United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY
FORTY-FIRST SESSION
Official Records*

SECOND COMMITTEE
34th meeting
held on
Friday, 21 November 1986
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 34th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. AL-ASHTAL (Democratic Yemen)

CONTENTS

86-57597 6318S (E)

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.2/41/SR.34
4 December 1986
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

/...

141

The meeting was called to order at 3.35 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 79: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC C&OPERATION (continued)

(a) TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT (continued) (A/C.2/41/L.29, L.43, L.57-L.61)

Draft resolution on the trade embarao against Nicaraqua (A/C.2/41/L.29)

1. Mr. NORRIS (United States of America) said that, from the beqinninq, the United States had requested that the question of the trade embarqo against Nicaraaue should be dealt with in plenary meetinq so that it could be qiven complete and comprehensive consideration. When the Committee had rejected that appeal, his delegation had put forward simple amendments, not to undermine the oriainal draft resolution, but simply to add to it. However, those amendments had been met with derision by the sponsors of the draft resolution, and particularly by the representatives of Mexico, Peru and Nicaraqua, who, after attemptina to turn the rules of procedure to their advantaqe while demonstratina compiete disrespect for the ideals for which the United Nations stood, had - not unexpectedly - submitted their own sub-amendments in order to block consideration of his delegation's amendments. Thus, rather than lower itself to the level of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.29 by becominq involved in an endless cycle of amendments and sub-amendments, his delegation had decided to withdraw the amendments issued in document A/C.2/41/L.43.

2. In submittinq those amendments. his deleastion had simply souqht to create a more balanced draft resolution by including in it references to other aspects of the situation in Latin America, namelv, the question of human rights, particularly in Nicaraqua, and the Contadora process. Unfortunately, all those proposals had been totally rejected by the draft resolution's sponsors. The Committee was now faced with a biased, unbalanced draft. Many delegations would orobahly vote in favour of it with the excuse that they opposed, in principle, the use of restrictive trade measures for non-economic purposes. That araument was rather worn, though, since nearlv every country represented on the Committee was usinq or had used restrictive trade measures for political reasons, or had expressed a willinqnese to do so, always in the belief that the specific cases justified a departure from tire qeneral Principle. The Sandinistas themselves had called for the imposition of trade sanctions aqainst the Somoza réqime. It was clearly recoqnized, then, that, in some cases, such measures were not only justifiable but necesaa ry. It was up to individual countries to take such a decisions the General Aseemhly could not tell them that they were riqht or wronq.

3. One might then question the draft resolution's raison d'être, since the General Assembly had never taken a stand on the trade measures adopted hy other countries. The answer was simpler the General Assembly had once aqain embraced a double standard. The sponsors of the draft resolution, knowinq that they had a numerical majoritv, had demonstrated their lack of respect. for those who did not share their views and for the hiqh principles on which the United Nations had been founded. While his deleaation could not prevent the use of such tactics, it did not have to he a party to such behaviour. His delegation had therefore decided that it would no lonqer participate in the Committee's consideration of the item.

/...

4. The CHAIRMAN said that, as the amendments had been withdrawn, the Committee was left with only draft resolution A/C.2/41/L. 29 for its consideration.

5. Mr. MARIN-BOSCH (Mexico), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, thanked the representative of the United States for having withdrawn his amendments. It was unfortunate, however, that that generous gesture had been accompanied by a diatribe which virtually insulted the members of the Committee. Furthermore, he was surprised that the representative of the United States had accused countries such as Mexico, Nicaragua and Peru, which were among the sponsors of the draft resolution, of having used their power, since the only power they had lay in defending the principles set out in the Charter of the United Nations.

6. Mr. VALDEZ (Peru) wholeheartedly endorsed the remarks made by the representative of Mexico; since there was no longer any significant opposition to the draft resolution under consideration, it could be adopted by the Committee without a vote.

