General Assembly

FORTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records

SECOND COMMITTEE
58th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 11 December 1991
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 58th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BURKE (Ireland)

CONTENTS

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.2/46/SR.58
23 December 1991

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

91-57830 5509S (E)

The meeting was called to order at 3.45 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued) (A/46/19, A/46/132-E/1991/58, A/46/558 and Corr.1; A/C.2/46/L.8 and Corr.1, L.12, L.21, L.31, L.34, L.41, L.64, L.65, L.83, L.86, L.101, L.114, L.120 and L.122)

Draft resolution on Israeli settlements in the Palestinian territory, the Syrian Golan and the other occupied Arab territories (A/C.2/46/L.8 and Corr.1)

Draft resolution on adverse economic effects of Israeli settlements in the occupied Palestinian territory, including Jerusalem, and other Arab territories occupied since 1967 (A/C.2/46/L.120)

1. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.120, which had been prepared on the basis of informal consultations on draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.8 and Corr.1. The new draft resolution had been submitted after the formal deadline for the submission of draft proposals under agenda item 12. However, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee was prepared to consider it.

2. It was so decided.

3. Mr. MAHMOUD (Lebanon) introduced draft resolution A/C.2/L.120, whose title was different from that of draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.8. The new draft took all views into account, and he recommended it for adoption by consensus.

4. Mr. MARKS (United States of America) said that the introduction of the profoundly political draft resolution in the Second Committee was inappropriate. It did not contribute to the peace process currently under way or to peace-making in the world in general.

5. Immigration and settlement in Israel were two separate issues. His delegation supported Jewish immigration to Israel from the Soviet Union and elsewhere; at the same time it believed that settlements were an obstacle to peace and that the final status of the occupied territories must be resolved in the context of a just, lasting and comprehensive peace in the Middle East. That goal could be achieved through the current peace process, which would not be furthered by the draft resolution.

6. The American Secretary of State had laboured hard to bring about direct negotiations between the parties to the Middle East conflict.. His delegation's long--standing policy had been that the negotiations should be based on Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) and on the principle of exchanging territory for peace in order to ensure Israel's security and the legitimate political rights of the Palestinian people.

7. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that rule 120 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly stipulated that the text of a draft

resolution must be circulated one day prior to the meeting at which action was to be taken. However, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee was prepared to waive the application of that rule.

8. It was so decided.

9. The CHAIRMAN announced that the representatives of Israel and the United States of America had requested that. a recorded vote should be taken on the draft resolution.

10. Mr. ELIASHIV (Israel) speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that, in recent weeks, many delegations had made a genuine effort to refrain from debate and defer action on the draft resolution. The highly sensitive issues it raised were being dealt with by the Security Council and by the General Assembly in plenary meeting; they were thus extraneous to the work of the Committee. Moreover, they were not conducive to the Middle East peace process and could even prejudice the outcome of the direct negotiations.

11. The sponsors of the draft resolution had singled out ostensible economic issues, but these issues could not be divorced from the complex Middle East political situation as a whole. His delegation's views on the political issues raised in the draft resolution had been stated in countless debates over the years in the General Assembly and the Security Council; those issues would be dealt with in bilateral negotiations between Israel and its neighbours.

12. The draft resolution was nothing more than an attempt to frustrate the peace process and divert attention from the real threat to international peace and security. I ndeed, had its sponsors been willing to recognize the State of Israel and live in peace with it, the draft resolution would not have been submitted through the back door of the Second Committee. The draft raised serious doubts as to whether its sponsors had really had a change of heart.

13. The Madrid peace conference on the Middle East had marked a turning point in Arab-Israeli relations. The United Nations must not remain detached from the new political realities in the Middle East by adopting a resolution which ran counter to the fundamental principles of the current peace process, namely direct negotiations without preconditions.

14. At the request of the representatives of Israel and the United States of America a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.120.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Feople's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Egypt.,

Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, flaiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mait.a, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmor, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America,

Abstaining: Belarus, Benin, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Costa Rica, Fiji, Germany, Kenya, Micronesia (Federated States of), Netherlands, Romania, Solomon Islands, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay.

15. Draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.120 was adopted by 112 votes to 2, with 17 abstentions.

16. Mr. VALENZUELA (Honduras) said that his delegation's vote in favour of the draft resolution had not been recorded.

17. Mr. HOLTHE (Norway), explaining the vote of the Nordic countries, said that those countries continued to have serious doubts about the appropriateness of a resolution which coincided with the peace negotiations currently in progress - negotiations which the international community should firmly support. Moreover, the resolution was clearly political in nature and outside the Committee's mandate. Nevertheless, the Nordic countries had voted for it in recognition of the sponsors' willingness to compromise on acceptable wording.

3.8. Mr. KOIKE (Japan) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution in the belief that Israeli settlements in the occupied territories were an obstacle to the achievement of peace and that the permanent occupation by one nation of the territory of another could never be justified. However, since the issue had already been dealt with by the General Assembly in plenary meeting and in the Special Political Committee, it should not have been raised in the Second Committee or in the Economic and Social Council.

19. Mr. TANLAY (Turkey) said that, while his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, it welcomed the diplomatic efforts by the United States of America and the Soviet Union that had culminated in the Madrid peace conference. His delegation firmly supported the peace process and hoped that it would contribute to a comprehensive, firm and lasting peace in the Middle East. Under no circumstances should the deliberations of the Second Committee be political in nature. It would have been preferable if the Committee, moved by the spirit which had led to the peace negotiations themselves, had adopted a consensus resolution.

20. Miss ULLOA (Ecuador) said that her delegation's vote in favour of the draft resolution had not been recorded.

21. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that, in the light of the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.120, the Committee did not wish to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.8 and Corr.1.

22. It was so decided.

Draft resolution on assistance to the Palestinian people (A/C.2/46/L.12)

23. Mr. BARAC (Romania), Vice-Chairman, reporting on the informal consultations, said that no consensus had been reached on draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.12.

