

UNITED NATIONS
General Assembly

FORTY-FOURTH SESSION

Official Records

SECOND COMMITTEE
52nd meeting
held on
Tuesday, 19 November 1989
at 6 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 52nd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. GHEZAL (Tunisia)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 86: OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 82: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION

(f) ENVIRONMENT (continued)

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

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 DC2 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 corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.2/44/SR.52
4 January 1990

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 9.25 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 86: OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued) (A/C.2/44/L.65, L.68 and L.87/Rev.1)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the revised draft resolution contained in document A/C.2/44/L.87/Rev.1 entitled "Comprehensive triennial policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system".
2. Mr. PAYTON (New Zealand), Vice-Chairman, said that the text of draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.87/Rev.1, which was the result of lengthy informal negotiations on draft resolutions A/C.2/44/L.65 and L.68, contained a number of errors. The sixth preambular paragraph should be deleted. In the twenty-seventh preambular paragraph, the word "erstwhile" should be deleted. In paragraph 3, the word "section" should be in the plural. In the penultimate line of paragraph 17 (g) the word "consultation" should be replaced by the word "consultative". In conclusion, he recommended the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus.
3. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.87/Rev.1, as orally revised.
4. It was so decided.
5. Mr. AL-FAIHANI (Bahrain), speaking in explanation of position, said that it was his delegation's understanding of paragraph 16 that the Director-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation, in presenting the report in question, would also take into account the reports submitted by Governments. Furthermore, Governments receiving assistance should be able to participate in the preparation of reports on operational activities taking place in their countries. It was only natural that their views should be taken into account when other reports were drawn up. Lastly, he stressed that the term "field representation" (para. 16) related only to United Nations operational activities.
6. Mr. KRAMER (Canada) expressed satisfaction at the adoption by consensus of draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.87/Rev.1, which was an important, if not perfect, step towards focusing more clearly on strengthening and utilizing national capacities in operational activities. There was an unnecessary preoccupation with the issues of responsibility and control, at the expense, perhaps, of qualitative aspects of the programmes. His delegation favoured more government/national execution, which helped to integrate external assistance into national administrations and facilitated greater use of national capacities.
7. Although the draft resolution failed to make a clear statement of objectives and provide for focused and mutually-reinforcing programmes geared to specific national objectives, important progress had been made in articulating the priority attached to the poorest countries and to human resources development within the technical co-operation programmes. The draft resolution, however, called for a refinement of the idea of the common country statement, which his delegation could not accept.

(Mr. Kramer, Canada)

8. The discussion of operational activities benefited from a process in which delegations collectively set forth a common vision for programmes. The conventional approach of pitting one group against another did not serve operational activities well because the desired improvements required collective commitment and the goodwill of donors and recipients alike and had important technical as well as political dimensions. The draft resolution did not do justice to the full range of recommendations put forward by the Director-General, who, it was hoped, would draw the attention of the Economic and Social Council to recommendations on which he considered additional guidance was required. Lastly, the Canadian delegation regretted that the draft resolution had not expressed appreciation for the report of the Director-General, which was the result of hard and useful work.

9. Mr. EHRENREICH (Denmark) said that his delegation welcomed the increased emphasis in the draft resolution on the least developed countries. While government execution should be the ultimate execution modality for United Nations operational activities, it was doubtful whether it would be possible to achieve that goal in the near future. The diversity of developing countries in that regard should be taken into account in the implementation of the draft resolution. Denmark, which had long supported the integration of women into all areas of development programmes, including operational activities, was pleased that the draft resolution reaffirmed their important role as agents in the development process. While his delegation was aware of the growing number of young people in many developing countries and the need to take that situation into account, it did not feel that the draft resolution clearly defined the concept of youth in that regard. Accordingly, Denmark's support for the draft resolution should be viewed only as recognition of the problem, not as approval of the concept.

10. Mr. MOORE (United States of America) said that his delegation had been pleased to join in the consensus on the draft resolution. Referring to paragraph 10 of the draft resolution, he pointed out that his Government did not accept the concept of ODA targets and would continue to oppose it.

11. Mr. HOPLAND (Norway) said that his delegation supported the statement made by the representative of Denmark.

12. Mr. RADE (Netherlands) stressed that operational activities should concentrate on the poorest groups and poorest countries. The scarce resources available for such activities should be allocated primarily to programmes and projects in the poorest countries, particularly those in sub-Saharan Africa, which faced increased obstacles to economic and social development. In that connection, his delegation stressed the importance of paragraph 4 of the draft resolution and welcomed the request made to the Secretary-General in paragraph 5.

