

UNITED NATIONS  
**General Assembly**

FORTY-FOURTH SESSION

*Official Records*

SECOND COMMITTEE  
41st meeting  
held on  
Tuesday, 21 November 1989  
at 3 p.m.  
New York

---

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 41st MEETING

Chairman: Mr. GHEZAL (Tunisia)

later: Mr. DOLJINTSEREN (Mongolia)

CONTENTS

- AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 82: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued)
- (d) EFFECTIVE MOBILIZATION AND INTEGRATION OF WOMEN IN DEVELOPMENT (continued)
  - (h) HUMAN SETTLEMENTS (continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 88: SPECIAL ECONOMIC AND DISASTER RELIEF ASSISTANCE (continued)
- (a) SPECIAL PROGRAMMES OF ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE (continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 84: EXTERNAL DEBT CRISIS AND DEVELOPMENT (continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 86: OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued)
- (a) COMPREHENSIVE POLICY REVIEW OF OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM (continued)
  - (b) UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (continued)
  - (c) UNITED NATIONS CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT FUND (continued)
  - (d) UNITED NATIONS TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION ACTIVITIES (continued)
  - (e) UNITED NATIONS VOLUNTEERS PROGRAMME (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 DC.2/40,  
United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.2/44/SR.41  
4 December 1989  
ENGLISH  
ORIGINAL: SPANISH  
/...

89-57324 2187S (E)

The meeting was called to order at 4.10 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)  
(A/C.2/44/L.34, A/C.2/44/L.22, A/C.2/44/L.23/Rev.1, A/C.2/44/L.25)

Draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.34

1. Mr. PAYTON (New Zealand), Vice-Chairman of the Committee, introduced draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.34, entitled "Prevention and control of acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS)", and said that it had been decided in informal consultations to add the phrase "at all levels, including at the regional and country levels" in the penultimate line of paragraph 3, after "United Nations system".
2. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution as orally revised.
3. Draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.34, as orally revised, was adopted.

Draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.22

4. The CHAIRMAN said that, in view of the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.34, as revised orally, if there were no objections, he would take it that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.22 wished to withdraw it.
5. It was so agreed.

Draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.23/Rev.1

6. Mr. DOLJINTSEREN (Mongolia), Vice-Chairman of the Committee, introduced draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.23/Rev.1, entitled "Patterns of consumption and qualitative indicators of development", on which a consensus had been achieved in informal consultations.
7. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution.
8. Draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.23/Rev.1 was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.25

9. Mr. DOLJINTSEREN (Mongolia), Vice-Chairman of the Committee, said that it had not been possible to reach a consensus during informal consultations on draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.25, entitled "Assistance to the Palestinian people", but paragraph 1 had been redrafted to read: "Takes note of the report annexed to the note by the Secretary-General on assistance to the Palestinian people".

/...

10. The CHAIRMAN said that a recorded vote would be taken on the draft resolution. Delegations wishing to explain their vote before the vote were invited to do so.

11. Mr. SHEK (Israel), explaining his vote before the vote, said that the resolution on economic assistance to the Palestinians might have enjoyed the support of all the members of the Committee. Indeed, Israel had requested accelerated international aid in order to meet the growing needs of the residents of Judea, Samaria and the Gaza district and, in particular, of the refugees. However, if development projects intended for the Palestinians were to be effective and viable, several fundamental principles must be respected: projects must be co-ordinated and carried out in co-operation with Israel which, according to international law, was the only State responsible for the well-being of the population; they should not emanate from resolutions hostile to Israel, and each participating body should act within the framework of its mandate, competence and capabilities. Draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.25, and the report on which it was based, met none of those requirements. Many of the projects proposed by Habitat in its report did not respond to the true and urgent needs of the population. What emerged from the report was a request for more surveys and expert work, which would involve even further unnecessary expenditures for the United Nations. Such useless reports might serve the purposes of anti-Israeli propaganda, but in no way contributed to solving the economic problems of the Palestinians. It would be better to channel the funds through UNDP to real development projects.