7. Mr. ICAZA GALLARD (Nicaragua) joined the two preceding speakers in thanking the representative of the United States for having withdrawn his amendments. However, he regretted that that had not been done at the outset of the debate, as it would have saved time. He also regretted that, in withdrawing the amendments in question, the representative of the United States had found it necessary to insult all the members of the Committee and the United Nations. Now that the amendments that would have weakened the original draft resolution had been withdrawn, the Committee again had before it a perfectly clear text based on two fundamental principles: the non-use of force in international relations, including the non-use of political, economic or military measures, and respect for the international legal order, as represented by the Judgment of the International Court of Justice regarding the trade embargo against Nicaragua.

8. Mr. WORONIECKI (Poland) said that the fact that the United States had withdrawn its amendments would not make people forget that those amendments had been designed to institutionalize discrimination and a one-sided administration of justice, in contempt of the international obligations assumed by a country. The trade restrictions imposed by the United States against Poland just as the international community was about to undertake a vast liberalization of trade were quite clear in that regard.

9. At the request of the representative of the United Kingdom, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.29.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya,

Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel.

Abstaining: Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of, Grenada, Guatemala, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Nepal, Netherlands, Niger, Oman, Paraguay, Portugal, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Zaire.

10. The draft resolution was adopted by 86 votes to 1, with 43 abstentions.

11. Mr. HARAN (Israel), speaking in explanation of vote, said that he had voted against the draft resolution, not because he supported the principle of trade embargoes, to which his country had been subjected since its creation, but because it was ludicrous that, after 41 years of existence, the United Nations should vote on a specific embargo under pressure from a majority of countries who thought they were in the right simply because of their numerical strength. Nicaragua had had the audacity to submit the draft resolution even though it, too, was maintaining a similar embargo against Israel. If Nicaragua wished to contest the principle of trade embargoes, it should start by renouncing their use.

12. Mr. KAWASHIMA (Japan) said that he had abstained during the vote because the question of trade embargoes had deep political implications; it was unlikely that consideration of that question would contribute anything to the work of the Second Committee.

13. Mr. MULLER (Australia) said he had voted in favour of the draft resolution but was disturbed at the turn which the debate on that subject had taken. All delegations had the right to submit draft resolutions and, consequently, amendments, which must also be considered by the Committee. However, the manner in which the amendments submitted by the United States had been dealt with was neither constructive nor equitable.

14. Mr DUN (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the States members of the European Economic Community, recalled that the Community had clearly stated on numerous occasions that it wished to contribute to the establishment of peace and to the economic development of Central America. Thus its members had not voted against the draft resolution; they nevertheless regretted that the procedure

followed prior to the vote had led the United States to withdraw its amendments. Any member State had lhe right to have its proposals considered by the Committee.

15. Mr. WALTER (Czechoslovakia), speaking on behalf of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Social ist Republ ic, the German Democratic Republic, Hunqarv, Monqol ia, Poland, the Ukrainian Soviet Social'st Republic and the Union ot Soviet Socialist Republ ics, said they had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.29 just as thev had voted in favour of resolution A/40/183 on the same subject at the fortieth session. They were deeply concerned that, one year later, the trade embarqo against Nicaraqua was still in effect. The socialist countr ies had already made i.t clear that they viqorously rejected any coercive measures aqainet a sovereiqn State, with the exception of those recommended by the United Nations. The trade embarqo aqainet Nicaraqua was illeqal and contrary to the fundamental principles qovernina relations amonq States, au well as to the provisions of the relevant treaties and the Judqment of the International Court of Justice dated 27 June 1986. The trade embarqo aqainst Nicaraqua jeopardized not only the Nicaraquan economy but also international economic relations as a whole. Central America's problems must be settled peacefully, without outside interference or intervention and without blackmail or pressure. The socialist countries unconditionally supported draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.29, and they called once aqain for the immediate liftinq of the trade embarao aqainst Nicaraqua.