13. Although the Netherlands recognized the importance of giving special attention to the situation of children and youth in the development process, it felt that that issue should be given thorough consideration before any conclusions were reached about the link between children, youth and operational activities. The draft resolution provided sufficient positive and concrete elements to continue the

(Mr. Rade, Netherlands)

process of improving the effectiveness of the operational activities in the governing bodies of the various United Nations development programmes. It was for the members of those bodies to ensure that concrete results were achieved within those programmes.

14. The CHAIRMAN said that, in the light of the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.87/Rev.1, if he heard no objection, he would take it that draft resolutions A/C.2/44/L.65 and L.68 were withdrawn by the sponsors.

15. It was so decided.

16. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had completed its consideration of agenda item 86.

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

(f) ENVIRONMENT (continued) (A/C.2/44/L.7, L.55*, L.58, L.63/Rev.1, L.64/Rev.1, L.86 and L.88)

17. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.64/Rev.1.

18. Mr. PAXTON (New Zealand), Vice-Chairman, said that after lengthy informal consultations general agreement had been reached on draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.64/Rev.1. Paragraph 11 had been reworded to read:

"Stresses that sustainable and environmentally sound development requires changes in the unsustainable pattern of production and consumption, particularly in industrialized countries, and the development of environmentally sound technologies, and in this context stresses also the need to examine with a view to recommending effective modalities for favourable access to, and transfer of, environmentally sound technologies, in particular to the developing countries, including on concessional and preferential terms, and for supporting all countries in their efforts to create and develop their endogenous technological capacities in the field of scientific research and development as well as in the acquisition of relevant information and, in this context, to explore the concept of assured access, for developing countries, to environmentally sound technologies, in its relation to proprietary rights, with a view to developing effective responses to the needs of developing countries in this area."

In conclusion, he recommended the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus.

19. The CHAIRMAN, said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.64/Rev.1 without a vote.

20. It was so decided.

21. Mr. UTHEIM (Norway), speaking in explanation of position, expressed satisfaction that the draft resolution had been adopted without a vote. The text was balanced and underscored the need for measures to solve national environmental problems of global concern.
22. The CHAIRMAN invited the representative of New Zealand, as Vice-Chairman of the Committee, to inform the members of the results of the informal consultations held on the draft decision in document A/C.2/44/L.7 and on draft resolutions L.55* and L.58.
23. Mr. PAYTON (New Zealand), Vice-Chairman, said that the draft decision and the draft resolutions concerned the convening in 1992 of a United Nations Conference on Environment and Development. During informal consultations, extensive consideration had been given to draft resolutions A/C.2/44/L.55* and L.58, which had led to the formulation of a new text: draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.86. Because of the importance of the subject-matter, it had been decided to ask the Chairman to submit that draft resolution, which, it was hoped, would be supported by all delegations.
24. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to the statement on programme budget implications contained in document A/C.2/44/L.88.
25. Draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.86 was adopted without a vote.
26. The CHAIRMAN said that in view of the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.86, he would take it that draft resolutions A/C.2/44/L.55* and L.58 were withdrawn by the sponsors and that no action was required on the draft decision contained in document A/C.2/44/L.7.
27. It was so decided.
28. The CHAIRMAN announced that the dates for the organizational session of the Preparatory Committee for the 1992 Conference would be 5 to 16 March 1990.
29. He invited the representative of New Zealand, as Vice-Chairman of the Committee, to inform the members of the results of the informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.63/Rev.1.
30. Mr. PAYTON (New Zealand), Vice-Chairman, said that since the sponsors had wished to produce a text which could be adopted by consensus, draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.63/Rev.1 had been the subject of intensive informal consultations. During those consultations, it had been decided that the delegation of Finland, which had represented all the sponsors, would become the sole sponsor of the draft resolution.
31. A new paragraph should be inserted in the preamble between the seventh and eighth paragraphs, to read as follows: "Recalling decision 14/10 of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme on the environmental impact of apartheid on black agriculture in South Africa." Paragraph 1 had been the subject of considerable debate and had been redrafted. Given the diversity of opinions on

(Mr. Payton, New Zealand)

the issue, it was probable that the new formulation, which represented a compromise, would not satisfy every delegation. Paragraph 1 should now read: "~~Endorses~~ the report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme on its fifteenth session and notes with appreciation the decisions therein". In paragraph 5, the word "further" should be replaced by the words "in this regard". In the second line of paragraph 7, the word "decides" should be replaced by the words "supports its decision". Paragraph 14 should be replaced in its entirety with the following: "~~Stresses~~ that sustainable and environmentally sound development requires changes in the unsustainable pattern of production and consumption, particularly in industrialized countries, and the development of environmentally sound technologies, and in this context stresses also the need to examine with a view to recommending effective modalities for favourable access to, and transfer of, environmentally sound technologies, in particular to the developing countries, including on concessional and preferential terms, and for supporting all countries in their efforts to create and develop their endogenous technological capacities in the field of scientific research and development as well as in the acquisition of relevant information and, in this context, to explore the concept of assured access, for developing countries, to environmentally sound technologies, in its relation to proprietary rights, with a view to developing effective responses to the needs of developing countries in this area".

