



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 59th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. MURGESCU (Romania)

CONTENTS

- AGENDA ITEM 56: UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT (continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 55: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 70: UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT
(continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 69: ACCELERATION OF THE TRANSFER OF REAL RESOURCES TO DEVELOPING
COUNTRIES (continued)

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.2/34/SR.59
20 December 1979

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 56: UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT (continued)

Draft decision A/C.2/34/L.126

1. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the draft decision entitled "Completion of the work of the United Nations Conference on Restrictive Business Practices" (A/C.2/34/L.126), which had been submitted in his name, and to the statement of administrative and financial implications in document A/C.2/34/L.127.
2. Draft decision A/C.2/34/L.126 was adopted without a vote.
3. Mr. KOLEV (Bulgaria), speaking on behalf of the delegations of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR, said that those delegations had not objected to the adoption of draft decision A/C.2/34/L.126 without a vote because they were aware of the importance which the elaboration of rules on the subject would have for the developing countries. The socialist countries had played an active role in the work of the Conference and had made constructive contributions to the principles which had been elaborated. They wished, however, to state that the cost of the resumption of the Conference should be met within the framework of existing funds, without additional appropriations from the United Nations budget. Any extra costs should be met from the savings to be derived from the elimination of ineffective programmes and duplication of work elsewhere in the Secretariat. Lastly, they would point out that the extension of both the Conference on Restrictive Business Practices and the Conference on an International Code of Conduct on the Transfer of Technology was further evidence of the questionable practice followed by UNCTAD of convening expensive conferences without proper preparation.

Draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.76

4. Mrs. SIKRI (India), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, said that the Group had made one revision in the text of draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.76 on the effects of the world inflationary phenomenon on the development process. The second preambular paragraph had been replaced by the following text: "Recalling resolution _____ on the global negotiations". The reference was to the resolution of the current session, which had not yet been adopted by the plenary Assembly and assigned a number.
5. Mr. DAVENPORT (Ireland), speaking on behalf of the States members of the European Economic Community, requested that a vote should be taken on the draft resolution.
6. Draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.76 was adopted by 97 votes to none, with 20 abstentions.

/...

7. Mr. DAVENPORT (Ireland), speaking in explanation of vote, said that the States members of the European Economic Community had abstained from voting because they considered that the text of the draft resolution was contentious and presented a picture which was not accurate. It had not been possible in the time available to make progress through consultations on the issue, and they had therefore regretfully abstained.

8. Mr. AKTAN (Turkey) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution. It was a source of disappointment to his delegation that, given the depth of the world economic crisis, the parties to the dialogue had failed to reach an understanding even on such elementary concepts as world inflation and its fundamental causes. The anti-inflationary role of policies aiming at the elimination of protectionism and the implementation of structural adjustment could not be over-emphasized. It was obvious that the slower the pace of growth in developed countries, the greater the need would be for structural adjustment in order to accelerate growth. In the view of his delegation, the transfer of real resources to the developing countries could have an important anti-inflationary effect by creating an additional healthy demand in those countries for the capital goods of the industrialized countries, a vital sector in which fixed capital investment was lacking because of deficient demand as against the inflated demand for consumer goods.

9. Mr. GREET (Australia) said that his delegation had supported draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.76 in the conviction that it was of the utmost urgency that Governments should implement effective policies to control inflation, which had a fundamental interrelationship with the other major economic problems of the day, namely, protectionism, structural adjustment, over-all economic growth and balance-of-payments disequilibria. He strongly supported the thrust of the ninth preambular paragraph, which recognized that interrelationship.

10. Nevertheless, his delegation was somewhat disappointed that the time available for consultations on the text had been so limited, as it would have liked to explore further with other delegations the possibility of broadening the text so that the General Assembly would state clearly that inflation affected the economies of both developed and developing countries. The draft resolution as adopted was a forceful statement from the perspective of the developing countries, and he would not deny the relevance of the points made. However, a statement which covered the perspective of the developed countries would have been an invaluable addition.

11. Mr. KOLEV (Bulgaria), speaking on behalf of the delegations of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR, said that those delegations had voted in favour of the draft resolution because of the stress which it laid on the negative effects of inflation on the economic development of developing countries. The socialist countries had drawn attention, both at the fifth session of UNCTAD and in the Second Committee, to the main causes of world-wide inflation and the factors which had contributed to it. Inflation was the direct result of the world capitalist system, of the militarization of their economies by the imperialist Powers and the resulting arms race and of the uncontrolled creation of international monetary liquidity. The imperialist policies of the Western

(Mr. Kolev, Bulgaria)

countries had had the effect of exporting inflation, so that its adverse effects were transferred onto the shoulders of the workers of the world, and in particular of the developing countries. Those countries were further damaged by the capitalist system through the reduction of their export earnings and the depletion of their currency reserves.