16. Mr. JØNCK (Denmark) said that his country had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.29 because it considered that the imposition of economic sanctions could not help to solve the Nicaraquan problem or put an end to conflict in the reaion, and threatened to undermine the efforts of the Contadora Croup. The only means of solvinq the underlylna problems of the countr ies concerned was throuah economic and social reforms, a more equitable distribution of resources nnd a democratic system of qovernment. Hi8 country endorsed the appeal made in draft. resolution A/C.2/41/L.29 for the immediate revocation of the trrde embarqo aqainst Nicaraqua, but deplored the Fact that the amendment8 submitted by the United States of America (A/C.2/41/L.43) had not been put to the voto. Fis deleqation would have voted in favour of most of them, In particular those advocatinq changes in the nrea of human riqhts and an end to the onooinq suspension of civil liberties in Nicaraqua.

17. Mr. GAJENTAAN (Netherlands) said that his deleqation had abstained In the vote on draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.29 for all the reasons qiven by the representative of the United Kinqdom on behalf of the States members of the European Economic Community and because the appeal contained therein, while based, amonq other thinqs, on the Judqment of the International Court of Justice, deformed It. In its preamble, the draft resolution referred to the principle of non-intervention, which auqqested that the Court had based its decision on the trade emharqo on that principle. In Fact, the International Court of Justice, in its Judqment, had stated that it was unable "to reanrd such action on he economic plane . . . as a breach of the customary-law principle of non-intervention". Moreover, on 3 November 1986, the General Assembly had adopted draft resolution A/41/L.22, in which it had called for full and immediate compliance with the Judqment of the

(Mr. Gajentaan, Netherlands)

court. The Necherlands, which had voted in favour of that draft resolution, considered that it was all the less necessary for the Second Committee to reconsider the matter since draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.29 was not likely to lead to a neqotiated solution of the confl ict which continued to wreack havoc in Central America .

18. Mrs. DANIELSEN (Norway) said that her country had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/49/L.29 but reqretted that, aqaic in 1986, the discussion had been dominated oy procedural questions to the detr lment of consideration of substantive problems. Nicaraqua had submitted u draft resolution on the trade embarqo to the Committee , and the United States had then submitted amendments thereto. It would have been fair to consider the two texts and to vote on each of them. If the amendments submitted by the United States had been put to a vote, her deleqation would have vote f . vour of some of them.

19. Mr. LABERGE (Canada) said that, from the outset, his deleqation had questioned the merits of considerinq that issue in the Second Committee, since the General Assembly had only recently spoken out on the Judqment of the . ternationzl Court of Jue t ice. Unfortunately, there had been duplication and useless fraqmentation of work on the matter, and the debate h. 1 become politicized, which had led to a breakdown of discussion. Equally reqrettably, that situation had led the deleqation of the United States to withdraw its amendments (A/C.2/41/L.43), some of which contained usc ful points, in particular with reqacd to human rights. For all thc reasons his deleqation had been obliqed to abstain, desoite its well-known pos .on on the matter.

20. Mr. BOECK (Austria) said that his country had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.29 because it was extremely concerned about the Nicaraquan situation. The exertion of economic pressure on a country of the reqian was hamper inq the search for a solution to the cr isis. His country therefore supported the efforts of the Contadora Group. In that connection, Austria had always advocated respect for human riqhts and the search For neqotiate' solutions. However, it rearetted that the two texts submitted on that question had been the subject of pol itical manoeuvr inq.

21. Mrs. DE WHIST (Ecuador1 said that her deleqation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.29 because the Ecuadorian Government did not maintain diplomatic relations with Nicaraqua. However, that vote did not alter its position on the application of coercive measures, since her country had lonq exoerience with measures of that type, of which it had itself been a victim on several occasions durinq its history.

