Mr. AL AUJLI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft decision A/C.2/39/L.17 and draft resolutions A/C.2/39/L.18/Rev.1 and L.19 in view of its Government's support for the rights of the Palestinians to sovereignty over their land and resources and to independence. Those affirmative votes in no way indicated that his country accepted the current situation in that region, namely, the presence of a Zionist entity. His delegation expressed reservations on any paragraph that might imply such acceptance.

32. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) said that his delegation had voted against the draft decision and the two draft resolutions because they were contentious and not at all constructive. They would perpetuate unproductive, if not counterproductive, activities which would in no way resolve the serious problems in the Middle East or improve the well-being of the Palestinian people living there.

33. His Government had been and continued to be actively involved in efforts to improve the quality of Palestinian life through bilateral and multilateral assistance programmes. During the past year, it had also inaugurated programmes designed to provide assistance directly to deserving Palestinian institutions in the West Bank and Gaza. Clearly, such programmes were no substitute for a negotiated settlement. Nevertheless, although the parties in the region were not yet ready to address the political dimension of the Palestinian problem, his country, through its actions, was not ignoring the problem's human dimension.

34. Mr. ABU KOASH (Observer, Palestine Liberation Organization) addressing those countries which had abstained on draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.18/Rev.1, including the Nordic countries, said that feasibility studies on the projects involved were available. Further studies would involve financial implications. He hoped that that would be taken into account in the future.

/...

(Mr. Abu Roash, Observer, PLO)

35. The statements made by the representative of Israel and the United States of America were rather ridiculous, particularly the former's statement that some of the ports in the part of Palestine which had been occupied in 1948 were open to Palestinian products. If that were so and if it were not for the assistance provided by the United States Government to Israel there would be no need for any draft resolution.

36. The CHAIRMAN said that the draft resolution, entitled "Co-operation between the United Nations and the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference", had been submitted on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.15. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution.

37. Draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.29 was adopted.

38. The CHAIRMAN said that, in the light of the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.29, he would take it that the draft resolution contained in document A/C.2/39/L.15 was withdrawn by the sponsors.

39. It was so decided.

(j) HUMAN SETTLEMENTS (continued) (A/C.2/39/L.11 and A/C.2/39/L.27)

40. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the statement on the programme budget implications of the draft resolution, contained in document A/C.2/39/L.27, and noted that a recorded vote had been requested.

41. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Committee) said that a number of changes had been made in the text of the draft resolution. In paragraph 1, the word "appreciation" should be replaced by the word "concern". Paragraph 6 (a) should be reworded to read: "To organize in 1985 a seminar on remedies for the deterioration of the economic and social conditions of the Palestinian people living in the occupied Palestinian territories". In paragraph 6 (b), the words "in co-operation with" should be replaced by the words "providing for the participation of". The number 20 should be deleted from paragraph 6 (c). A new paragraph 6 (d) should be inserted, reading: "To invite also relevant intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations". The existing paragraph 6 (d) would then become paragraph 6 (e).

42. Mr. LADOR (Israel), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.11 once again reflected the hypocrisy of its sponsors. It was obvious that the intent was to slander Israel, rather than to help Palestinians. The Arab States competed among themselves in their promotion of the Palestinian cause, and yet, with all the wealth and resources at their disposal, they had concentrated their efforts on submitting ludicrous resolutions of no practical avail.

43. While the draft resolution took note of the report of the Secretary-General (A/39/233) and the statement of the representative of the so-called PLO, there was no mention at all of documents A/C.2/39/7, A/39/295 and A/39/356, his delegation submitted. With regard to paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, which

/...

(Mr. Lador, Israel)

rejected the "plans and actions intended to change the demographic composition of the (...) territories", he asked how a handful of Jews could change the demography of 1.9 million Arabs. The reference to an alleged deterioration in the living conditions of the Palestinian Arabs was absurd. As for the proposed seminar to study that deterioration, not only was its outcome presupposed, but required financial contributions from countries which could ill afford to foot such a bill, and its outcome would doubtless be more empty rhetoric.