12. Some of the consequences of inflation could be avoided by the developing countries through economic links with the socialist countries and through State planning of their economies. The creation of State monopolies would make it possible for the developing countries to erect defensive barriers against inflation from the West. Capitalism by its nature remained at the centre of the uncontrolled phenomenon of inflation. A planned society could generate its own growth and contribute to global growth; it therefore represented a stabilizing factor which could act as a restraint on militarism and the arms race. State planning would strengthen the public sector in developing countries and increase the degree of their control over their own natural resources and over foreign private capital, represented in particular by transnational corporations.

13. Mr. ALLEN (United States of America) said that his delegation had been unable to support the draft resolution. There had been no time for negotiations, and its text contained many distortions which his delegation could not accept.

14. Mr. XIFRA (Spain) said that his delegation had abstained on the draft resolution, as there had been no time for informal negotiations through which changes reflecting its views might have been introduced.

Draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.81/Rev.1

15. Mr. TABIBI (Afghanistan), introducing on behalf of the sponsors the revised draft resolution on specific action related to the particular needs and problems of land-locked developing countries (A/C.2/34/L.81/Rev.1), said that the sponsors had attempted to accommodate all delegations which had made suggestions, with the result that the revised draft resolution contained nine operative paragraphs as against seven in the original text. The sponsors had considered it important to recall previous resolutions on the subject adopted by the General Assembly and UNCTAD and also the work undertaken by UNDP. The land-locked developing countries were the most needy, and the assistance provided to them was not sufficient for their needs. The sponsors now called upon all Member States to help to meet those needs. As the revised draft resolution incorporated all suggestions which had been made, he hoped that the Pakistan delegation would not insist on the separate votes it had requested on certain paragraphs. The draft resolution would benefit coastal States as well as land-locked countries, and there was therefore room for co-operation between them.

16. The CHAIRMAN announced that certain delegations had requested recorded votes on the last preambular paragraph, on operative paragraph 1 and on the draft resolution as a whole.

/...

17. Mr. GADEL HAK (Egypt) said that, while his delegation was not opposed to the content of the draft resolution, it considered that account should be taken of developments in the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea. He therefore proposed that the words "without prejudice to the results of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea" should be added at the end of the last preambular paragraph, and the words "in accordance with the relevant articles of the forthcoming convention on the law of the sea" at the end of operative paragraph 1. He trusted that, with those additions, the draft resolution could be adopted by consensus.
18. Mr. TABIBI (Afghanistan) appealed to the representative of Egypt not to press his amendments. The last preambular paragraph simply recalled the provisions of certain General Assembly resolutions on the matter, and there was therefore no need to make its terms conditional on the results of the Conference on the Law of the Sea. The same was true of operative paragraph 1, because under international law there was an established right to free access to and from the sea.
19. Mr. SEBURYAMO (Burundi) agreed with the representative of Afghanistan and said that the draft resolution, as formulated, reflected the position and views of land-locked developing countries. While he recognized that the text could perhaps be improved, he could not agree to any change that would disturb its balance.
20. Mr. KAMANDA wa KAMANDA (Zaire) said his delegation, which shared the concern of the sponsors of the draft resolution regarding the situation of land-locked developing countries, considered that it would be inappropriate for the draft resolution to refer to the results of a Conference when those results were not yet known and to a convention which had not even been adopted. He therefore urged the representative of Egypt not to press his proposal, particularly since he had said that his delegation was not opposed to the draft resolution. Instead, when the time came, the Egyptian delegation should exert its influence to ensure that the terms of the draft resolution did not conflict with those of the convention on the law of the sea.
21. Mr. GADEL HAK (Egypt) said that his delegation had simply wished to facilitate the Committee's work. The amendments he had proposed were designed to take account of the fact that the matters dealt with in the draft resolution were under detailed consideration by a major international conference, and he did not believe that they would prejudice the interests of land-locked countries or complicate the issues. As his delegation did not wish to stand in the way of a consensus, however, he would withdraw the proposal.
22. Mr. KANTE (Guinea), referring to operative paragraph 8 of the draft resolution, asked what was meant by the expression "transit and land-locked developing countries".
23. Mr. TABIBI (Afghanistan) thanked the representative of Egypt for withdrawing his proposal.
24. In reply to the representative of Guinea, he explained that the reference to transit and land-locked developing countries had been introduced at the suggestion of Uganda, itself a land-locked country, to take account of the special needs of

(Mr. Tabibi, Afghanistan)

those land-locked countries which, for various reasons, were unable to find alternative routes to the sea through neighbouring countries. Since transit countries might themselves be under-developed, any assistance rendered to them would also benefit the land-locked countries concerned.

25. Speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution, he said that in paragraph 5 the words "and requests that those countries be provided with increased resources to meet their needs" should be deleted, since the point was already covered by paragraph 6.

26. Mr. KHAN (Pakistan), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that his delegation supported the draft resolution, except for the last preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1. During the informal consultations it had proposed that those two paragraphs, which caused difficulty for a number of delegations, should be replaced by the relevant provisions of UNCTAD resolution 123 (V) and had indicated that, on that basis, it would be willing to join in a consensus on the draft resolution. It regretted that the sponsors had not found it possible to accept that proposal.

27. His delegation considered that the problems of transit trade of land-locked countries should be dealt with on a bilateral basis and in a spirit of good-neighbourliness. His own Government's record in that regard was exemplary. In the regional context, it had extended very liberal transit facilities to neighbouring countries and had recently entered into discussions with a view to the implementation of the relevant UNCTAD resolutions. It could not, however, agree that land-locked countries had an unqualified right to access to and from the sea and to freedom of transit, since that would derogate from the sovereignty of transit countries over their own territories. Moreover, it was not for the Second Committee to pronounce on a matter which was of a legal nature and was under consideration in the appropriate forums, particularly the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea.

28. For those reasons, his delegation would vote against the last preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1 and would abstain from voting on the draft resolution as a whole.

29. Mr. TABIBI (Afghanistan) said, with regard to the statement by the representative of Pakistan, that the sponsors of the draft resolution also wished to co-operate and had taken into account all the proposals made by transit countries as well as land-locked countries. However, the Committee should be careful not to endorse the as yet unknown results of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea. From recent developments in the Conference it appeared doubtful whether any help would be given to the land-locked countries, because the trend was to place all rights in the hands of the transit countries. The fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution were based on the Conventions on the high seas now in force. Furthermore, the position they reflected had been endorsed by the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, and a vote against the draft resolution would be a vote against what had been adopted at Havana.

/...

30. Mr. KAMANDA wa KAMANDA (Zaire) urged strict observance of the rules of procedure. At the present stage, statements should be confined to explanations of vote. The representative of Afghanistan, a sponsor of the draft resolution, had in fact reopened the debate.

31. A recorded vote was taken on the fourth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.81/Rev.1.

In favour: Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Hungary, Iraq, Jordan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Venezeula, Viet Nam, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Guinea, India, Pakistan.

Abstaining: Algeria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Burma, Canada, Chile, China, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Romania, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Yemen, Yugoslavia.

32. The fourth preambular paragraph was adopted by 51 votes to 3, with 60 abstentions.

33. A recorded vote was taken on operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.81/Rev.1.

In favour: Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Hungary, Iraq, Jordan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, Panama, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Togo, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Venezeula, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Gabon, Guinea, India, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Pakistan.

Abstaining: Algeria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Burma, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mauritania, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Romania, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sweden, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Yemen, Yugoslavia.

34. Operative paragraph 1 was adopted by 46 votes to 5, with 60 abstentions.

35. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.81/Rev.1 as a whole, as orally revised.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Burma, Chile, Gabon, Guinea, India, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea.

36. Draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.81/Rev.1 as a whole, as orally revised, was adopted by 111 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

/...

37. Mr. PARANHOS-VELLOSO (Brazil) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the fourth preambular paragraph, operative paragraph 1 and the draft resolution as a whole because Brazil supported its land-locked neighbours. That should not, however, be interpreted as prejudging the outcome of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea.

38. Mrs. SIKRI (India) said that her delegation had voted against the fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1 and had abstained on the draft resolution as a whole because of its formulations relating to the right of land-locked developing countries to free access to and from the sea as well as their right to freedom of transit. That right had never been recognized in international law in the unqualified way in which it had been formulated in the two paragraphs concerned. The question had also been debated extensively in the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea. The Government of India could not accept the unqualified right of land-locked countries to free access to and from the sea and their right to freedom of transit in a manner which would infringe the sovereign rights of the transit countries. In the Conference on the Law of the Sea, her delegation had agreed that the land-locked countries had some specific rights but not unqualified rights of access. For example, it had agreed that land-locked countries should enjoy freedom of transit through the territories of the transit countries.