12. The draft resolution was clearly hostile to Israel in substance and in language, for it mentioned Israel only in the context of false and baseless accusations and did not state that Israel was by far the largest contributor to development in the territories. The 30 projects proposed by Habitat exceeded that organization's scope of action and capabilities. Both the annex and appendix to document A/44/637 contained extraneous and provocative statements of a political nature which had nothing to do with economic development and should be debated in other forums. The implementation of development projects in the territories should continue to be channelled through UNDP, and Israel would continue to offer its co-operation and assistance. Israel was concerned over the fact that development had come to a standstill in the past two years as a result of the violence and unrest. When order was restored and a negotiated settlement was reached, development activities would be resumed.

13. Referring to paragraphs 4 and 5 of the draft resolution, concerning exports on a transit basis, and the granting of trade concessions, he stressed that products from Judea, Samaria and the Gaza district were never considered transit goods, but were shipped through Israeli ports in co-operation with the competent authorities. In accordance with the agreement between Israel, the European Community and the producers, those goods were not qualified as "Palestinian products" on certificates of origin, but as products from regions or localities such as Jericho, Hebron or Nablus. They were exported according to a plan agreed upon between the producers and Israel's Ministry of Agriculture. For all of the reasons he had given, Israel would vote against the draft resolution.

/...

14. Mr. SHAHEED (Syrian Arab Republic) said that the Syrian inhabitants of the Golan Heights were suffering the economic and social consequences of annexation by Israel: industry and education had deteriorated, and thousands of workers had been forced to emigrate to Israel, where they were victims of racism. Moreover, they were suffering as a result of the tax policy imposed in the Golan since 1981. In 1989 the occupation authorities had stepped up their harassment of the inhabitants: workers' wages had been cut and farmers had been barred from all the markets for their main product, apples.

15. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.25.

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, 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: Antigua and Barbuda, Canada.

16. Draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.25 was adopted by 132 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.

17. Mr. DEVINE (United States of America), explaining his vote, said that his country had on various occasions expressed its support for the provision of economic assistance to the Palestinians, and had demonstrated that position through its substantial contributions to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, the United Nations Development Programme and

(Mr. Devine, United States)

other United Nations programmes, as well as through various private voluntary organizations that gave substantial direct assistance to Palestinians in the occupied territories. However, the resolution was unacceptable for the following reasons: it mentioned Israeli restrictions without reference to the ongoing conflict in the occupied territories; it called for international assistance to the Palestinians to be provided in "close co-operation" with the Palestine Liberation Organization, an approach which his delegation had consistently opposed; it spoke of the "national economy" of the Palestinian people, which presupposed a Palestinian State, without reference to a negotiated settlement based on Security Council resolutions 242 and 338, the foundation of any true and lasting peace in the region.

18. Miss COURSON (France), speaking on behalf of the member States of the European Community and in explanation of vote, said that the member countries of the Community had voted in favour of the draft resolution. However, they wished to place on record their reservation with regard to General Assembly resolution 43/178, referred to in the first preambular paragraph, and to make it clear that the sixth preambular paragraph referred to the economy of the Palestinian territories occupied by Israel since 1967, including Jerusalem. The European Community and its member States were providing substantial humanitarian and economic aid to the Palestinian people. With regard to operative paragraph 3, the Community wished to stress that its assistance would continue to be channelled in the most appropriate manner, in co-operation with such competent agencies as UNDP and UNRWA. With regard to trade, the European Community had approved suitable tariff arrangements which included access of industrial goods free of tax and preferential treatment for selected agricultural products. The European Community had recognized the chambers of commerce of the West Bank and Gaza Strip as authorities qualified to issue certificates of origin and to ensure the necessary administrative co-operation.

19. Mr. FJAERTOFT (Norway), explaining his vote, said that Norway had voted in favour of the draft resolution, on the understanding that operative paragraph 3 would in no way restrict Norway's ability to provide assistance to the Palestinian people through channels of its choice, for example non-governmental organizations. He recalled that Norway had not supported the resolution referred to in the first preambular paragraph. By supporting the resolution on assistance to the Palestinian people, his country had not prejudged its position on the political issues involved, which had to be resolved through negotiations leading to a comprehensive peace settlement. Norway's assistance to the Palestinian people in 1989 would amount to approximately \$11.5 million.