22. Mr. PAYTON (New Zealand) said that his deleqation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.29 but reqretted that the Committee had not been able to take action on the amendments submitted by the United States delegation (A/C.2/41/L.43). It was to be hoped that, if they intended to raise the issue aqain in the Committee at th forty-second session, the sponsors of the draft

(Mr. Payton, New Zealand)

resolution just adopted would qive serious thouqht to th e possible consequences of the procedural manoeuvr inq that had led the United States to withdraw its amendments.

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)
(A/C.2/41/L. 14, L.20, L. 28/Rev.1, L.63, L.65, L.33/Rev.1, L.49/Rev.1)

Draft decision on protection against producta harmful to health and to the environment (A/C. 2/41/L. 14)

23. Mr. JØNCK (Denmark) said that the informal consultations on draft decision A/C.2/41/L.14 had unfortunately not led to a consensus and that the text would therefore have to be put: to the vote.

24. MrDUN (United Kinqdom), speakinq on behalf of the Staten members of the European Economic Community, said that a list of products harmful to health and the environment would factlltate the prompt flow of accurate and unambiauous information between consumers and producers. The Twelve were therefore qrateful for the efforts made by the Secretariat in preparinq such a list and in ensurinq effective co-ordination with other bodies within the United Nations system. They would have preferred a completely inteqrated consolidated list, but were not opposed to the form detailed in Economic and Social Council resolution 1986/72, paragraph 3, or the current decision by the Second Committee endorsinq that resolution. Thev did, however, wish to underline the prime importance they attached to universal product coverage, the need for consistent updatinq of brand names and the chemical composition of products in the list and the maintenance of parts I and II as a single publication in future updated editions.

25. Draft decision A/C.2/41/L.14 was adopted by 136 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

Draft resolution on the report of the Secretary-General in implementation of General Assembly resolution 40/173 (A/C.2/41/L.33/Rev.1)

26. Mr. JØNCK (Denmark) said that, since informal consultations had not led to a consensus on the draft resolution, the Second Committee would have to vote on it.

27. MrSHAABAN (Eqypt) said that the concept of international economic security, if well defined and analvsed, as recommended by the Secretary-General's report and the text to be voted on, was of qreat interest to many countries, in particular the developinq countries. His deleqation had submitted an amendment to the draft resolution and would vote in favour of the text, as amended.

28. Mr. LAHEHGE (Canada) said that his delegation would have joined in a consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.33. In the absence of such a consensus, it would have to abstain. Never the leas, it was to be hoped that the Second Committee or the Economic and Social Council would continue to consider the matter.

29. Mr. BLGHOUAYEL (Tunisia) said that draft resolution A/C. 2/41/L.33/Rev. 1 dealt with a concept which was limited in scope and could be tnteqrated into the questions related to international economic co-operation and to development In the overall context of North-South neqotiations. His delegation would vote for the draft resolution.

30. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C. 2/41/L.33/Rev.1.

In favour: Afqhanistan, Alqeria, Anqola. Arqentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Banqladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulqaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byeloruesian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Conqo. Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Eqypt, Eauatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hunqary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Traq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madaqascar, Malawi, Malavsia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Monqolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaraqua, Niqer, Niqeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraquay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Seneaal, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Toqo, Trinidad and Tobaqo, Tunisia, Uqanda. Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruquay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yuqoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Belqium, Denmark, Fiji, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, 'Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourq, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portuqsl, Spain, United Kinqdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Abstaining: Austria, Canada, China, Côte d' Ivoire, Finland, Greece, Israel, Liberia, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Sweden, Turkey, United States Of America.

31. Draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.33/Rev.1 was adopted by 106 votes to 17, with 13 abstentions.*

32. Mr. BROTODININGRAT (Indonesia) said that. his delegation had voted for the draft resolution in thr. hope that it would promote dialoque between the developinq and the developed countries. However, it was more important to implement the recognized concept of a new international economic order than to seek to define new concepts.

---

* See para. 40 below.

33. Mr. FAREED (Pakistan) said that he had voted for the text just adopted, but regretted that the Committee had had to vote on a concept which would be useful only if its value was universally acknowledged.