24. Mr. ELIASHIV (Israel) referred to the statement made by his delegation during the debate on agenda item 12 at the 16th meeting. He wished to reiterate that his delegation not only welcomed assistance to Palestinian Arabs for constructive purposes, through proper and legitimate channels, but also fully cooperated with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and other international organizations in implementing professional, non-political programmes to improve the living conditions of the inhabitants of Judea, Samaria and Gaza. However, Israel firmly opposed any form of assistance to or cooperation with the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO). The draft resolution was based entirely on misleading assertions and distortions of fact and did not seek to improve the welfare of the inhabitants of those areas. Rather, it sought to advance political warfare against Israel and was not conducive to the ongoing peace process and direct negotiations,

25. Mr. MARKS (United States of America) said that the amalgam of objectives contained in the draft resolution did not contribute to the Middle East peace process. His delegation fully supported all programmes of assistance to the Palestinian people and had contributed significantly to those programmes, both directly and through the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA). However, the introduction of political elements in the draft resolution prevented it from being constructive. He therefore urged delegations to consider the broader issues and to vote against the resolution or abstain.

26. At the request of the representatives of Israel and the United States of Am , recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.12.

In favour: Alhania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria Burkina Faso, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Yonduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, 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: Fiji, Liberia, Micronesia (Federated States of).

27. Draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.12 was adopted by 135 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions.

28. Mr. BABINGTON (Australia), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation attached importance to assisting the economic development of the Palestinian people: Australia had in fact provided such aid. However, his delegation was unable to accept the reference in the draft resolution to Palestinian certificates of origin issued by the Palestinian chamber of commerce (para. 5), since Australian law only recognized certificates of origin issued by competent State authorities. He also wished to reiterate his delegation's support for the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, including an independent State.

29. Ms. FREUDENSCHUSS-REICHL (Austria) said that her delegation had voted for the resolution, although Austrian national legislation did not permit the acceptance of the Palestinian certificates of origin mentioned in paragraph 5. With regard to the preferential measures mentioned in the same paragraph, she noted that the occupied Palestinian territories were included on a list annexed to the Austrian law relating to preferential customs treatment.

30. Mr. MAJOOR (Netherlands), speaking on behalf of the European Community and its twelve member States, said that, while those States had supported the resolution, they interpreted the sixth preambular paragraph as referring to the economy in the occupied Palestinian territories. The European Community and its member States had provided substantial humanitarian economic assistance to the Palestinian people, including CO million ECUs (approximately $US 70 million) following the Gulf crisis. With regard to paragraph 3, assistance from the European Community would continue to be channelled through the appropriate organs and institutions, such as UNRWA, UNDP and non-governmental organizations.

31. In the area of trade, the Palestinian people benefited from autonomous tariff arrangements with the European Community, including duty-free access for Palestinian industrial products and preferential treatment for certain agricultural products. The European Community recognized the competence of chambers of commerce in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip to issue certificates of origin and ensure administrative cooperation in trade. The Community had repeatedly stressed to the Israeli authorities the importance it attached to the effective implementation of its trade measures without administrative or other obstacles to Palestinian exports. Finally, the Community interpreted paragraph 8 of the resolution to mean the establishment of a network of local banks in the occupied territories.

32. The States members of the European Community would continue to grant aid and development assistance to the Palestinian people and attached great importance to the Madrid peace conference, a process which they hoped would make the resolution just adopted and others like it unnecessary in the future.

33. Mr. HOLTHE (Norway) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution on the understanding that paragraph 3 did not impair or restrict its ability to provide assistance to the Palestinian people through the channels of its choice, including non-governmental organizations. Norway continued to be a major contributor to international assistance to the Palestinian People.

34. Mr. MOUSSA (Cameroon) said that., had his delegation been present during the voting, it would have voted in favour of the draft resolution.

35. Mr. KJELLEN (Sweden) said that. his delegation fully supported efforts to improve the condition of the Palestinian People, to whom it provided humanitarian assistance. Sweden also promoted the import of Palestinian

(Mr. Kjellen, Sweden)

products. However, paragraphs 4 and 5 of the draft resolution gave rise to formal and technical difficulties which were being reviewed by the appropriate Swedish authorities.

36. Mr. KAARIA (Finland) said that his delegation continued to be concerned about the issue of certificates of origin to cover Palestinian imports and exports. Had there been a separate vote on paragraphs 4 and 5 of the draft resolution, his delegation would have abstained. It nevertheless continued to support assistance to the Palestinian people.

Draft resolutions on the impact of recent evolution of East-West relations on the growth of the world economy, in particular on the economic growth and development of the developing countries, as well as on internal economic cooperation (A/C.2/46/L.21 and L.122)

37. Mr. BARAC (Romania), Vice-Chairman, introduced draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.122, which he was submitting on the basis of the "informal informal consultations" that had followed the informal consultations on draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.21, and recommended it for adoption without a vote. The draft text required a number of minor editorial corrections. In addition, in the second preambular paragraph, the words "in 1991" should be revised to read "on 4 and 5 July 1991"; and in paragraph 4, the phrase "allocation of resources to the Eastern European countries would not reduce or divert the resources and aid, " should be revised to read "resources allocated to the Eastern European countries would not reduce or divert official development assistance".

38. Mr. JOMAA (Tunisia) said that the method of reaching consensus on draft resolutions without holding informal consultations should not become a precedent since no interpretation was provided for "informal informal consultations".

39. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, in order to ensure that no precedent was created, the Committee should adopt draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.122 as a Chairman's text.

40. Mr, ZHANG Yesui (China) said he had just learned that wording in paragraph 5 that had been agreed at one stage of the "informal informal consultations" had been changed during the final stages of those consultations, which many delegations, including his own, had been unable to attend. That procedure should not be repeated.

41. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.122 as a Chairman's text.

42. Draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.122, as orally revised, was adopted.

43. Draft resolution A/C. 2/46/L. 21 was withdrawn by the sponsors.

Draft resolution on convening of an international conference on the financing of development (A/C.2/46/L.31 and A/C.2/46/L.105)

44. Mr. ZIARAN (Islamic Republic of Iran), Vice-Chairman, said that informal consultations on draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.31 had yielded a compromise text contained in document A/C.2/46/L.105, which he recommended for adoption by consensus.

45. Draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.105 was adopted.

46. Draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.31 was withdrawn by the sponsors.

Draft resolution on the report of the Committee for Development Planning: criteria for identifying the least developed countries (A/C.2/46/L.34 and L.101)

47. Mr. ZIARAN (Islamic Republic of Iran), Vice-Chairman, introduced draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.101, which he was submitting on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.34, and recommended it for adoption by consensus.

40. Draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.101 was adopted.

49. Mr. MARKS (United States of America) said that during the informal consultations his delegation had voiced its concern that the adoption of the new criteria formulated by the Committee for Development Planning might lead to an unwarranted expansion of the list of least developed countries, thereby rendering the concept less meaningful. His delegation had expressed the view that, before adopting the new criteria, the General Assembly should ask the experts on the Committee fur Lsvelopment Planning to take one more look at them and make any minor revisions needed to ensure that they properly identified only those countries which were truly least developed. Only then could his delegation endorse the new criteria.

50. He welcomed the improvements that had been made in the text of the draft resolution, but said he still would have preferred to let the experts take one last look at the criteria and report thereon to the Economic and Social Council in 1992.

51. Draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.34 was withdrawn by the sponsors.

Draft decision on the Second Industrial Development Decade for Africa (A/C.2/46/L.64)

52. Mr. ZIARAN (Islamic Republic of Iran), Vice-Chairman, said that during the consultations on the draft decision it had been agreed to make the following changes to the text: a comma and the words "in particular, paragraph 4 of that resolution" should be added to the end of subparagraph (a) and subparagraph (b) should be deleted. With those changes, the draft decision could be adopted without a vote.

53. The CHAIRMAN announced that the programme budget implications of the draft decision were contained in document A/C.2/46/L.86.

54. Mr. KUFUOR (Ghana), speaking on behalf of the group of African States, proposed that the following paragraph should be added to the draft decision: "Takes note with appreciation of resolution GC.4/Res.8, on the Second Industrial Development Decade for Africa (IDDA), adopted by the General Conference of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization at its fourth session on 22 November 1991." It was his understanding from the informal consultations that all members of the Committee could agree to the insertion of that paragraph.

55. The CHAIRMAN noted that the resolution to which the representative of Ghana had referred was contained in document A/C.2/46/19.

56. Draft decision A/C.2/46/L.64, as orally revised, was adopted.

Draft decision on Phase II of the Transport and Communications Decade for Asia and the Pacific, 1985-1994 (A/C.2/46/L.65)

57. Mr. BARAC (Romania), Vice-Chairman, said that, following informal consultations, the sponsors of the draft decision had accepted the following amendments: the words "in particular, paragraph 2 of that draft resolution" should be added at the end of subparagraph (a) and subparagraph (b) should be deleted. He recommended that the draft decision, as amended, should be adopted without a vote.

58. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that the programme budget implications of the draft decision were contained in document A/C.2/46/L.83.

59. Draft decision A/C.2/46/L.65, as amended, was adovted.

Other documents relating to the report of the Economic and Social Council

60. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that it should take note of the report of the World Food Council (A/46/19); the note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report on the code of conduct on transnational corporations (A/46/558 and Corr.1); and the report of the Secretary-General on the role of the public sector in promoting the economic development of developing countries (A/46/132-E/1991/58).

61. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 77: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC COOPERATION (continued)

Draft resolution entitled "International conference on money and finance for development" (A/C.2/46/L.5)

62. Mr. ZIARAN (Islamic Republic of Iran), Vice-Chairman, said that it had been decided in informal consultations to recommend that consideration of the draft resolution should be deferred for further consultations.

63. The CHAIRMAN said that, in the light of the statement made by the Vice-Chairman, he would take it that the Committee wished to defer action on the draft resolution until the forty-seventh session of the General Assembly.

64. It was so decided.

(a) TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT (continued) A/46/496 and Add.1; A/C.2/46/L.55, L.57, L.91, L.113 and L.118)

Draft resolution on economic measures as a means of political and economic coercion against developing countries (A/C.2/46/L.55)

65. Mr. ZIARAN (Islamic Republic of Iran), Vice-Chairman, said it had become apparent during the informal consultations on the draft resolution that the positions of delegations were so divergent that a consensus could not be reached. A vote would therefore have to be taken on the draft resolution.

66. At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.55.

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Belarus, Greece, Liberia, Lithuania, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Spain, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay.

67. Draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.55 was adopted by 100 votes to 28, with 11 abstentions.

68. Mr. MARKS (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation disagreed with the entire premise of the draft resolution. It believed strongly that the question of whether to impose trade and other economic sanctions in order to protect essential security and other interests was a matter which international law left to each country's discretion. Calling for the international community to eliminate the use of unilateral economic measures was incompatible with that fundamental right.

69. In international relation6 there was occasionally need to use such sanctions as a policy tool to signal disapproval of support for subversion abroad and disregard for human rights at home.

70. Resolutions of the type just adopted did not enhance the status of the United Nation6 in the eyes of government figures who followed the Orqanization's deliberation6 and who had been encouraged by the trend towards consensus seeking in the Second Committee during the past several years,

71. Mr. EFTYCHIOU (Cyprus) said that as the draft resolution had been submitted by the Group of 77, of which his country was a member, his delegation had voted in favour of it.

72. Mr. AL SALLAL (Kuwait) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution despite reservations regarding some paragraphs because it had been proposed by the Group of 77, of which his delegation was very proud.

Draft resolutions on specific actions related to the particular needs and problems of land-locked developing countries (A/C.2/46/L.57 and L.118)

73. Mr. ZIARAN (Islamic Republic of Iran), Vice-Chairman, said that, following extensive consultations on the text of draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.57, he was in a position to introduce a new text, contained in document A/C.2/46/L.118, which could be adopted without a vote.

74. The CHAIRMAN said he had been advised that the programme budget implications contained in document A/C.2/46/L.85 did not apply to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.2/46/L.118.

75. Mr. NEBIE (Burkina Faso) said that his delegation wished to become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.57.

76. Draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.118 was adopted.

77. Mr. TANLAY (Turkey) said that the consensus on the draft resolution did not change his Government's position on the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, to which Turkey was not a signatory.

78. Draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.57 was withdrawn by the sponsors.

Draft resolution on the United Nations/International Maritime Organization Conference of Plenipotentiaries on a Draft Convention on Maritime Liens and Mortgages (A/C.2/46/L.91)

79. Mr. ZIARAN (Islamic Republic of Iran), Vice-Chairman, said that during the informal consultations a provisional consensus had been reached on the draft resolution, pending an explanation from the Office of Programme Planning, Budget and Finance regarding the programme budget implications of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.2/46/L.113, in particular with respect to the last. sentence of: paragraph 3 of that document. If the explanation was acceptable to the committee, he would recommend the adoption of the draft resolution without a vote.

80. Mr. BELOV (Programme Planning and Budget Division) said that, because of time constraints, the wording of paragraph 3 of document A/C.2/46/L.113 differed from the usual wording of statements of programme budget implications. The last sentence of paragraph 3 meant that there would be no deviation from the usual practice of providing conference services for specific United Nations meetings. Therefore, if the draft resolution was adopted, the United Nations/International Maritime Organization Conference of Plenipotentiaries would receive full conference-servicing.

81. Mr. MAJOOR (Netherlands), speaking on behalf of the European Community and its member States, thanked the representative of the Programme Planning and Budget Division for his assurances that the cost of conference servicing for the Conference would be absorbed within the normal resources provided under section 32 of the proposed programme budget for 1992-1993. The European Community could accept the draft resolution on the understanding that the statement of programme budget implications would be revised to reflect those assurances in standard terms before it was submitted to the Fifth Committee for consideration. The statement of programme budget implications should also indicate that any additional requirements created as a result of the Conference would be dealt with in the context of the performance report.

82. Mr. MARKS (United States of America) supported the statement made by the representative of the Netherlands on behalf of the European Community and said he hoped that the statement of programme budget implications would be amended to indicate that the cost of the Conference would be met from within existing resources.

83. Draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.91 was adopted.

Other documents

84. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that it should take note of the note by the Secretary-General on progress in the implementation of specific action related to the particular needs and problems of land-locked developing countries (A/46/496 and Add.1).

85. It was so decided.

(e) ENVIRONMENT (continued) (A/46/138-E/1991/52, A/46/156-E/1991/54, A/46/214-E/1991/77, A/46/615 and Corr.1; A/C.2/46/3; A/C.2/46/L.71/Rev.1, L.74/Rev.1, L.88, L.90, L.98/Add.1 and L.108)

Draft resolution on international cooperation to mitigate the environmental consequences on Kuwait and other countries in the region resulting from the situation between Iraq and Kuwait (A/C.2/46/L.71/Rev.1)

86. Mr. BARAC (Romania), Vice-Chairman, reporting on the results of informal consultations held on the draft resolution, said that it had not been possible to reach consensus on the text.

87. The CHAIRMAN announced that the programme budget implications of the revised draft resolution were contained in document A/C.2/46/L.98/Add.1.

88. Miss BIFFOT (Gabon) said that her delegation wished to become a sponsor of the revised draft resolution.

89. Mr. MISSARY (Yemen) said that his delegation supported the draft resolution, which reflected the solidarity of all the peoples affected by the ecological disaster in the region. The considerable environmental damage done to Yemen as a result of the catastrophe would have long-term adverse consequences for the country.

90. He therefore proposed that, in the first sentence of paragraph 3, the words "and other countries in the region" should be added after the title "Regional Organization for the Protection of the Marine Environment". His amendment was intended to extend the proposed programme of action to the countries of the Arabian Peninsula and the Gulf region, including Yemen.

91. Mr. AL-SALLAL (Kuwait) said that the draft resolution did take into account the needs of all countries of the region, including Yemen. Apart from Kuwait, no country was named in the draft resolution, and none should be, especially not one that had not been directly affected. In any case, there was no precedent for defining the countries of a region. He urged all States supporting the draft resolution to reject the Yemeni amendment and to vote for the draft resolution without any amendment.

92. Mr. BATAYNEH (Jordan) said it was his understanding that the purpose of the draft resolution was to mitigate the environmental consequences arising out of the situation between Iraq and Kuwait. All countries of the Arabian Peninsula and the entire Gulf region had been affected. Consequently, Jordan supported the Yemeni amendment and called on all Arab States to support it without a vote.

93. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the Yemeni amendment to paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.71/Rev.1.

94. The Yemeni amendment was rejected by 22 votes to 72, with 21 abstentions.

95. The CHAIRMAN announced that separate recorded votes had been requested by the representative of Iraq on the second preambular paragraph and on draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.71/Rev.1 as a whole.

96. At the request of the representative of Iraq, a recorded vote was taken on the second preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.71/Rev.1.

In favour: Albania, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, 'Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niyer, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Iraq, Sudan.

Abstaining: Yemen.

97. The second preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.71/Rev.1 was adopted by 120 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

98. At the request of the representative of Iraq, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.71/Rev.1 as a whole.

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Dnrussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Koroa, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hai ti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Iraq, Yemen.

99. Draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.71/Rev.1 as a whole was adopted by 135 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

100. Mr. SHAKIR (Iraq) said that the draft resolution just adopted had completely overlooked the environmental consequences to Iraq, focusing instead on accusing Iraq. However, environmental protection knew no borders, and the aggression against Iraq by the allied forces had seriously damaged the country's infrastructure. Reports by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), non-governmental organizations and many other groups that had visited Iraq spoke of thousands of children starving or dying from preventable diseases. Moreover, the allied forces had left radioactive substances in Iraq that would affect life and health for years to come.

(Mr. Shakir, Iraq)

101. During the informal consultations his delegation had requested that the environmental consequences to Iraq should be mentioned in the draft resolution. Instead, a political resolution had emerged which totally ignored the sufferings of Iraqi women and children. Despite its spurious appearance of international legitimacy, the draft resolution was unfair.

Draft resolution on environment and agricultural policies (A/C.2/46/L.74/Rev.1)

102. Mr. BARAC (Romania), Vice-Chairman, introduced a draft decision which he was submitting on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.74/Rev.1. The draft decision would consist only of paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.74/Rev.1, with the words "including inter alia" replacing the words "in particular** and the portion of the paragraph following the phrase "area of trade" deleted. He recommended the draft decision for adoption without a vote.