32. He hoped that the Committee members would take action on the draft resolution, as orally revised, in the same spirit of compromise they had shown in adopting the resolution concerning the 1992 conference.

33. Mr. VARGAS (Brazil) said that the new version of operative paragraph 1, as just read out by the Vice-Chairman, had not gained general approval. He therefore requested a suspension of the meeting in order to hold further informal consultations.

The meeting was suspended at 10.25 p.m. and resumed at 11.05 p.m.

34. Mr. PAYTON (New Zealand), Vice-Chairman, read out the following wording for paragraph 1: "Endorses the report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme on its fifteenth session and notes with appreciation the decisions therein, as adopted.". He trusted that Member States would adopt the draft resolution as orally revised, without a vote.

35. Mr. VARGAS (Brazil) said that, unfortunately, that formulation was not acceptable. He proposed instead the following wording: "Welcomes the report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme on the work of its fifteenth session and takes note of the decisions contained therein.".

36. Mr. GOPINATHAN (India) supported the amendment proposed by the representative of Brazil.

37. Miss HASSAN (Egypt) said that the Brazilian amendment was not acceptable to her delegation.

38. Mr. DE LA TORRE (Argentina) said that now that the United Nations was embarking on so important an undertaking as the conference on the environment scheduled for 1992, it was essential to endorse the report and decisions taken by the Governing Council of UNEP. The wording read out by the Vice-Chairman was the only honourable solution.
39. Mr. BEN MOUSSA (Morocco) suggested that the formulation proposed by the Vice-Chairman might be acceptable to the representative of Brazil if the word "welcomes" was substituted for the word "endorses".
40. Miss HASSAN (Egypt) said that the Committee would be sending the wrong signal concerning the work of UNEP if it did not endorse the report of the Governing Council.
41. Mr. DE LA TORRE (Argentina) proposed the following wording: "Endorses the report and decisions of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme on the work of its fifteenth session, as adopted, without prejudice to the decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its forty-fourth session".
42. Mr. VARGAS (Brazil) said that his delegation was not able to go any further than the wording it had proposed, which it believed was even stronger than the wording contained in document A/C.2/44/L.63/Rev.1. He had already explained why his delegation would have difficulty in endorsing the report and the decisions of the Governing Council. It was not a question of judging UNEP but of passing an opinion concerning the work which had led to the adoption of the decisions at the fifteenth session and the decisions themselves.
43. Mr. OULD CHEIKH EL GHAOUTH (Mauritania) noted that the two delegations which did not agree with the formulation proposed by the Vice-Chairman were both members of the Governing Council. Yet they did not appear to have voted against any of the latter's decisions. Perhaps someone could enlighten him as to why that was so.
44. Mr. KIURU (Finland) said that the formulation proposed by the Vice-Chairman would meet many of the concerns expressed while at the same time paying tribute to UNEP, as was the Committee's practice. He appealed to delegations, in the light of the earlier decision taken by the Committee to convene a conference on the environment in 1992, to accept the wording proposed by the Vice-Chairman.
45. Mr. DE LA TORRE (Argentina) said that his delegation wished to withdraw its proposal.
46. Mr. UMER (Pakistan), Mr. AL-FAIHANI (Bahrain), Mr. RAHMAN (Bangladesh), Mr. ZIARAN (Islamic Republic of Iran), Mr. AL-SALLAL (Kuwait), Mr. ALMABROUK (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. GIANELLI (Uruguay), Mr. RONDON (Venezuela) and Mr. FARRUGIA (Malta) endorsed the Vice-Chairman's proposal. They urged other delegations to do likewise.
47. Mr. HILLEL (Israel) said that the Vice-Chairman's formulation was not acceptable to his delegation.