34. Mr. WALTER (Czechoslovakia), speaking also on behalf of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian SSR and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, said that those countries had voted for the draft resolution but reserved the right to present their views on the subject in plenary session.

35. Mr. HARAN (Israel) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.33/Rev.1 because it considered that General Assembly resolution 40/173 contained the guidelines necessary for the Secretary-General to prepare his report.

36. Mr. TUAN (Liberia) said that he had reluctantly abstained during the vote on the draft resolution. His delegation had hoped that there would be a consensus on the draft resolution, since it dealt with a concept which would be useful only if it were universally accepted. If a consensus was reached in plenary session, Liberia would join it.

37. Mr. RAHMAN (Bangladesh) said that he had voted for the draft resolution but that the resolutions referred to in the first preambular paragraph of General Assembly resolution 40/173 should have been expressly mentioned. He hoped that the Secretary-General would take those resolutions into account when preparing his report.

38. Miss FANG PING (China) said that her delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution because the idea of international economic security seemed to it to be very vague. According to General Assembly resolution 40/173, that idea appeared to concern development and international economic co-operation. The General Assembly had already adopted a large number of resolutions and instruments on that subject, the most important of which were the Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States and the International Development Strategy. China believed that it would be more useful to concentrate on the implementation of those instruments rather than begin to discuss such an ambiguous idea.

39. Mr. DE LA TORRE (Argentina) said that he had voted for the draft resolution On the understanding that it would prejudge neither the conclusions of the report the Secretary-General had been asked to prepare, nor the consensus reached by the General Assembly regarding development.

40. Mr. ARIYARATNE (Sri Lanka) said that his delegation's vote had not been recorded, and requested that note should be taken that Sri Lanka had voted for the draft resolution.

41. Mrs. DE WHIST (Ecuador) said that, had her delegation been present at the time of the vote, it would have voted for the draft resolution.

42. Mr. DUN (United Kinqdom), speaking on behalf of the States members of the European Economic Community, said that they had voted aqainet the draft resolution because they did not aee the need for it: the General Assembly in its resolution 40/173 had already requested the Secretary-General to report to it at its forty-second session through the Economic and Social Council. Further, they questioned a procedure which consisted in proposinq a lotion" and then askinq the Secretariat to turn it into a "concept".

43. Mr. ADAM (Somalia) requested that Somalia should be included in the list of countries which had voted for the draft resolution.

Draft resolution on the proclamation of the World Decade for Cultural Development (A/C.2/41/L.49/Rev.1)

44. Mr. JØNCK (Denmark), Vice-Chairman, said that as a result of the informal consultations, two chanqee of Corm had been nab in draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.49/Rev.1. In paragraph 4, the phrase "from their respective reqular budqets" should be deleted. In paraqraph 5, the words "with respect to" should be replaced by the word "respecting'. Unfortunately, the consultations had not led to a consensus, since no agreement could be reached on the fourth and fifth preambular paraqraphe and paraqraphe 1 and 5. Ther ore, it was up to the Committee to take a decision on the draft resolution.

45. Mr. SEKULIĆ (Yuqoslavia) said that, in order to break the deadlock, paraaraph 1 should be amended by deletinq the comma and the word "with", which followed the words "United Nations*, adding the word "and", and deletinq the phrase "actinq as the lead agency" at the end of the paraqraph.

46. Mr. FAREED (Pakistan) requested an explanation regarding the chanqe made in paraqraph 5, and suggested that an extra effort ehould be made to reach a consensus on the text.

47. The CHAIRMAN suqqeeted that consideration of draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.49/Rev.1 should be postponed until the next meetinq.

48. It was so decided.

49. Mr. FAREED (Pakistan) said that it was reqrettable that the provision of drinkinq water in the conference rooms had been discontinued and that in addition. a distinction had been made between delegations and the members of the Bureau, who were not affected bv that measure. He therefore proposed the Collowinq draft decision:

'The General Assembly

*Requests the Secretary-General to reinstate, in accordance with past practice and within available resources, the provision of drinkinq water in all conference rooms, with immediate effect.'