39. The terms and modalities for exercising freedom of transit must be agreed between the land-locked States and the transit States concerned, through bilateral, subregional or regional agreements. Transit States, in the exercise of their full sovereignty over their territory, must have the right to take all necessary measures to ensure that their legitimate interests were not infringed in any way. Her delegation's understanding of the provision in operative paragraph 4 was that it would be subject to India's stated position in its application to the infrastructure and facilities in the transit States.

40. The Government of India fully sympathized with and appreciated the economic problems facing the land-locked developing countries as a result of the geographical disability imposed on them. It therefore fully supported the other provisions of the draft resolution and had voted in favour of the draft resolution adopted by the Second Committee on the United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries. It had also spared no effort, in its bilateral relations with its land-locked neighbours, to overcome their difficulties to the best of its capacity and on a mutually agreed and amicable basis.

41. Miss ZANABRIA (Peru) said that her delegation had voted in favour of the fourth preambular paragraph, operative paragraph 1 and the draft resolution as a whole, on the understanding that the right to access meant the right of communication and also that the adoption of the draft resolution in no way prejudged developments in or the outcome of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, which her delegation believed was the proper forum for consideration of the question.

42. Miss GARCÍA DONOSO (Ecuador) said that her delegation had abstained from voting on the fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1 because they referred to matters that were within the competence of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea.

/...

43. Mr. EKANEY (United Republic of Cameroon) said that his country, being aware of the special difficulties faced by land-locked countries, had always adopted a positive and understanding attitude towards them. It had accordingly given its full support to special measures in their behalf, and it provided various facilities to reduce the transit difficulties of its immediate neighbours.

44. His delegation would have been pleased if it could have supported draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.81/Rev.1 unreservedly. Unfortunately, the fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1, which mentioned the exercise of the right to free access to and from the sea, was unacceptable to his delegation for the reasons it had stated at the thirty-third session of the General Assembly. His delegation did not believe that it was within the competence of the Second Committee to take decisions on legal questions which were still under discussion in other forums, such as the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea. In adopting those two paragraphs, the Committee was prejudging the results of the Conference. Most important of all, his delegation considered that the question dealt within the two paragraphs should be settled at the bilateral or subregional level. It was for those reasons that his delegation had abstained in the separate votes on those paragraphs.

45. Mr. ABDALLAH (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that his country, which contributed to the United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries, believed that the Second Committee should not prejudice the results of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea. Accordingly, his delegation had voted against operative paragraph 1, abstained on the fourth preambular paragraph and voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

46. Mr. LAZAREVIC (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on the fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1 and had voted for the draft resolution as a whole. If the wording of those two paragraphs had followed that adopted by the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, his delegation would have voted in favour of them.

47. Mr. HAQUE (Bangladesh) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1 on the understanding that they would be subject to agreements on matters of transit.

48. Mr. SHAPOVALOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the two paragraphs and of the draft resolution as a whole because the needs of the land-locked countries were legitimate. They did have a right to free access to and from the sea and to freedom of transit, as his delegation had stated on several occasions, including at the time of the adoption of the resolution on the United Nations Special Fund for Land-locked Developing Countries. His delegation also wished to confirm its stated position with regard to UNCTAD resolutions 63 (III), 98 (IV) and 123 (V), which were referred to in the first preambular paragraph.

49. Mr. SHIVONGS (Thailand) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the fourth preambular paragraph and the draft resolution as a whole but had abstained on operative paragraph 1 as it had done on similar texts in previous years.
50. Mr. DAVENPORT (Ireland), speaking on behalf of the States members of the European Economic Community, said that those countries had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole. With regard to operative paragraph 2, the reservations they had previously expressed were still valid.
51. Mr. GADEL HAK (Egypt) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on the fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1 because, as it had stated previously, the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea was the appropriate forum in which those matters should be discussed. It had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole because it understood the needs of the land-locked countries and supported them.
52. Mr. HANJAN (Iran) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on the two paragraphs because they referred to matters that were yet to be negotiated and the outcome of those negotiations should not be prejudged.
53. Mr. AYENI (Nigeria) said that his delegation had abstained on the two paragraphs because it believed that access to and from the sea should be the subject of bilateral agreements. It had, however, voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole in recognition of the plight of land-locked countries, for which Nigeria had established special programmes.
54. Mr. BALASUBRAMANIAM (Sri Lanka) said that his delegation's vote in favour of the fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1 was in no way a prejudgement of the outcome of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, which was the proper forum for the discussion of the issues raised in those two paragraphs.
55. Mr. BARREIRO (Uruguay) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the fourth preambular paragraph, operative paragraph 1 and the draft resolution as a whole as an expression of its solidarity with the land-locked countries. It interpreted the two paragraphs in question and the draft resolution as a whole in accordance with the relevant provisions of international law, which did not give an unqualified right of access. The adoption of the draft resolution was in no way a prejudgement of the results of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea.