20. Mr. BOECK (Austria), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution. However, the current legal situation in Austria did not permit the acceptance of the Palestinian certificates of origin mentioned in operative paragraph 5. He informed the Committee that steps were being taken to remedy that situation by including the occupied Palestinian territory in a list annexed to the Austrian code on preferential customs treatment.

/...

21. Mr. KIURU (Finland), explaining his vote, said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution. However, if there had been a separate vote on paragraphs 4 and 5, it would have abstained in both cases. He regretted that the sponsors of the draft resolution had not been able to accept the proposals submitted by his delegation on exports and imports from the occupied Palestinian territories and on the certificates of origin issued in those territories. His country reserved its position in the matter and it would continue to support and assist the Palestinian people.

22. Mr. PILBEAM (Australia), explaining his vote, said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution but had difficulty with the certificates of origin mentioned in operative paragraph 5. The Australian Government accepted certificates of origin only if they were issued by competent State authorities. Therefore, in the circumstances, it could not recognize certificates of origin issued by Palestinian chambers of commerce. Australia, although it supported the right of the Palestinians to self-determination and independence, had made it clear that the question of the recognition of a Palestinian State could arise only in the context of an overall peace settlement.

23. Mrs. HJELT af TROLLE (Sweden), speaking in explanation of vote, said that her delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution and fully supported the efforts directed towards improving the conditions of the Palestinian people. Sweden extended considerable humanitarian assistance to the Palestinian people and also tried to promote imports of Palestinian products. However, operative paragraphs 4 and 5 gave rise to formal and technical problems that would have to be further studied.

24. Mr. KRAMER (Canada), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had abstained in the vote since it was unable fully to support operative paragraphs 4 and 5. The granting of preferential treatment and trade concessions to other than States was not in keeping with the trade policy and regulations of his Government, which was providing considerable assistance to the Palestinian people.

25. Mr. OGAWA (Japan), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, although operative paragraph 5 presented technical problems. Japan intended to continue supporting the Palestinian people by all possible means, in accordance with its established administrative practices.

AGENDA ITEM 82: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued)

(d) EFFECTIVE MOBILIZATION AND INTEGRATION OF WOMEN IN DEVELOPMENT (continued)  
(A/C.2/44/L.45 and A/C.2/44/L.10)

Draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.45

26. Mr. PAYTON (New Zealand), Vice-Chairman of the Committee, introduced draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.45, entitled "Integration of women in development", which was the product of a consensus reached on the basis of the informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.10.

27. The CHAIRMAN said that if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution.

28. Draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.45 was adopted without a vote.

29. Mr. MACEDO (Mexico), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had not wished to vote against the draft resolution in order to maintain the climate of conciliation prevailing at the current session. However, his delegation was surprised that the resolution did not reflect the role played by the Commission on the Status of Women in the preparation of the World Survey and the analysis of its recommendations and conclusions. Operative paragraph 4 did not take into account either the previous updates or the notable progress made in studies on the status of women. Nor was account taken of the need for essential interaction between the preparation of the report and the results to be achieved at the session devoted to the evaluation of the first five years of implementation of the Nairobi Strategies, to be held in 1990. Once again, the consideration and adoption of that resolution in the Second Committee without an adequate exchange of views with the Commission on the Status of Women, the Economic and Social Council and the Third Committee indicated a lack of co-ordination and logic in the work of the Assembly.

30. The CHAIRMAN said that in view of the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.45, and if there was no objection, he would take it that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.10 wished to withdraw it.

31. It was so agreed.

32. Mr. HUSSEIN (Malaysia), speaking on behalf of the States members of the Group of 77, thanked all delegations for adopting resolution A/C.2/44/L.23/Rev.1 by consensus. Urgent attention should be paid to paragraphs 2 and 3 of the resolution in order to complete in good time the preparations for the preparatory meeting at Geneva and the international conference of high-level experts, which would take place in Morocco in July 1990. The outcome of those meetings would make a substantial contribution to the international development strategy and to the United Nations conference on environment and development.