If the draft resolution had financial implications, they should be considered at a later meetinq, and the draft decision could be adopted by consensus.

50. The CHAIRMAN said that the draft decision certainly had financial implications, since it was precisely for financial reasons that drinkinq water wae no lonqer provided. He suqqested that the question should be considered at the Committee's last meeting.

51. Mr. FAREED (Pakietan) requested the Chairman to circulate the draft decision which he had just read out and, if necessary, a report on its financial impl ications.

52. Mr. DIECKMANN (Federal Republic of Germany), speakinq on a point of order, fully supported the proposal to consider the question at the last meetinq.

53. Mr. HARAN (Tarael) , speakinq on a point of order, said that the question had nothinq to do with aqenda item 12, and that it fell within the competence of the Fifth Committee and not the Second Committee.

54. Mr. TUAN (Liber is) , speakinq on a point of order, supported the proposai of the deleqation of Pakistan, and considered that if it had financial implications, drinkinq water should no lonqer be provided for the membeis of the Bureau.

55. The CHAIRMAN, replying to the representative of Israel, said that any deleqation had the right to make a propose1 and that it was up to the Committee to decide whether it was competent to consider it and whether the proposal was acceptable.

56. Mr. SEBURYAMO (Burundi) said that the proposal of Pakistan was not on the Second Committee's aqenda and that Burundi did not support it. However, the proposal could be examined at the next session.

AGENDA ITEM 80: OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued) (A/C.2/41/L.67)

(a) OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM (continued) (A/C.2/41/L.66)

(c) UNITED NATIONS FUND FOR POPULATION ACTIVITIES (continued) (A/C.2/41/L.68)

Draft resol ition on operational activities for development (A/C.2/41/L.67) and draft deci:ions on the field representation of orqanizations cf the United Natior s system (A/C.2/41/L.66) and on the United Nations Population Award (A/C.2/41/L.68)

57. Mr. DE ROJAS (Venezuela) , epeakinq as Vice-Chairman, said that in draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.67 the General Aseembly endorsed Economic and Social Council resolution 1986/74. With reqard to draft decision A/C.2/41/L.66, it should be noted that the title had been revised to read: "Report of the Joint Inspection Unit on the field representation of orqanizations of the United Nations system". Finally, the ess: ntial purpose of draft decision A/C.2/41/L.68 was to amend General Assembly resolution 36/201. Informal consultations I ad enabled consensus to be reached in all three cases and he hoped that the Committee would be able to adopt the drafts without a vote.

58. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Committee), recalled that the Committee had adopted a number of draft resolutions in which the General Asaembly endorsed resolutions of the Economic and Social Council without the text of those resolutiona beinq annexed. He therefore propoeed that the same ehould be done for reasons of economy with draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.67, which would then end with the title of the Economic and Social Council resolution.

59. Mr. DE ROJAS (Venezuela) , speaking as Vice-Chairman, said that that possibility had been considered durinq the informal conaultatione and it had been decided to keep the text as aubmitted to the Committee.

60. Mr. JØNCK (Denmark) said that it would be a pity to reopen the queetion, since it had already been conaldered during the informal coneultatione. Without iqnorinq the financial implications, which he considered to be limited, he stronqly recommended that the consensus text should be kept an it was.