44. The fact that the Committee was spending time considering politically motivated draft resolutions on the Palestinians when the world sought to cope with the starvation of millions of Africans suggested that the Committee had lost all sense of proportion. Only sound reasoning and political maturity, rather than another draft resolution, would ultimately make the reports of the Secretary-General on the living conditions of the Palestinians unnecessary, since the draft resolution exhibited neither of those qualities, his delegation would vote against it and expected other delegations to do likewise.

45. Mr. MANN (Canada) noted that paragraph 7 of document A/C.2/39/L.27 stated that the Secretariat was looking into ways in which the requirements for implementing the seminar requested in draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.11 could be met, and that a statement to that effect would be submitted to the Fifth Committee. He sought clarification from the Secretariat as to why that information was not being submitted to the Second Committee as well.

46. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said it was difficult to see how the annual voting on political draft resolutions on the living conditions of the Palestinian people accomplished anything useful. The Second Committee was supposed to deal with economic, and not political, questions; if the funds expended on such political actions were otherwise employed, they might actually benefit the needy of the world, including Palestinians.

47. During the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly, his delegation had pointed out that the main product of the draft resolution then before the Committee on the same subject would be another report which said almost nothing new and for which \$81,000 would be spent on consultants, air fares and hotels instead of assistance to Palestinians. The current report of the Secretary-General (A/39/233) was in fact so biased and wilfully distorted as to be unworthy of the United Nations. It was clear that the drafters of the study would find fault with any policy carried out by the Israeli authorities in the West Bank and elsewhere. The draft resolution itself was inaccurate, and called for action which would incur costs of \$82,000 or \$103,000, depending on the venue for the seminar called for in paragraph 6. His delegation strongly believed that such unproductive expenditures were unconscionable.

48. He shared the view expressed by the representative of Canada with regard to paragraph 7 of document A/C.2/39/L.27. It was his understanding that the Secretariat had agreed to provide the relevant Main Committees with information regarding the way in which the financial implications of their draft resolutions would be dealt with, and he therefore wished to know whether the Secretariat had in

/...

(Mr. Goodman, United States)

fact found ways to finance the seminar specified in the draft resolution without adding to the existing budget. His delegation shared the international community's concerns about the quality of Palestinian life, but did not believe that the use of condemnatory language constituted a constructive approach to that problem. Consequently, his delegation would vote against the draft resolution.

49. Mr. UY (Budget Division) said that the Secretariat had been working with delegations, particularly within the framework of the Fifth Committee, to implement the provisions of General Assembly resolution 38/227, particularly those in part A, section II. The Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management, fully aware of the difficulties which had attended the adoption of that resolution, and that section in particular, had informed the Fifth Committee on 26 October 1984 of procedures which the Secretariat would follow in preparing integrated statements of the programme, financial and administrative implications of draft resolutions. Statements presenting the full programme budget implications would be submitted to the Main Committees, whereas the extent to which certain costs could be funded from available resources would be indicated in a statement to the Fifth Committee. At present, there were no indications that that procedure was to be changed, and until such time as it was, existing procedures must be followed.

50. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) proposed the postponement of voting on draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.11 until the Committee was in possession of all the information regarding its financial implications.

51. Mr. FAREED (Pakistan) said that the information contained in document A/C.2/39/L.27 presented the full costs of the seminar. In the past, the Committee had taken action on draft resolutions on the basis of such information on the understanding that the Secretariat would find a way to reduce costs. He therefore urged the Committee to vote on the draft resolution at the current meeting.

52. Mr. MANN (Canada) said that his question had been addressed to the information contained in document A/C.2/39/L.27, and not to the content of draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.11. In view of the comments made by the representative of Pakistan, he thought that the Committee should vote on the draft resolution at the current meeting, provided that a discussion on the financing of the seminar could be held subsequently.

53. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the officers of the Committee should discuss how and when the Committee might deal with the matter, and invited the Committee to vote on draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.11, as orally revised.

54. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.11.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti,

/...

Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, 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, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Gabon, Ivory Coast.

55. Draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.11 was adopted by 129 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.

56. Mr. SCHUMANN (German Democratic Republic), speaking in explanation of vote on behalf of the delegations of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and his own delegation, said that they had voted in favour of draft resolutions A/C.2/39/L.11, A/C.2/39/L.18/Rev.1 and A/C.2/39/L.19 and draft decision A/C.2/39/L.17. Their support was predicated on their position that there must be a just and comprehensive solution to the situation in the Middle East. They had always supported the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and strongly condemned Israel's actions which had hindered the implementation of those rights, including its policy of colonizing Arab lands. Responsibility for that policy must also be borne by those who financed, armed and defended the aggressor and hindered the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. He reaffirmed the position which the aforementioned countries had stated during the Economic and Social Council's second regular session of 1984, following the vote on resolution 1984/56.

57. Mr. QUINLAN (Australia) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolutions A/C.2/39/L.11 and A/C.2/39/L.19 and draft decision A/C.2/39/L.17, but had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.18/Rev.1. Despite its affirmative vote on the first of those drafts, his delegation remained concerned by the financial implications of the seminar which it called for as presented in document A/C.2/39/L.27, and believed that every effort must be made to reduce costs. His delegation's affirmative vote on draft decision A/C.2/39/L.17 did not alter the position which it had taken on General Assembly resolution 38/144. The

/...

(Mr. Quinlan, Australia)

draft decision related to a procedural matter - the preparation of a report - and his delegation's vote implied no commitment to support for related decisions and resolutions in the future.

58. With regard to draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.18/Rev.1, his delegation supported the Palestinian right to economic development and the intentions behind the draft resolution. However, it had reservations concerning the cost, funding and feasibility of the projects referred to. In principle, his delegation was not happy with a situation in which the General Assembly was invited to approve specific project proposals in the absence of any assurances of their technical and financial viability, as such a situation might set a precedent.

59. Mr. MURRAY (Ireland), speaking in explanation of vote on behalf of the countries members of the European Economic Community, said that they had found the report of the Secretary-General on the living conditions of the Palestinian people in the occupied Palestinian territories to be a valuable and informative document. Because they believed that considerable resources must be allocated to alleviate the problems of the region, they had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.11 on the condition that the seminar called for in paragraph 6 would be held within existing resources and in line with the programme budget implications presented in document A/C.2/39/L.27. All information regarding alternative methods of financing the seminar should be conveyed to the Second and Fifth Committees; in that connection, the inadequacy of paragraph 7 of document A/C.2/39/L.27 was unfortunate.

60. The holding of the seminar at Vienna would constitute an exception to General Assembly resolution 31/140; in that connection, he expressed support for the principle that United Nations bodies should meet at their respective headquarters.

61. Mr. MIGNOT (Belgium) said that his delegation had not participated in the vote on draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.11; had it done so, it would have voted in favour.

62. Mr. KANEKO (Japan) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.11. However, it was unfortunate that the Secretariat's statement on programme budget implications had been issued only one day previously and that the vote had been taken without any possibility of discussion or informal consultations on the basis of that document. He also noted that the holding of the seminar away from Nairobi contradicted General Assembly resolution 31/140.

63. Ms. KORHONEN (Finland), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries, said that although they had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.11 that did not prejudice their position regarding how programme budget implications should be presented. Her delegation considered the statement contained in document A/C.2/39/L.27 inadequate.

64. Mr. AL AUJLI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that his delegation's vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.11 should not be interpreted as a recognition of any fait accompli or of the entity in occupied Palestine.

/...