(h) HUMAN SETTLEMENTS (continued) (A/C.2/44/L.24/Rev.2 and L.35/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.24/Rev.2

33. Mr. PAYTON (New Zealand), Vice-President, said that the informal consultations on draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.24/Rev.2, entitled "Living conditions of the Palestinian people in the occupied Palestinian territory", had not resulted in a consensus, and the Committee would have to proceed to a vote.

34. Mr. HILLEL (Israel) said that draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.24 contained an incoherent mixture of irrelevant elements pertaining, on the one hand, to the political situation in the region and, on the other, to studies, projects and infrastructural designs. The draft resolution had been prepared on the basis of a report contained in document A/44/534, entitled "Future transportation infrastructural needs for the Palestinian people in the West Bank and in the Gaza

/...

(Mr. Hillel, Israel)

Strip", distributed as an annex to a note by the Secretary-General. The report had been prepared under Arab pressure and its soundness was questionable in view of the fact that its author, a Palestinian residing in the West Bank, was an interested party. The purported technical study contained clearly political proposals, since it was based on the supposition of an imaginary State. The document also referred to the 1947 resolution on the partition of Palestine which, however, had been rejected by the Arab States 42 years ago. Moreover, the author of the report took liberties with Israel's territorial sovereignty, since he imagined a so-called "neutral zone" which divided Israel in two, and ignored realities such as the intensive diplomatic activity which had been undertaken with the aim of promoting the peace process, and the fact that a transportation infrastructure already existed in the zone. It was regrettable that the United Nations financed or distributed documents of that kind.

35. The draft resolution was tendentious and was designed to attain purely political objectives through the use of United Nations economic bodies, and the organization which stood behind the resolution was clearly identifiable. The financial implications contained in document A/C.2/44/L.35/Rev.1 were totally disproportionate and entailed superfluous expenditures without any justification whatsoever, especially in the light of the Organization's financial crisis. The sums required could be better used for current commitments, such as disaster relief assistance, development projects and peace-keeping operations. Consequently, his delegation completely rejected the draft resolution and would vote against it.

36. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.24/Rev.2.

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

/...



Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Canada, El Salvador, Germany, Federal Republic of, Netherlands, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

37. Draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.24/Rev.2 was adopted by 127 votes to 2, with 7 abstentions.

38. Mr. DEVINE (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote after the vote, said that the United States was committed to improving the living conditions of the Palestinians in the occupied territories and, since 1975, had provided more than \$105 million in humanitarian and economic assistance for the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, and another \$25 million in food assistance through the PL-480 programme. However, the United States believed that resolution A/C.2/44/L.24/Rev.2 was unbalanced in its criticism of Israel without making any reference to the existing situation in the territories. The resolution suggested that Israel applied a deliberate policy to reduce the living standards of the Palestinians in the occupied territories, which was manifestly untrue, since the recent deterioration of living conditions in the territories was largely attributable to the economic disruption caused by the intifadah. Moreover, the United States opposed the request that the Secretary-General should make extra funds available to the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) for a comprehensive study on the economy of the occupied Palestinian territory.

39. Mr. KRAMER (Canada), speaking in explanation of vote after the vote, said that Canada opposed unilateral actions intended to predetermine the outcome of the peace negotiations, including the establishment of Israeli settlements in the occupied Palestinian territories. His delegation had consequently voted in favour of previous resolutions on the same item. However, the text of resolution A/C.2/44/L.23/Rev.2 contained elements which had obliged Canada to abstain. At a time when resources were scarce, his delegation was concerned at the call for a study which would be difficult to complete.