61. The CHAIRMAN euggeated that no account should be taken of the proposal by the Secretary of the Committee.

62. Draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.67 was adopted.

63. Draft decision A/C.2/41/L.66, as orally revised, was adopted.

64. Draft decision A/C. 2/41/L. 68 was adopted.

65. The CHAIRMAN suqqeeted that the Committee should adopt the followinq draft declsionr

"The General Aeeembly takes note of the followinq documenter

"(a) The note by the Secretary-General eubmittinq the report of the Director-General for Development and Intornationel Economic Co-operation for the triennial policy review of the United Nations system's operational activities for development (A/41/350 and Add.1-E/1986/108 and Add.1);

"(b) The note by the Secretary-General on the information provided by orqanizations of the United Nations system on the aystem-wide policy issues affectinq operational activities (A/41/374 and Add.1, 2, 3-E/1986/109 and Add.1, 2, 3);

"(c) The note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU/REP/86/1) on the field representation of orqanizatione of the United Nations system: structure and co-ordination (A/41/424) I

"(d) The note by the Secretary-General on the operational activities of the United Nations system (A/41/776 and Corr.1);

(The Cha i rman)

"(e) The report of the Governinq Council of the United Nations Development Programme on its orqanizational meetinq for 1986 and on its thirty-third session (E/1986/29, Supplement No. 9, I

"(f) The note by the Secretary-General transmittinq the report of the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme on Forward-lookinq Strateqies for the Advancement of Women to the Year 2000r the United Nations Development Fund for Women (A/41/6001.

AGENDA ITEM 82: SPECIAL ECONOMIC AND DISASTER RELIEF ASSISTANCE (continued)

(b) SPECIAL PROGRAMMES OF ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE (continued) (A/C. 2/41/L. 52/Rev. 2 and L.55/Rev.1)

Draft resolution on special assistance to front-line States (A/C. 2/41/L. 52/Rev. 2)

66. The CHAIRMAN announced that Banqladeah, Bolivia, Botswana, the German Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Mali, Niqeria, Romania and Rwanda had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

67. Mr. DE ROJAS (Venezuela) , speakinq as Vice-Chairman, said that draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.52/Rev.2 reflected a series of amendments made to the oriqinal draft resolution durinq informal consultations. Additional amendments hnd been made durinq fresh consultations held recently and the Committee Secretary would read them out. However, despite those amendments, it had not been possible to achieve consensus on the text under consideration.

68. Mr. SEVAN (Secretary of the Committee) said that, in paraqraph 2 of the draft resolution, the words "and appropriate subreqional or ,ional orqanizations" should be replaced by the words "or subreqional orqanizations".

69. Draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.52/Rev.2, as orally amended, was adopted by 135 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

70. Mr. KUFUOR (Ghana) said that he had voted for the draft resolution just adopted, but his vote had not been registered.

71. Mr. CHABALA (Zambia) , apeakinq on behalf of the sponsors, expressed deep gratitude to the members of the Committee for adoptina draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.52/Rev. 2, to the delegations which had participated in the informal consultations on it and, in particular, to Vice-Chairman de Rojas for his skilful quidance of the consul tations.

---

* See paraqraph 70.

Draft resolution on assistance to Benin, the Central African Republic, the Comoros, Democratic Yemen, Equatorial Guinea, Djibouti, the Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Madagascar, Nicaragua, Sierra Leone and Vanuatu (A/C. 2/41/L. 55/Rev. 1)

72. Mr. SEVAN (Secretaty of the Committee) said that the word "adjustments" at the end of the nineteenth preambular paraqraph should be replaced by the words "adjustment measures".

73. M..DE ROJAS (Venezuela), speakinq as Vice-Ch-irman, thanked all the countries that had taken part in formulatinq the draft resolution durinq the informal consultations. Thanks to their efforts and patience, it had been pooeihle to achieve consensus on the text of the draft.

74. Draft resolution A/C.2/41/L.55/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.

75. Hr. GAJENTAAN (Netherlands) said that the fiquree for the assistance provided by his country in the report of the Secretary-General on assistance to Nicaraqua (A/41/538) were incorrect and that he would forward correct fiqures to the Secretariat in due course.

76. The CHAIRMAN and Mr. DIECKMANN (Federal Republic of Germany' said that they were qrateful to the deleaations that had taken part in drawinq up the draft resolution and, in particular, to the Vice-Chairman for his untiring efforts.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.