48. Mr. URIARTE (Chile) said that Chile was a member of the Governing Council of UNEP and had no objection to the Council's report or its decisions as adopted. His delegation would have supported the Argentine proposal, but under the circumstances, was prepared to support the Vice-Chairman's formulation.
49. Mr. VARGAS (Brazil) said that the Brazilian proposal, which constituted a more flexible approach than that contained in the draft resolution, had been drawn to the sponsors' attention throughout the negotiations. The Vice-Chairman's proposal remained unacceptable. If the Committee took action on the draft resolution, his delegation would request a vote on the paragraph at issue.
50. Mr. GOPINATHAN (India) urged delegations to consider the Moroccan proposal for made earlier in the discussion, as it represented an opportunity to reach consensus.
51. Mr. VARGAS (Brazil) said that he would consult his Government on the Moroccan proposal.
52. Mr. AL-ZADGALY (Oman) said that, since the Committee could not reach a consensus and the draft resolution was very important, perhaps a recorded vote should be taken.
53. Mr. PAYTON (New Zealand), Vice-Chairman, said that, rather than take a recorded vote, the Committee should continue its efforts to reach a consensus. The Committee's position on the draft resolution would be a clear indication of its support - or lack of support - for UNEP, whose work would be substantially increased in 1990-1991. Speaking as the representative of New Zealand, he said that his delegation wished to join the sponsors of draft resolution
A/C.2/44/L.63/Rev.1.
54. Ms. NCHAPI (Lesotho), supported by Mr. FERNANDEZ (Liberia), said that her delegation agreed with the other delegations, particularly the Maltese delegation, which had expressed support for the Vice-Chairman's proposal. Neither the Moroccan proposal, nor the Omani proposal for a recorded vote, was acceptable.
55. Mr. VARGAS (Brazil) reiterated that his delegation could not accept the Vice-Chairman's proposal, even though it was acceptable to many delegations. Accordingly, his delegation would like a recorded vote, particularly on paragraph 1.
56. Mr. DINU (Romania) proposed that the draft resolution should be referred to the plenary Assembly. Otherwise, his delegation could reluctantly agree to a recorded vote.
57. Mr. RAHMAN (Bangladesh), Miss HASSAN (Egypt) and Mr. ZIARAN (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that their delegations wished to become sponsors of the draft resolution.
58. Mr. PAPADATOS (Greece) asked whether the Committee would be taking action under rule 90 of the rules of procedure, since the Vice-Chairman had amended the text.

59. The CHAIRMAN said that the Vice-Chairman's changes constituted a revision, not an amendment, of the draft resolution.

60. Mr. KIURU (Finland) said that it would be regrettable if a vote had to be taken, the decision on the 1992 conference on environment and development having been adopted by consensus earlier in the evening. His delegation hoped that the Brazilian delegation could see its way to withdrawing its proposal. Naturally, its views would be duly reflected in the record of the meeting and in the preparatory process for the 1992 conference.

61. Mr. VARGAS (Brazil) said that while his delegation recognized the support for the Vice-Chairman's proposal, it was bound to its earlier formulation, especially since that formulation was broader than the text contained in draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.63/Rev.1.

62. Mr. GOPINATHAN (India) said that it would be unfortunate if a draft resolution on the report of the UNEP Governing Council had to be put to a vote. Referring to the statement by the representative of Greece, he asked whether, in accordance with rule 90 and considering that the Argentine proposal had been withdrawn, a vote would have to be taken first on the Moroccan proposal.

63. Mr. STOBY (Secretary of the Committee) said that, as the Chairman had indicated, the resolution had been orally revised, not amended. Therefore, the procedure outlined in rule 90 would apply only if suggestions by various delegations became amendments.

64. Mr. BEN MOUSSA (Morocco) said that his proposal had been made with the specific intention of reaching a consensus and avoiding a vote. Since a vote appeared inevitable, it was important that an informed decision should be taken. He therefore requested clarification as to the legal difference between the word "endorses" and the word "welcomes".

65. The CHAIRMAN said that it appeared that there was no difference between the two words in a legal context.

66. Miss HASSAN (Egypt) said that the two words at issue had been discussed during informal consultations. Since a legal difference did not exist, the Committee should respect the word decided upon by the sponsors, namely, "endorses".

67. Mr. VILCHEZ (Nicaragua) said that there were two perfectly clear positions on the draft resolution - that of the Vice-Chairman of the Committee, which his delegation fully supported, and that of the representative of Brazil. The latter had made a formal request for a vote, to which no response had been given. He suggested that the Committee act on Brazil's request first.

68. The CHAIRMAN said that Brazil had requested a vote on the text of paragraph 1, as revised by the sponsors. In view of the prolonged debate, it appeared that a consensus was not possible and that a vote was inevitable.

69. Mr. MARTIN (United Kingdom) said that taking a vote on the issue of the environment would be most regrettable and should be avoided if at all possible. He proposed that the matter should be reconsidered on the following day, thus allowing the representative of Brazil time to consult with his Government.