40. Mr. PILBEAM (Australia), speaking in explanation of vote after the vote, said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution principally because Australia supported any measure which could contribute to the improvement of the living conditions of the Palestinian people. However, it had not been easy for Australia to take that position since paragraph 6 of the draft resolution requested the Secretary-General to make available extra funds whose allocation would jeopardize the maintenance of an orderly budgetary process and, in view of the Organization's scarce resources, would make it difficult to meet other needs.

41. Mr. FJAERTOFT (Norway), speaking in explanation of vote after the vote, said that Norway had voted in favour of the draft resolution despite its serious reservations with regard to the financial implications mentioned in the text of the draft. It did not seem advisable to allocate resources from the regular budget for the preparation of the study requested. It would have been preferable to finance the study through voluntary contributions.

/...

42. Mr. GIANELLI (Uruguay), speaking in explanation of vote after the vote, said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it believed that it was essential for UNCTAD to prepare a comprehensive study on the economy of the occupied Palestinian territory. However, Uruguay regretted the biased nature of some of the expressions contained in the text.

43. Mr. KINCHEN (United Kingdom), speaking in explanation of vote after the vote, said that his delegation had been ready to support draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.24/Rev.1 as submitted, including operative paragraph 6. However, it should be recalled that the financial situation of the Organization remained extremely precarious, since the accumulated arrears to the regular budget in October 1989 were equivalent to some 77 per cent of the appropriations for 1989. It was therefore necessary to avoid duplication and to seek extrabudgetary funding whenever possible. Paragraph 10 of document A/C.2/L.35 indicated that a substantial sum had already been received in the form of voluntary contributions for the preparation of an intersectoral study of the Palestinian economy. Consequently, the United Kingdom could not support the additional appropriation from the regular budget contingency fund proposed in document A/C.2/44/L.35/Rev.1. The contingency fund had been introduced as a result of the process of reform in the United Nations; that process was intended to restore the financial stability of the Organization. It was unlikely that that objective would be achieved if delegations failed to recognize that the funds available were limited and refused to allow the Secretariat to explore alternative options for obtaining extrabudgetary funding. For all those reasons, his delegation had abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.24/Rev.2.

44. Mr. OGAWA (Japan), speaking in explanation of vote, said that the fact that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution did not mean that it supported the use of additional funds for the preparation of a comprehensive study on the economy of the occupied Palestinian territory. Japan thus reserved its position in that regard, in the belief that it would be necessary to revise the budget estimates in consequence of the study.

AGENDA ITEM 88: SPECIAL ECONOMIC AND DISASTER RELIEF ASSISTANCE (continued)

(a) SPECIAL PROGRAMMES OF ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.27

45. Mr. DOLJINTSEREN (Mongolia), Vice-Chairman of the Committee, announced that, despite the informal consultations that had been held, it had not been possible to reach a consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.27, entitled "Special assistance to front-line States". Austria, Barbados, Cuba, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, New Zealand and Norway had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

/...

46. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.27.

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, 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: None.

Abstaining: United States of America.

47. Draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.27 was adopted by 132 votes to none, with one abstention.

48. Mr. MacARTHUR (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his country had contributed \$100 million to enable the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference to achieve its objectives, and was working to enhance the capacity of the front-line States and other bordering States and to help the countries of the region to cope with the adverse conditions against which they were struggling and to lessen their dependence on South Africa. The basic principles guiding United States policy towards South Africa were active support for economic development throughout southern Africa and intensive consultations with the front-line States. The resolution that had been adopted pursued the same objectives, and the United States would thus have liked to join the consensus.

49. However, it had been unable to do so because the third preambular paragraph introduced outdated and irrelevant language about South Africa's activities in the

/...

(Mr. MacArthur, United States)

region. Such language, which had not appeared in the previous year's resolution, did not reflect the changes currently taking place in southern Africa, and had no place in a resolution dealing with special economic assistance. It was a fact that in the past South Africa had committed acts of aggression and destabilization, but it was also a fact that recently Namibia had drawn closer to independence, that South African forces had left Angola, and that there had been positive diplomatic initiatives, such as the visits by the President of South Africa to capitals in the region. Failure to recognize that the situation in southern Africa was changing served only to discourage the further evolution of South African policy towards the universally desired goal: namely, an end to apartheid and the establishment of a non-racial democracy.