65. Mr. RAJABE (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his country had always supported the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people and had consequently voted in favour of all draft resolutions and decisions relating to the Palestinian question. However, his delegation was opposed to the inclusion in the text of those documents of any paragraph which explicitly or implicitly accorded recognition to the régime occupying the Palestinian territories.

AGENDA ITEM 82: TRAINING AND RESEARCH (continued) (A/39/581)

(a) UNITED NATIONS INSTITUTE FOR TRAINING AND RESEARCH (continued) (A/39/14, A/39/148)

(b) UNITED NATIONS UNIVERSITY: (continued) (A/39/3 (part II), A/39/31)

66. Mr. ASHOUR (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that his delegation had taken note of the report of the Executive Director of the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (A/39/14) and the report of the Secretary-General on long-term financing arrangements for the Institute (A/39/148). His Government was deeply concerned at the problems which were threatening UNITAR's existence; it had considered carefully the three proposals contained in paragraph 29 of the report, and was prepared to co-operate within the framework of a total understanding of the difficult situation the Institute was experiencing. The Institute played an important role within the United Nations system, and deserved to be fully supported. Training and research activities needed to be closely linked to the requirements of the developing countries, and his Government attached great importance to the co-operation between the Institute and the Institute of International Relations in his country.

67. He took note of the report of the Council of the United Nations University (A/39/31) and reaffirmed the need for the widest possible dissemination of studies and research undertaken by the University, particularly those relating to the problems that hindered the economic and social development of developing countries and to international peace and security.

68. Mr. DORADO (Philippines), noting that a number of the research activities undertaken by the United Nations University related to areas of concern to developing countries, asked how the University's publications were distributed. Such studies were often costly, and it was important that they should reach decision makers and opinion makers directly involved in development, particularly those in the developing countries. He also asked how the University co-operated with other agencies of the United Nations system.

69. The programme areas relating to one global economy were of particular interest to the Committee. It was to be hoped that with the establishment of the World Institute for Development Economics Research (WIDER), appropriate attention would be given to a number of serious policy questions that had been pending for several years. His delegation agreed that development strategies and North-South relations had been inadequately researched in the past and that the resulting gaps in knowledge had constrained policy choices.

/...

(Mr. Dorado, Philippines)

70. In that connection, the findings of the UNITAR study on global negotiations had not surprised his delegation. However, its documentation of the process might be helpful in the exploration of alternatives. It was his understanding that the findings would be used to enhance the effectiveness of the United Nations in that area. Regarding the research into the new international economic order it was encouraging to note that some elements of the order were being accepted into the normative practices of States, and his delegation hoped the ongoing study of the development of international law relating to the new order would be completed on time.

71. His delegation supported the continuation of research efforts by both the Institute and the University provided that they were undertaken in a cost-effective manner and their results were widely disseminated, and welcomed the view taken by the Council of the University that new research and training centres should be set up only to fill unmet needs in global research and training capacity or to respond to a developmental purpose that existed in tandem with research and training needs. It noted that some of the new institutions were being located in developing countries, and particularly welcomed the establishment of the Institute for Natural Resources in Africa.

72. He urged those who were in a position to increase their support to UNITAR seriously to consider whether they were ready to terminate the Institute's operations, stressed the serious consequences that such a decision would have.

73. Miss OREJE (Nigeria) said that her delegation was encouraged by the noticeable improvement in the management of the United Nations Institute for Training and Research and by the revitalization of its programmes. She acknowledged the high level of co-operation between the Institute and other bodies within the United Nations system, including the United Nations University, and stressed the need for continuing the collaboration.

74. Although the importance of UNITAR's role had been recognized, there had been no corresponding increase in its resources. Member States that already contributed to the Institute must increase the level of their contributions while those which had not as yet contributed must begin to do so. She hoped that the General Assembly would find an acceptable formula, at its present session to ensure the institute of regular and adequate financing, for UNITAR must not be forced to terminate its operations.