70. Mr. PINZON (Colombia) said that the Committee should do everything possible to adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

71. Mr. AL-ZADGALY (Oman) said that while it was not opposed to the United Kingdom's proposal, his delegation was also willing to put the text to a vote, if the Committee should so decide.

72. Mr. SVENSSON (Sweden) said he supported the United Kingdom proposal, which might allow the Committee to finally reach a consensus. There had never been a vote on the work of UNEP in its entire history. UNEP would be playing a major role in the 1992 conference on environment and development; by taking a vote, the Committee would be undermining that role.

73. Mr. DINU (Romania) said that his delegation would be flexible and would go along with the wishes of the Committee.

74. Mr. PAPADATOS (Greece) said that he supported the representatives of the United Kingdom and Sweden. Those delegations which had insisted on a vote should bear in mind that, because of the unexpected developments during the Committee's deliberations, many delegations needed additional instructions from their Governments.

75. Mr. LICHTINGER (Mexico) said that his delegation supported the United Kingdom proposal.

The meeting was suspended at 12.36 a.m. and resumed at 1.15 a.m.

76. The CHAIRMAN said that he wished to propose the following draft decision: "The Second Committee decides to refer the draft resolution contained in document A/C.2/44/L.63/Rev.1, as orally revised, to the plenary Assembly for consideration and appropriate action". The draft decision would enable the General Assembly to take action on the draft resolution and at the same time would provide further opportunity for Committee members to reach a consensus and avoid a vote. He called upon the Committee members to adopt the draft decision without delay.

77. Mr. OULD CHEIKH EL GHAOUTH (Mauritania) said that his delegation would comply with the Chairman's request on the understanding that the wording considered would be that proposed by the Vice-Chairman, as the other formulations were unacceptable.

78. Mr. CABACTULAN (Philippines) said that the Chairman's proposal was the best course of action open to the Committee. He wished to know whether the draft decision referred to the forty-fourth session of the General Assembly, since that had not been explicitly stated.

79. Mr. PAYTON (New Zealand) suggested that the words "at its present session" should be added to the draft decision following the words "and appropriate action".

80. The CHAIRMAN said that although the forty-fourth session of the General Assembly would be resumed in 1990, it had been his intention to have draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.63/Rev.1 considered by the General Assembly before the end of 1989.

81. Miss HASSAN (Egypt) said that while it would not oppose the Chairman's proposal, her delegation accepted it with deep regret. Furthermore, she wished to know whether the wording "for consideration" was customary in a decision. Document A/C.2/44/L.88 indicated that additional appropriations related to the 1992 conference would be submitted to a resumed session of the General Assembly and she wished to know when that session would take place.

82. The CHAIRMAN said that the resumed session of the General Assembly would be held in 1990 subsequent to the organizational session of the Preparatory Committee for the conference on environment and development, to be held in March 1990.

83. Mr. CABACTULAN (Philippines) said that the draft decision proposed by the Chairman could be made even more precise by wording which would specify the exact meeting at which the General Assembly would take action on the draft resolution.

84. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee did not have the authority to specify the programme of work for the General Assembly and therefore could not adopt the suggestion of the Philippines. The draft decision could include a reference to the present session of the General Assembly, as proposed by the Vice-Chairman. The Committee would then make every effort to ensure that the draft resolution was submitted to the plenary Assembly by 22 December 1989.

85. If there were no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft decision he had proposed.

86. It was so decided.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

87. The CHAIRMAN said that, owing to the lateness of the hour, the biennial programme of work of the Second Committee would have to be considered at the next meeting.

88. Mr. AL-ZADGALY (Oman) said that, had it been present at the Committee's 51st meeting, his delegation would have voted in favour of draft resolutions A/C.2/44/L.12/Rev.1, L.42/Rev.1 and L.52/Rev.1.

89. Miss HASSAN (Egypt) said that her delegation had supported the draft decision because of its understanding that the Committee was meeting for the last time. Since another meeting was scheduled, the Committee could continue its consideration of draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.63/Rev.1.

90. The CHAIRMAN said that the draft resolution had to be submitted immediately to the General Assembly in order to be considered before the end of 1989.

91. Miss HASSAN (Egypt) wished to know whether the Fifth Committee would be meeting during the current week to consider the financial implications of draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.63/Rev.1.

92. Mr. STOBY (Secretary of the Committee) said that since it had no programme budget implications, the draft resolution would not be considered by the Fifth Committee.

The meeting rose at 1.40 a.m.