50. Mr. OLUWOLE (Nigeria) said that his delegation had intended to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.27.

AGENDA ITEM 84: EXTERNAL DEBT CRISIS AND DEVELOPMENT (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.47

51. Mr. DOLJINTSEREN (Mongolia), Vice-Chairman of the Committee, introduced draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.47, entitled "Towards enhanced debt reduction to revive growth and promote development in developing countries", on behalf of the Group of 77.

AGENDA ITEM 86: OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued) (A/44/3, A/44/361, A/44/376, A/44/401, A/44/409 and Corr.1, A/44/477, A/44/551, A/44/646, A/44/689)

- (a) COMPREHENSIVE POLICY REVIEW OF OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM (continued) (A/44/324 and Add.1 to 5)
- (b) UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (continued) (E/1989/32, A/44/389)
- (c) UNITED NATIONS CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT FUND (continued)
- (d) UNITED NATIONS TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION ACTIVITIES (continued) (DP/1989/46 and Add.1 to 3)
- (e) UNITED NATIONS VOLUNTEERS PROGRAMME (continued)

52. Mr. BLANCA (Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation) said that the dynamic and very positive debates held in the Committee seemed to herald the end of the era of resolutions without tangible follow-up. A substantial degree of agreement between Governments was already noticeable on all aspects of the necessary changes, which were closely interrelated. The many and interdependent recommendations presented called for the capacity for analysis and reflection to be extended to the maximum and for the necessary measures to be adopted to avoid implementation of the agreements being delayed indefinitely and unnecessarily.

/...

(Mr. Blanca)

53. On the basis of the consensus reached, it was possible to determine the measures that must be adopted without delay by the organizations responsible for operational activities; the elements which by their very nature required a process of consultation and dialogue within the system in order to determine the most appropriate forms of implementation; and the questions that must be examined and decided on in each of the developing countries concerned.

54. The measures that might be adopted immediately included: strengthening of national capacities; adoption of national execution as an objective and a norm among the various modalities for project management; technical co-operation between developing countries; diversification of procurement; simplification and harmonization of procedures; and the synchronization of programming cycles with the developing countries' own programming. He noted with satisfaction that the Joint Consultative Group on Policy had just adopted recommendations on the latter two questions. In general, all measures tending to decentralization seemed to be unanimously supported. Lastly, it was necessary to strengthen the role of the resident co-ordinator.

55. Areas calling for greater co-ordination among organizations or Member States included: resource mobilization; objectives for operational activities; the revising by certain organizations of the three-way relationship between Governments, funding institutions and specialized agencies; and programming and sectoral, multisectoral or thematic objectives requiring a more programmatic focus.

56. Among the issues which ought to be taken up in consultations with the developing countries concerned were: changing existing structures in those countries into multidisciplinary teams whose composition would be determined on the basis of national needs; rationalizing field offices to reflect changes that had taken place in national structures; and adapting procedures to those of national institutions. It would also be useful to start up activities of an experimental nature in interested countries in order to test the validity of the new thrust of programming.

57. It had become clear during informal consultations that a clear definition was needed of measures that would make it possible to implement the decisions adopted, monitor their implementation and submit reports thereon. In that connection, he drew attention to the spirit of collaboration displayed by the specialized agencies, the executing agencies of the United Nations system and the Executive Directors of UNICEF and the United Nations Population Fund. In addition, the Administrator of UNDP was prepared to assume responsibilities in several of the areas under consideration. A number of organizations had offered their services to Member States in order to provide clarifications and advice when technically complex issues were under consideration. He himself intended to continue to promote inter-agency dialogue and draw up a programme of work for the implementation of the decisions adopted. It was also important to draw on the experience of the various legislative bodies of United Nations organizations and to ask them to look at changes that ought to be made and submit reports to the General Assembly. Finally, an element which was vital to the effective implementation of the decisions adopted was their translation into appropriate national policies.

/...