75. Mr. RAHMAN (Bangladesh) said that his delegation welcomed the fact that as many as 37 institutions were associated with the University's activities. However, the needs of developing countries continued to require priority, and emphasis should be placed on establishing the University's own research and training centre. The progress in establishing the world Institute for Development Economics Research in Helsinki was also welcome, and the University should moreover consider forming a working relationship with the International Centre for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology being set up in New Delhi and Trieste.

(Mr. Rahman, Bangladesh)

76. The Executive Director of UNITAR was doing his best to revitalize the Institute, but the realities were beyond his control. Member States should seek effective means to provide UNITAR with the resources it required: fewer than half of them had made contributions to the Institute, and major donors were not in a position to extend substantive long-term support. The solutions recommended by the Board of Trustees for the long-term financing of the Institute were reasonable. Whichever option was agreed upon, all countries should give substantive support to a viable future for UNITAR; its objectives in the area of training and research were universal, and its contribution merited much more than it had received in recent years. He hoped that all would respond; failure to do so might deal a severe blow to the United Nations system as a whole.

77. Mr. McBARNETTE (Trinidad and Tobago) said that his delegation commended the Executive Director of UNITAR for the innovations which had enabled the Institute to achieve so much despite severe resource constraints. At the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly, his delegation had supported the idea that, the Institute should be provided with a core budget from the regular budget of the United Nations, to permit the devotion of more time to substantive work rather than fund-raising and to safeguard its autonomy. It remained unconvinced by the arguments which had led to rejection of that idea.

78. Subsequently, the UNITAR Board of Trustees had concluded that the system of annual pledges was not likely to meet the minimum requirements for fulfilling the Institute's mandate. The three alternative proposals it had recommended were not revolutionary, and his delegation would have hoped that one or more of them would have gained the major donors' support. In the absence of such support, the international community must act decisively to ensure the survival of UNITAR, the demise of which they could ill afford. The reports before the Committee and the debate itself had confirmed that UNITAR was unique within the United Nations system, and was needed more than ever.

79. His Government appealed to all Member States to spare no effort to ensure the long-term viability of the Institute; however, it would only be possible to do so if they examined all the options available, including the proposal for a core budget.

80. Mr. GOTTELMANN (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his Government attached much importance to the University's work for the benefit of developing countries and thought highly of the Programme on Resource Policy and Management. The projects on human and social development and the establishment of the World Institute for Development Economics Research at Helsinki were also important. Fortunately, the University enjoyed broad support and his Government would continue to give it moral and financial backing.

81. His Government attached equal importance to the work of UNITAR, and was prepared to continue co-operating with its training programmes, seminars and symposiums. The Institute's training activities in areas that played a crucial role in promoting development were of extreme importance for the overall

/...

(Mr. Gottelmann, Federal
Republic of Germany)

effectiveness of the United Nations system. At the same time, its significance in the field of research was uncontested. Unfortunately, however, UNITAR's financial difficulties were growing. The Executive Director had achieved much by cutting expenditures and seeking new sources of revenue. It might be possible to assist his efforts by enlarging the Board of Trustees to include wealthy sponsors, attracting private donors and intensifying co-operation with national and private institutions of Member States. The establishment of long-term priorities in line with a realistic long-term financing plan might also help to solve the budgetary problem.

82. Donor countries had responded favourably to the emphasis in General Assembly resolution 38/177 on the role of UNITAR in the development process. However, only half the Member States were providing financial contributions; those which had not contributed should give financial support commensurate with their expressions of appreciation for the Institute.

83. Of the three options proposed by the Board of Trustees to make the Institute's finances more assured, the reserve fund would be a good solution, but not all Governments had the legal power to contribute towards such a fund, even though it was preferable to core funding or a combination of assessed and voluntary contributions. The Institute's independence of the regular budget should be maintained, so that it could make an independent contribution to the United Nations system and the international community. His own Government had increased its already substantial financial support for UNITAR in 1984 and 1985. Other countries must match its preparedness to support the Institute, however, since discussion of arrangements for ensuring the long-term viability of UNITAR would only make sense when they did so.