56. Mr. DO THANH (Viet Nam) said that his country, which had resolved the issue of right of access with its neighbour, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, had voted in favour of the draft resolution. It believed that the issues referred to in it could be settled by bilateral agreements.

Draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.84

57. Mrs. SIKRI (India), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, read out a revised version of operative paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.84 on the multilateral trade negotiations.

58. Draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.84, as orally revised, was adopted by 95 votes to 1, with 22 abstentions.

59. Mr. RENISON (United States of America) said that his delegation had voted against draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.84, since it could not agree with its general thrust as expressed in the sixth preambular paragraph and in operative paragraph 3. Inadequate consideration had been given to the results of the multilateral trade negotiations during the current session of the General Assembly. He realized that not all participants in the negotiations had achieved all their objectives, and it was that fact, not a subjective judgement as to the outcome of the negotiations, which should have provided the basis for a resolution. The multilateral trade negotiations were a closed chapter in the history of international trade, and the international community should move forward. The active participation of developing countries in GATT would be the best way for those countries to secure a better future within the international trading system. The United States welcomed the recent decision of the Contracting Parties to GATT on the need for an improved multilateral safeguard system, as a development of the rules of the international trading system.

60. He hoped that his delegation would not be forced to vote against resolutions on the multinational trade negotiations in the future. The fifth session of UNCTAD had also been unable to reach agreement on that subject. It was time to move beyond the stage of assessing those negotiations, and his delegation looked forward to participating in the relevant discussions within an appropriate framework.

61. Mr. DAVENPORT (Ireland), speaking on behalf of the States members of the European Economic Community, said that the Nine had abstained from voting on draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.84, which reflected a very partial view of the multilateral trade negotiations. The negotiations had produced many positive achievements of considerable benefit to developing countries. The draft resolution also contained many value judgements which did not accord with the reality of the negotiations, nor did it take account of recent developments subsequent to the end of the negotiations. The text of the draft resolution had therefore presented the EEC countries with numerous problems. They deeply regretted that, owing to the late submission of the draft resolution, there had been no time for discussion, which might have led to amendments reflecting the actual situation rather more accurately.

62. Mr. HOHWÜ-CHRISTENSEN (Sweden) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.84, the contents of which were neither correct nor balanced but merely represented the views of some countries.
63. Since the multilateral trade negotiations had only recently been concluded, it was far too early to appraise the results. In the years to come, both developed and developing countries might well benefit from the tariff reductions, the agreements in non-tariff fields and other results of the negotiations. Developing countries in particular stood to gain from improved multilateral discipline in the field of trade. The multilateral trade negotiations had been the first round of trade talks in which the interests of the developing countries had been taken into account. Although the expectations of those countries at the outset of the negotiations had been very high, he did not think that their current disappointment was warranted.
64. He regretted that there had been insufficient time for informal consultations, which might have produced a more objective and factually correct draft resolution.
65. Mr. RUTANEN (Finland) said that his delegation had abstained on draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.84 because it did not share the view of the outcome of the multilateral trade negotiations expressed in it. The recent decisions taken by the Contracting Parties to GATT had accommodated several of the concerns of the developing countries; a new committee to continue negotiations on safeguards had been established, and so had a sub-committee to examine cases of protectionism by developed countries against imports from developing countries, in fulfilment of a commitment embodied in UNCTAD resolution 131 (V). The framework of preferences for developing countries had also been made an integral part of GATT. Finally, the mandate of the GATT Committee on Trade and Development had been strengthened to enable it to undertake further work on the relationship between trade policy and structural adjustment. Those decisions would contribute to the implementation of the multilateral trade negotiations.
66. Mr. GREET (Australia) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on the draft resolution. It recognized that, while there were some positive aspects to the outcome of the multilateral trade negotiations, many countries were not satisfied. It was true that the results in some areas were disappointing; nevertheless, in all the substantive areas where results had been achieved, particularly in relation to the codes, the wishes of developing countries had been taken into account. Although there was a need for further liberalization of trade, particularly for the benefit of developing countries, and although not all the interests of those countries had been taken into account in the multilateral trade negotiations, he did not think it wise to prejudice future discussions on trade liberalization by indirectly prejudging their possible outcome.
67. Mr. TREHOLT (Norway) said that his delegation had abstained because it shared the reservations expressed by the representatives of Sweden and Finland.
68. Mr. TANIGUCHI (Japan) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on the draft resolution. Japan had participated actively and positively in the multilateral trade negotiations, which had been conducive to the expansion of world