(Mr. Blanca)

58. Of the recommendations contained in the report on operational activities for development, he drew attention to those relating to information, training and the struggle against poverty, a topic which could also be the subject of one of the first thematic reviews he had suggested the Economic and Social Council might carry out. It was his hope that the debate in the Committee would produce a resolution that would lead to concerted action to enhance the effectiveness of operational activities and make them more innovative, more relevant and, above all, better adapted to the specific situation of individual countries.

59. Mr. ROKOTUIVUNA (Fiji) endorsed the statements made by the representatives of Malaysia, on behalf of the Group of 77, and Vanuatu, on behalf of the countries of the South Pacific Forum. In carrying out operational activities, UNDP must be able to meet the priorities of recipient countries and the sometimes tough conditions imposed by donor countries. Resident representatives must also have the necessary authority and backing to impose discipline within the participating agencies of the United Nations system so that their work reflected national priorities rather than particular agency preferences.

60. National capacity-building, decentralization, government execution and technical co-operation among developing countries were particularly important if countries like Fiji were to be able to meet future challenges. As the Administrator had noted, what was needed was a simple, clearly defined, cost-effective funding mechanism that would prevent the diversion of funds towards administrative and bureaucratic complexities and away from where they were really needed.

61. For two decades, UNDP had actively participated in the development efforts of the island countries of the Pacific subregion, where regional programmes had been about equal to the sum of national indicative planning figures. The special characteristics, the small size and the remoteness of the island countries of the Pacific subregion made them highly vulnerable to the forces of nature. When the criteria for the fifth programming cycle were determined, due account needed to be taken of those characteristics and the diseconomies of scale which led to an inverse relationship between essential per capita public expenditures and the population of each country. The smaller the country, the higher the per capita expenditures required to provide basic services. Per capita GNP must be the major criterion for the fifth programming cycle, although the efforts of countries which had succeeded in controlling population growth should also be rewarded.

62. The developing countries were undertaking difficult changes and adjustments to respond to the needs of their people. UNDP had demonstrated great sensitivity and effectiveness in fulfilling its mission; unfortunately, other aid agencies, both multilateral and bilateral, had been inflexible and unresponsive to specific national realities, having sought to persuade recipient countries that they should undertake programmes that bore no relationship to their priority needs. Finally, for the operational activities of the United Nations system to be effective, the staff must be qualified and competent, especially in the field, and be provided with adequate support and appropriate remuneration and feel that their efforts were appreciated by both the Organization and the country for which they worked.

/...

63. Mr. TSHERING (Bhutan) said that the item on operational activities for development was one of the most important to be considered by the General Assembly because it reflected the international community's commitment to the concept of multilateralism; the relative success of the recent pledging conference also constituted a reaffirmation by donor and recipient countries of their faith in that concept.

64. UNDP and other organizations of the United Nations system had helped Bhutan implement a succession of economic and social development plans: they had helped build roads, bridges, schools and hospitals and set up industries and communication systems. Those plans gave highest priority to training, since human resources were in scarce supply. UNDP had begun a project to promote self-sufficiency in that area.

65. His delegation welcomed the commitment of UNDP to assist the least developed countries, particularly through the organization of round-table meetings, which served to co-ordinate, programme and mobilize aid and constituted a forum for dialogue on development; his delegation also appreciated the role the Programme was playing in the preparations for the Second United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries, to be held in Paris in 1990, and expressed the hope that the international community would actively participate in the Conference. The United Nations Children's Fund, the United Nations Population Fund, the World Food Programme and the United Nations Volunteers programme had also made valuable contributions to Bhutan's efforts to realize economic growth and social progress.

66. As a beneficiary of United Nations development assistance, Bhutan supported any initiatives aimed at adapting operational activities to developing countries' priorities and capacities and welcomed the report of the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation (A/44/324), which focused on the need to simplify, decentralize and harmonize procedures relating to operational activities. If those objectives were to be achieved, the responsibility of the resident co-ordinators for development strategy implementation must be enhanced and the roles and responsibilities of the specialized agencies must be more clearly defined.

The meeting rose at 6.25 p.m.