84. Mr. AREGAW (Ethiopia) said that UNITAR was unique in having been established to increase the effectiveness of the United Nations in achieving its major objectives. Moreover, it had made ceaseless efforts to promote mutual understanding between nations through its research into a host of pressing international economic problems. It had also made an invaluable contribution through its training programme, which had done much for developing countries despite the Institute's limited resources. Unfortunately, UNITAR had not realized its full potential for want of financial support, but his delegation hoped that the international community would now solve its chronic financial problem once and for all.

85. The task entrusted to the United Nations University was also important and its research would have a positive influence on international relations. Its studies dealt with urgent issues, and his delegation welcomed the fact that its programme was to be made more coherent, responsive and multi-dimensional. The associations which the University was forming with other bodies, notably with his own country's national university, were also encouraging; such contacts should be increased, since they would give UNU a better understanding of the problems of developing countries.

/...

86. Mr. GAJENTAAN (Netherlands) said that the discussions about UNITAR should not be concerned only with salvaging that institution but also with the broader question of analysing the training and research needs of the United Nations system, with particular reference to the Institute. The fact it had not been able to muster sufficient general support, was not the fault of UNITAR itself, but of Governments. The case for the Institute had been clearly established. Equally clearly, differences remained over its future financing and the situation was not likely to change quickly. The views put forward by the representative of Canada could perhaps form the basis for a decision by the General Assembly, and the suggestions made on behalf of the Nordic group of countries were also welcome.

87. His own delegation wished to emphasize the need for an independent analysis of the training and research functions of UNITAR. Many had spoken of the need to increase United Nations effectiveness in that area, so it was reasonable to take a closer look at the Institute set up for the purpose. An independent analysis by the Secretary-General of its training and research functions might find an approach to financing which would increase the effectiveness of both, while of course preserving the independent nature of the Institute's research, and could take into consideration the increasing emphasis placed by UNITAR over the years on its development role. Pending such an independent study, consideration should be given to interim measures to provide temporary financing out of regular budget resources for UNITAR, and for its training functions in particular.

88. Mr. SOEDJATMOKO (Rector, United Nations University) said he found the statements of support for the work of UNU very encouraging. On the question of improving co-ordination with the United Nations system, the past year's record spoke for itself; there had been greatly increased co-operation with agencies such as FAO and WHO and with various divisions of the Secretariat. As for the question of priorities, the large number of research projects naturally created problems, but he hoped that policy recommendations would be made which would give particular priority to certain areas.

89. The question of dissemination policies had also been raised. The University's charter set the dissemination of scientific knowledge as one of the three goals of UNU, together with research and training. UNU publications were distributed by the libraries of 40 different countries as well as by commercial publishers, and were also made available free of charge to poorer third world countries, though wealthier countries were required to pay for them. The same was true of various journals circulated by the University. In addition, the University sought to reach policy makers by organizing seminars in which scholars also participated. A special effort was being made to find more effective ways of disseminating scientific knowledge in digestible form to its end users, often poor farmers whose working methods could have a significant impact on the environment. The problem was to find ways of reaching them effectively.

90. Mr. FIELD (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the representative of the USSR had reproached his delegation for trying to calculate the level of Soviet spending on training overseas students. It had not in fact done that, and would have found it difficult to do so for lack of information on Soviet aid. In the past, it had tried to elicit such information on a clear and comparable basis, but what was known from available statistics was not encouraging. Any move towards greater transparency on that score would be welcome, and he hoped that the Soviet Union would soon give details comparable with those provided by Development Assistance Committee countries. Of course, all major donors spent heavily on training and technical assistance, and he was glad that all were agreed in recognizing the importance of preparing the administrative and technical experts who played a vital role in the development process.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.