103. The draft decision submitted by the Vice-Chairman was adopted.

104. Mr. JOMAA (Tunisia) said that his delegation would have no objection to a discussion of the issue referred to in the draft decision at the fourth session of the Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development on the understanding that the session would be a true negotiating session and that there would be substantive discussion without formal statements.

105. Draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.74/Rev.1 was withdrawn by the sponsors.

Draft resolutions on international cooperation in the monitorina, assessment and anticipation of environmental threats and in assistance in cases of environmental emergency (A/C.2/46/L.88 and L.108)

106. Mr. BARAC (Romania), Vice-Chairman, informed the Committee that Belarus, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Samoa, and Trinidad and Tobago had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.88. On the basis of informal consultations on that draft resolution, he wished to introduce draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.108, which he recommended for adoption without a vote.

107. Draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.108 was adopted.

108. Mr. JOMAA (Tunisia) said it was his delegation's understanding that the Committee had been agreed to convey the report of the Secretary-General on the monitoring, assessment and anticipation of environmental emergencies to the Preparatory Committee of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, but that the report would not be discussed in the Preparatory Committee.

109. Draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.88 was withdrawn by the sponsors.

Draft decision on the report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme (A/C.2/46/L.90)

110. Mr. BARAC (Romania), Vice-Chairman, said that consensus had been reached in informal consultations on the draft resolution and recommended that it should be adopted without a vote.

111. Draft decision A/C.2/46/L.90 was adopted.

Other documents

112. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that it should note of the report of the Secretary-General on possible adverse effects of sea-level rise on islands and coastal islands, particularly low-lying coastal areas (A/46/156-E/1991/54); the report of the Secretary-General on traffic in and disposal, control and txansboundary movements of toxic and dangerous products and wastes (A/46/214-E/1991/77): the report of the Secretary-General on implementation of General Assembly resolution 44/227 (A/46/138-E/1991/52): the report of the Secretary-General on large-scale pelagic drift-net fishing and its impact on the living marine resources of the world's oceans and seas (A/46/615 and Corr.1); and the note by the Secretary-General on international conventions and protocols in the field of environment (A/C.2/46/3).

113. It was so decided.

(g) HUMAN SETTLEMENTS (continued) (A/46/8 and Add.1; A/C.2/46/L.58 and L.100)

Draft resolution on the living conditions of the Palestinian people in the occupied Palestinian territory (A/C.2/46/L.58)

114. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.58, which were contained in document A/C.2/46/L.100.

115. Mr. BARAC (Romania), Vice-Chairman, reporting on the informal consultations, said that no consensus had been reached on draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.58.

116. Mr. UMER (Pakistan) proposed, on the basis of the consultations held by the sponsors, that, in the third line of paragraph 6 the words, "pending the exercise of their right to self-determination," should be inserted after the word "and," and that everything after the word "system" in the fourth line should be deleted. In the second line of paragraph 7, the word "forty-seventh" should read "forty-eighth". The sponsors hoped that, with those amendments, the draft resolution would be adopted by the widest possible margin of votes.

117. Mr. LEV (Israel), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that Israel's policies aimed at improving the living standards of the Arab population in the administered territories of Judea, Samaria and Gaza could be described at some length. The International Peace Conference on the Middle East was a historic turning point in the Arab-Israeli conflict, yet the Committee was about to adopt the same resolution as two years previously as if nothing had changed. His delegation called on all countries which wished to contribute to the peace effort to vote against the draft resolution; a vote against it would be a vote in support of the peace process and its continuation in direct negotiations.

118. Mr. MARKS (United States of America) said that for the third time his delegation was obliged to explain its position on what was essentially the same issue. The substance of the draft resolution was unfortunate because it mixed political concerns with some legitimate human and social concerns in an inappropriate way. The context also made the draft resolution unfortunate, since momentous historic events were under way and the long awaited peace process had started. Delegations should demonstrate their commitment to the peace process by voting against the draft resolution or abstaining so that the process could proceed unhindered without attacks from the side.

119. At the request of the representatives of Israel and of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.58.

In favour: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, 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: Belarus, Canada, Estonia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

120. Draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.58, as amended, was adopted by 133 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions.

121. Mr. ISAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in explanation of vote on resolutions A/C.2/46/L.12, L.58 and L.120, said that the resolutions had been taken up at a time of rising hopes for a settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict, which for many years had had a destabilizing effect on the Middle East region and on the international situation as a whole. The end of that confrontation at the global level had made it possible to find approaches in line with the new political thinking and realities and to convene a peace conference on the Middle East on the basis of the formula worked out by the USSR and the United States. That conference offered prospects for a comprehensive settlement of the problems of the Middle East region: its preparation had required the good will of the parties to the conflict and intensive diplomatic efforts. At a time when the negotiating process was under way, his delegation believed that it was useful to create an atmosphere around it. that would be as favourable as possible to the development and intensification of Arab-Israeli dialogue, and of Palestinian-Israeli dialogue. His delegation, representing a country which was co-chairman of the conference, therefore believed that it was inappropriate to adopt. resolutions concerning matters of substance, including the Palestinian problem, that were under consideration at the peace conference. It had therefore abstained in the vote on resolutions A/C.2/46/L.120 and A/C.2/46/L.58. On humanitarian grounds and because of the need to continue existing programmes, it had voted in favour of resolution A/C.2/46/L.12, which it had also supported at the latest session of the Economic and Social Council.

122. Mr. BEZEREDI (Canada) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on resolutions A/C.2/46/L.120 and L.58 and had voted in favour of resolution A/C.2/46/L.12. Canada supported the economic well-being of the Palestinian people and believed that United Nations assistance could help realize that goal. However, the resolutions included political elements which were outside the scope of the Committee; some passages were neither balanced nor comprehensive; and resolution A/C.2/46/L.120 was not opportune given the more hopeful prospects for progress towards peace. The International Conference on the Middle East had opened up opportunities to make progress on some of the problems raised in the resolutions in the context of movement towards a just and durable resolution of the Middle East conflict.