(Mr. Taniguchi, Japan)

trade, including that of developing countries. The draft resolution did not accurately reflect the outcome of the negotiations. He regretted the short amount of time which had been available for consideration of the text.

69. Mr. KUEN (Austria) said that his delegation had abstained because the draft resolution did not reflect the outcome of the multilateral trade negotiations either adequately or accurately. He regretted that lack of time had precluded the possibility of a more balanced resolution, which might have resulted from informal consultations.

70. Mr. GREEN (New Zealand) said that his country shared to some extent the disappointment of the Group of 77 at the outcome of the multilateral trade negotiations. The draft resolution did not provide a balanced assessment of the results of the Tokyo round. To quote but one example, it ignored the framework agreement which had specifically recognized tariff and non-tariff preferential treatment of developing countries as a permanent legal feature of the international trading system, no longer requiring GATT waiver authorization. New Zealand could not contemplate a renewal of the multilateral trade negotiations, when the results of the Tokyo round had still to be tested in practice. It had therefore abstained from voting on the draft resolution.

AGENDA ITEM 55: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued)
(A/C.2/34/L.89)

71. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take action on draft decision A/C.2/34/L.89 on the restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations system.

72. Draft decision A/C.2/34/L.89 was adopted without a vote.

AGENDA ITEM 70: UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.122 and Add.1

73. Mr. KUEN (Austria), introducing draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.122 and Add.1, said that, although the text had not met with the approval of all members of the Committee, significant progress had been achieved on many issues. The draft resolution reflected the broadest agreement which could have been reached in the available time, and he hoped that it would be adopted by consensus.

74. Mr. MULLER (Secretary of the Committee) read out a number of corrections to the text of the draft resolution.

75. Mr. KAABACHI (Tunisia) said that, under normal conditions, his delegation would be firmly opposed to considering a text which had appeared in only one working language. However, in view of the deadline set by the General Assembly and the lateness of the hour, it would not oppose consideration of the draft resolution, while reserving the right to revert to the question and oppose the adoption of that text in plenary meeting if it had not in the meantime been issued in all the working languages.

/...

76. Ms. RANGEL (Venezuela) associated herself with the remarks made by the representative of Tunisia and expressed the hope that the Spanish text of the draft resolution would be issued before that draft resolution was considered in plenary meeting.
77. Mr. NABULSI (Jordan) said that his delegation reserved the right to revert to the draft resolution when it was issued in Arabic.
78. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that the text of the draft resolution in all other working languages would be issued the following day. He announced that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.79 and Corr.1 and Add.1 had withdrawn their proposal in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.122 and Add.1; the statement of financial implications in document A/C.2/34/L.105 and Add.1 would apply to the new text.
79. Mr. GRAY (Ireland), speaking on behalf of the States members of the European Economic Community, requested a separate vote on section III of the draft resolution.
80. Mr. YAO (Ivory Coast) requested that the vote on section III should be recorded.
81. A recorded vote was taken on section III of draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.122 and Add.1.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Netherlands, Poland, Togo, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

82. Section III of the draft resolution was adopted by 97 votes to none, with 20 abstentions.

83. Draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.122 and Add.1 as a whole was adopted without a vote.

84. The CHAIRMAN requested delegations wishing to explain their votes to do so at the following meeting, in order that the Committee might proceed to dispose of the last item scheduled for discussion at the current meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 69: ACCELERATION OF THE TRANSFER OF REAL RESOURCES TO DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.128

85. The CHAIRMAN said that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.66 had withdrawn their proposal in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.128, submitted by the Vice-Chairman (Mr. Xifra) on the basis of informal consultations.

86. Draft resolution A/C.2/34/L.128 was adopted without a vote.

87. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should conclude its consideration of item 69 by taking note of the report of the Secretary-General on finance for development (A/34/494).

88. It was so decided.

The meeting rose on Friday, 14 December, at 12.30 a.m.