123. Mr, SZEDLACSKO (Hungary), speaking on behalf of the delegations of Czechoslovakia, Poland and Hungary, said that they had voted in favour of draft resolutions A/C. 2/46/L. 120, L. 12 and L.58; they wished to stress, however, that they believed that consideration of certain issues in the draft

(Mr. Szedlacsko, Hungary)

resolutions was inappropriate at the current time and was not conducive to the ongoing peace process.

Report of the Commission on Human Settlements

124. Mr. BARAC (Romania), Vice-Chairman, reporting on the results of informal consultations on resolutions 13/1 and 13/2, contained in the report of the Commission on Human Settlements (A/46/8), said that the resolutions had been accepted without amendment, and recommended that they should be adopted without a vote.

125. Resolutions 13/1 and 13/2 contained in the report of the Commission on Human Settlements (A/46/8) were adopted.

126. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that it take note of the report of the Commission on Human Settlements (A/46/8) and the report of the Commission on the Global Strategy for Shelter (A/46/8/Add.1).

127. It was so decided.

128. Mr. STOBY (Secretary of the Committee), replying to a question from Mr. ORLIANGE (France), said that the decision just adopted in no way implied endorsement of decisions that the Committee had not specifically adopted or endorsed.

129. Mr. ORLIANGE (France) said that it was therefore his understanding that resolution 13/3 endorsed by the Economic and Social Council at its summer session in 1991 remained valid with the changes made and that the fact that the Committee had taken note of the report did not change that decision by the Economic and Social Council.

(h) SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued)

Draft resolutions on science and technology for development (A/C.2/46/L.23 and L.116)

130. Mr. ZIARAN (Islamic Republic of Iran), Vice-Chairman, introduced draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.116, based on the informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.23, and recommended it for adoption without a vote.

131. Draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.116 was adopted.

132. Draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.23 was withdrawn by the sponsors.

(i) ENTREPRENEURSHIP (continued)

Draft resolution on entrepreneurship (A/C.2/46/L.25/Rev.2)

133. Mr. BARAC (Romania), Vice-Chairman, after pointing out that Belarus and Guatemala had joined in sponsoring the draft resolution and that the words "as adopted" should be added after the date "21 December 1990" in the first line of the first preambular paragraph, said that, on the basis of the informal consultations, he was recommending draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.25/Rev.2 for adoption.

134. Draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.25/Rev.2 as amended, was adopted.

135. Mr. FERNANDEZ DE COSSIO DOMINGUEZ (Cuba) said that his delegation had joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.25/Rev.2 because the text contained elements that were generally accepted. Nevertheless, it had reservations about the first preambular paragraph which reaffirmed General Assembly resolution 45/188; his delegation had voted against that resolution because it believed that despite it:; title it was designed to promote the market economy system or neo-liberal economic models and would lead the United Nations along the dangerous course of indicating to Member States what specific socio-economic and political systems they should adopt.

136, Mr. SCHIALER (Peru), referring to the Spanish text, said that in paragraph 7, the words "estructurado y no estructurado" should be replaced by "formal e informal".

AGENDA ITEM 78: UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT (continued) (A/C.2/46/L.75 and L.112)

Draft resolution on the United Nations Conference on Envirorment and Development (A/C.2/46/L.75)

137. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the programme budget implications contained in document A/C.2/46/L.112.

138. Mr. BARAC (Romania), Vice-Chairman, after pointing out that the words "and the International Atomic Energy Agency" should be added at the end of paragraph 9, subparagraph (a), and that the words "in particular least developed countries" should be added after "developing countries" in the third line of paragraph 11, said that, on the basis of the informal consultations he was recommending that draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.75 should be adopted by consensus.

139. Draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.75, as orally amended, was adopted.

AGENDA ITEM 79: PROTECTION OF GLOBAL CLIMATE FOR PRESENT AND FUTURE GENERATIONS OF MANKIND (continued) (A/C.2/46/L.80 and L.110)

Draft resolution on Protection of global climate for present and future generations of mankind (A/C.2/46/L.80)

140. Mr. BARAC (Romania), Vice-Chairman, said that in operative paragraph 2, the phrase "on climate change containing appropriate commitments and any related legal instruments as may be agreed upon" should be inserted in the third line after the words "the framework convention" and that the words "unless the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee decides otherwise at its fifth session" should be added at the end of operative paragraph 3. A new paragraph should be inserted after paragraph 3, which would read as follows:

> "Requests the Secretary-General to make appropriate arrangements for the work of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee and its ad hoc secretariat for the rest of 1992 in the light of the outcome of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development and the report by the Chairman of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee on possible future steps in the field of climate change."

141. In the sixth line of paragraph 4, the words "existing and new" should be changed to *'present and potential". The first half of paragraph 8, should be reworded as follows: "Requests the Secretary-General, in the light of the outcome of the negotiations on a framework convention on climate change and the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development . . .".

142. Mr. KUFUOR (Ghana) said that, in light of the changes made to the text, the draft resolution should be considered as the text of the Chairman.

143. It was so decided.

144. Mr, STOBY (Secretary of the Committee), referring to the proposed amendment to paregraph 3 of the draft resolution, said that while the Secretariat could give assurances that services would be available in New York for a resumed session in April, it could give no such assurances in respect of meetings planned for Geneva or any other venue in a yet undetermined month of 1992. Moreover, any proposal for a change in the timing or venue of the resumed session would need to be submitted to the Committee on Conferences.

145. Mr. MARTIN (United Kingdom) pointed out that a subsidiary body of the General Asembly was required to meet at the place where its secretariat was located. In the case of the International Negotiating Committee, that was Geneva.

146. Mr. ORLIANGE (France) supported that statement.

147. Mr. KUFUOR (Ghana) said that the issue of the venue of the fifth session was a political one. The Group of 77 would prefer that the last session of

(Mr. Kufuor, Ghana)

the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee prior to the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in 1992 should be held in New York.

148. Mr. MARKS (United States of America) stressed the need for flexibility on the question in order to ensure that the product of the session would be available for signing at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development.

149. Mr. STOBY (Secretary of the Committee) said that the Secretariat would endeavour to accommodate additional activities. However, it was impossible at the current stage to give absolute assurances that meeting services would be available and he merely wished to introduce a note of caution.

150. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.80, as orally revised, without a vote.

151. Draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.80, as orally revised, was adopted.

152. Mr. VAN BRAKEL (Canada) said that he had taken note of the statements made by the Secretariat on the question of the venue for the resumed fifth session of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee. While his delegation had accepted the wording of the draft resolution, it was of the view that the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee should meet in Geneva where its servicing body was located.

153. Mr. MAJOOR (Netherlands), speaking on behalf of the twelve member States of the European Economic Community, said that there was need for flexibility in establishing the venue and duration of the session. He agreed with the representative of Canada that the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee should hold its resumed fifth session at Geneva where its secretariat was located.

154. Mr. SCHIELE (United States of America) said that his delegation interpreted the resolution just adopted by the Committee in light of the General Assembly's strong desire that the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee (INC) should complete work on a framework convention and should have the authority to take appropriate steps which it believed would lead to that outcome.

155. During informal discussions, his delegation had argued that paragraph 3 of the draft resolution should not specify the location of the potential meeting in April 1992. The text that had been adopted was an improvement over the original draft in so far as it referred to the possibility of the Committee holding a short resumed session in New York in April 1992 unless INC decided otherwise at its fifth session. His delegation believed that it should also be possible for INC to make such a decision at its fourth session,

(Mr. Schiele, United States)

156. Upon completion of the framework convention, there might be need to address procedural aspects associated with the convention's entry into force, as well as administrative steps that should be taken during the interim period. In view of the paramount importance of the proposed framework convention, the international community should concentrate its energies on those interim efforts.

157. Ms. FREUDENSCHUSS-REICHL (Austria) said that her delegation had joined the consensus but wished to echo the arguments put forward by the delegations of Canada, the Netherlands and the United States witn regard to paragraph 3 of the draft resolution. It, too, believed that the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee should be given the possibility to decide about its resumed session since it was in the best position to determine how to complete the work assigned to it.

158. Mr. GATHUNGU (Kenya) said that it was his understanding that paragraph 3 of the draft resolution just adopted did not in any way prejudice the provisions adopted on the same subject in resolution 451212.

159. Mr. BABINGTON (Australia) said that his delegation had joined the consensus but shared the position taken by the European Community, the United States and Austria regarding the venue for the resumed fifth session of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee and the need for flexibility in giving that Committee scope to decide on the venue and duration of such a session.

160. Mr. ADANK (New Zealand) said that his delegation had been pleased to join the consensus because the resolution underscored the need to adopt an effective framework convention on climate change in time for it to be opened for signature during the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in June 1992. The issue was of particular importance to Pacific island countries, given the potentially disastrous impact there of climate change. The States which had expended so much time in negotiating the convention would have to demonstrate a corresponding commitment after the Conference to ensure that it was effectively implemented. New Zealand was making that point because of the disturbingly slow progress in implementing important environmental instruments following their adoption. In the case of the London Amendments to the Montreal Protocol on the Ozone Layer, for instance, there were thus far only 8 of the 12 ratifications required for their entry into force on 1 January 1992. The delay was particularly worrisome since in the interim it had been discovered that ozone layer depletion was much more extensive than had previously been thought, The amended Montreal Protocol was clearly the best way to deal with the human activities that were causing the problem, and New Zealand urged support for it.

161. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to document A/C.2/46/L.110 containing the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.80.

162. Mr, SUGANO (Japan) said that his delegation would comment in the Fifth Committee on document A/C.2/46/L.110, but wished to state that Japan

(Mr. Sugano, Japan)

considered paragraph 6 to be a grave misinterpretation of the mandate outlined in the draft resolution in question.

AGENDA ITEM 81: EXTERNAL DEBT CRISIS AND DEVELOPMENT (continued)
(A/C.2/46/L.6, L.38 and L.119)

Draft decision on the establishment of an advisory commission on debt and development (A/C.2/46/L.6)

163. Mr. ZIARAN (Iran), Vice-Chairman, informed the Committee that it had been decided during informal consultations to defer consideration of the draft decision on the establishment of an advisory commission on debt and development until the forty-seventh session of the General Assembly.

164. The CHAIRMAN said that he would take it, if he heard no objection, that the Committee agreed to so defer consideration of the draft decision in document A/C.2/46/L.6.

165. It was so decided.

166. Mr. GUERRERO (Philippines) observed that his delegation continued to support the establishment of an international advisory commission on debt and development, as first proposed by his country. However, it believed, as did the Group of 77, that the Committee could defer the issue in order to concentrate on other aspects of the debt problem.

Draft resolutions on the international debt crisis and development: enhanced international cooperation towards a durable solution to the external debt problems of developing countries (A/C.2/46/L.38 and L.119)

167. Mr. ZIARAN (Islamic Republic of Iran), Vice-Chairman, introduced draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.119, which was based on the informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.38. The compromise language reflected in draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.119, however, had not met the concerns of some delegations and accordingly the sponsors were proposing the following revisions.

168. In the second line of paragraph 5, the words "including improved" should be replaced by the words "as regards, inter alia," and, in the third line, the word "improved" should be added before the words "market access". Paragraph 12 should be deleted and replaced by the text of paragraph 15 of the previous year's resolution on the same subject.

169. With those revisions, he recommended the adoption of the draft resolution without a vote.

170. Mr. SCHIELE (United States of America) observed that there had been a protracted discussion of the complex and thorny problem of debt in the

(Mr. Schiele, United States)

Committee. The United States position was well known, and he wished to express appreciation, especially to the leadership of the Group of 77, for the cooperation, collegiality and flexibility that had been shown.

171. Draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.119, as orally revised, was adopted.

172. Draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.119 was withdrawn by the sponsors.

173. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that it should take note of the report of the Secretary-General on the recent evolution of the international debt strategy (A/46/415).

174. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 82: OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued) (A/C.2/46/L.47, L.66, L.69 and Corr.1, L.87/Rev.1, L. 115, L.121 and L.123)

Draft resolution on the celebration of World Food Day (A/C.2/46/L.47)

175. The CHAIRMAN said that it was his understanding, based on the informal consultations on the draft resolution, that the members of the Committee attached importance to the desirability, as called for in resolution 35/70, of having Governments and national, regional and international organizations contribute to the effective commemoration of World Food Day to the greatest possible extent. He had been assured that, as a visible sign of effective cooperation and coordination among the United Nations organizations based in Rome - the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), the World Food Council (WFC) and the World Food Programme (WFP) those organizations would enhance their contribution to the commemoration of World Food Day, with FAO as lead agency.

176. He had been informed that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.47 had, in the light of that understanding, decided to withdraw their proposal. It was also his understanding that the representatives of the organizations concerned would transmit the statement he had just made to their respective headquarters.

Draft resolutions on operational activities of the United Nations system (A/C.2/46/L.66, L.69 and Corr.1, and L.121)

177. Mr. BARAC (Romania), Vice-Chairman, informed the Committee that the agreement reached in informal consultations on draft resolutions A/C.2/46/L.66 and L.69 and Corr.1 was reflected in a new consensus text, draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.121, which he recommended for adoption without a vote.

178. The CHAIRMAN advised the Committee that the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.121 were contained in document A/C.2/46/L.123.

179. Ms. JANJUA (Pakistan) read out a series of editorial corrections that she wished to see incorporated in the final version of the text of draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.121.

180. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.121 had been circulated only in English and would not be available in the other official languages at that final meeting. Under the circumstances, it would not be proper for the Committee to act on it immediately; but members should agree on a way of having the draft resolution adopted subsequently, while at the same time concluding their work at that meeting.

181, After a procedural discussion in which Mr. ORLIANGE (France), Mr. JOMAA (Tunisia), Mr. FERNANDEZ-PITA (Spain), Mr. AMAZIANE (Morocco), Mr. ILEKA (Zaire), Mr. KPAKPO (Benin), Mr. MAJOOR (Netherlands), the CHAIRMAN Mr. ZIARAN (Islamic Republic of Iran), Mr. AGUILAR HECHT (Guatemala; and Mr. PAPADATOS (Greece) took part, the CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it, first, that the Committee authorized him, as the representative of Ireland, to submit the draft resolution for discussion and adoption by the General Assembly in plenary meeting, and secondly, that draft resolutions A/C.2/46/L.66 and L.69 and Corr.1 had been withdrawn by their sponsors.

182, It was so decided.

Draft resolution on the United Nations Development Proaramme Human Develovment (A/C.2/46/L.87/Rev.1)

183. Mr. REDZUAN (Malaysia), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of its sponsors, drew attention to the following revisions: the first and second preambular paragraphs should be deleted; in the sixth preambular paragraph, the words "those aspects of" should be inserted after "Welcoming"; footnote 1/ should be deleted and footnotes 2/ and 3/ should be renumbered accordingly; the operative paragraph should be numbered paragraph 1; in that paragraph, the words "with the participation of Governments and human rights experts,*' should be deleted, and the sentence should continue as follows: "in order for the Governing Council to facilitate and decide on future work in the area of human development ...". As the draft resolution was the result of compromise, he recommended it for adoption without a vote.

184. Draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.87/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.

185. Mr. BABINGTON (Australia), explaining his delegation's position on the draft resolution just adopted, expressed regret that, while the Committee had finally been able to adopt a text on the Human Development Report without a vote, its adoption had created sharp divisions, threatening the consensus-seeking approach to operational activities which the Committee had always, and often successfully, pursued.

186. His delegation considered that there was an increasing recognition of the relationship between human freedoms and sustained economic development.

(Mr. Babington, Australia)

Accordingly, Australia believed that UNDP should not- be deterred from exploring that link and that it should do so in an empirical and non-ideological manner, taking into account the views of Member States, in accordance with the relevant decision adopted at the previous session of the Governing Council. That was especially necessary at a time when Member States were seeking greater intellectual input and more solid policy development by United Nations secretariats on a wide range of issues.

187. There were many flaws in the human freedom index contained in the Human Development Report, 1991, and the need to improve the data and the methodology was widely acknowledged, especially by UNDP. However, that should not prevent full consideration of the principles and the issues embodied in the index, His delegation believed that the question should continue to be discussed, primarily in the Governing Council.

Other documents

188. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that it take note of the following documents relating to the item: the note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Joint Inspection Unit on technical cooperation and the use of national professional project personnel, and the comments of the Administrative Committee on Coordination thereon, under sub-item (a) (A/46/186 and Add.1); the note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Administrator of UNDP on the United Nations Development Fund for Women under sub-item (b) (A/46/491); and the report of the Secretary-General on the participation of the United Nations in the review of the governance arrangements of the World Food Programme, under sub-item (f) (A/46/265). If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to adopt that suggestion.

189. It was so decided.

(a) OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM (continued)

Draft resolution on operational activities for development of the United Nations system (A/C.2/46/L.4)

190. The CHAIRMAN said that, in the light of the procedure adopted with regard to draft resolution A/C.2/46/L. 121, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee decided not to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.4.

191. It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 86: TRAINING AND RESEARCH: UNITED NATIONS INSTITUTE FOR TRAINING AND RESEARCH (continued) (A/C.2/46/L.77, L.102 and L.117)

Draft resolutions on the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (A/C.2/46/L.77 and L.117)

192. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to document A/C.2/46/L.102, containing the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.77.

193. Mr. ZIARAN (Islamic Republic of Iran), Vice-Chairman, introducing draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.117, based on the informal consultations on draft resolution A/C.2/46/L.77, drew attention to the following revisions of the text. In paragraph 5 (g), "(g)" should be deleted and the sentence should read "The report of the Secretary-General should conclude . . ."; in paragraph 6, the phrases "in accordance with paragraph 8 of General Assembly resolution 45/219," and "in 1992" should be deleted. On behalf of the sponsors he recommended the draft resolution for adoption without a vote.

194. Mr. STOBY (Secretary of the Committee) said that, following the oral revisions made by the Vice-Chairman, there were elements of document A/C.2/46/L.102 which did not apply to the text under consideration. If Member States required further explanation, the representative of the Programme Planning and Budget Division would be able to assist them.

The meeting rose at 9 p.m.