

UNITED NATIONS  
  
**General Assembly**  
FORTY-FOURTH SESSION  
*Official Records*

SECOND COMMITTEE  
48th meeting  
held on  
Monday, 4 December 1989  
at 10 a.m.  
New York

---

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 48th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. GHEZAL (Tunisia)

CONTENTS

- AGENDA ITEM 83: PREPARATIONS FOR THE SPECIAL SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY IN 1990 (continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 82: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued)
- (b) TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT (continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 85: PROTECTION OF GLOBAL CLIMATE FOR PRESENT AND FUTURE GENERATIONS OF MANKIND (continued)
- AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)
- OTHER MATTERS

---

This record is subject to correction.  
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned  
*within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2 750,  
2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.2/44/SR.48  
11 December 1989  
ENGLISH  
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

89-57540 2236S (E)

/...

8P.

The meeting was called to order at 10.35 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 83: PREPARATIONS FOR THE SPECIAL SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY IN 1990 (continued) (A/C.2/44/L.70)

Draft decision on preparations for the special session of the General Assembly devoted to international economic co-operation, in particular to the revitalization of economic growth and development of developing countries (A/C.2/44/L.70)

1. Mr. HUSSEIN (Malaysia) introduced the draft decision on behalf of the Group of 77.

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

(b) TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT (continued) (A/C.2/44/L.49, L.50 and L.51)

Draft resolution on economic measures as a means of political and economic coercion against developing countries (A/C.2/44/L.49)

2. Mr. DOLJINTSEREN (Mongolia), introducing draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.49 in his capacity as Vice-Chairman of the Committee, said that the informal consultations had failed to lead to consensus and he therefore recommended that the Committee should decide on the draft resolution.

3. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.49.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Sweden,

/...

Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland,  
United States of America.

Abstaining: Greece, Malta, Spain.

4 Draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.49 was adopted by 89 votes to 22, with 3 abstentions.

5. Mr. BANERI (Argentina), Mr. KONN (Cameroon), Mr. FERNANDEZ (Liberia), Mr. MUGUME (Uganda) and Mr. FALL (Senegal) said that, had they been present during the voting, they would have voted in favour of the draft resolution.

6. Mr. ROKOTVIVUNA (Fiji), who had voted against the draft resolution, said that he had in fact wished to vote in its favour.

7. Mr. LU Ruishu (China), speaking in explanation of vote after the vote, said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.49 because, notwithstanding the adoption of resolution 42/173 by the General Assembly, certain countries had stepped up their coercive economic measures against developing countries in order to put pressure on them and to interfere in their internal affairs for political ends. Those measures were in violation of the principles of international law and the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. At the very time when the world was moving towards détente and dialogue, developed countries were still adopting economic measures of that kind thereby poisoning relations between countries and artificially generating international tension. The resulting abnormal situation was evidence of the urgent need for a new international economic order, and rendered all the more timely the adoption of the afore-mentioned draft resolution.

8. Mr. DEVINE (United States of America) said that the preamble to draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.49 referred to various documents concerning a new international economic order, a concept which his delegation regarded as outdated and ill-conceived. The United States had rejected the various instruments aimed at establishing such a new international economic order.

9. Furthermore, the draft resolution was unbalanced in so far as it was limited to measures taken by the developed countries vis-à-vis the developing countries. In addition, it indiscriminately condemned all so-called coercive economic measures. Yet States had the right to organize their economic relations with other States as they deemed best, provided that they did so in a manner consistent with international law, and sanctions did not necessarily constitute a violation of international law.

10. Mr. TANLAY (Turkey) said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution because it referred to the Secretary-General's report (A/44/510) which contained misleading anti-Turkish accounts provided by the Greek Cypriots. In that context, he wished merely to draw the Committee's attention to the letter dated 17 November 1989 addressed to the Secretary-General by the representative of the

/...

(Mr. Tanlay, Turkey)

Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (A/44/744), which dealt with the embargo imposed by the Greek Cypriot administration against the Turkish Cypriot people in all spheres.

11. Mr. KAKOURIS (Cyprus) requested the representative of Turkey to show respect for the Second Committee and the United Nations by referring to Cyprus as a State, the Republic of Cyprus, and not as the Greek Cypriots. He also pointed out that there was no Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus.

12. Mr. TANLAY (Turkey) said that the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus was a sovereign, independent, democratic and pluralistic State, and was recognized as such by Turkey. The Greek Cypriot administration could only represent the Greek population of Cyprus, which was concentrated in the southern section of the island. The Turkish Government did not recognize that administration as the Republic of Cyprus or the Cypriot Government.

13. Mr. KAKOURIS (Cyprus), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, observed, first, that the Security Council, in decisions 541 (1983) and 550 (1984), had declared illegal the entity existing in the Turkish-occupied territory on Cyprus since the 1974 invasion. Secondly, he requested once again that the proper respect should be shown to the United Nations through the use of the official name given by that body when referring to his country.

14. Mr. TANLAY (Turkey), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, reminded the Greek Cypriot representative that the natural interlocutor of Turkey was the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, which was a sovereign, independent, democratic and pluralistic State.

Draft resolution on an international code of conduct for the transfer of technology (A/C.2/44/L.50)

15. Mr. DOLJINTSEREN (Mongolia), speaking as Vice-Chairman of the Committee, introduced the draft resolution, which reflected the agreement achieved after informal consultations, and recommended that the Committee should adopt it by consensus.

16. Draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.50 was adopted.

17. Mr. HUSSEIN (Malaysia), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, said his delegation was pleased that the draft resolution had been adopted by consensus. He took it as an indication of a general political will to give new impetus to the consultation process designed to find an appropriate solution to the remaining problems arising in the elaboration of a code of conduct. The Group of 77 thanked the Secretary-General of UNCTAD and the President of the Conference for their efforts. The study by the UNCTAD Secretariat, which would take into consideration recent changes in technology, would be utilized to resolve the remaining problems in the negotiations in order to accelerate the drafting of a code of conduct, in accordance with General Assembly resolutions 40/184, 41/166 and 42/172. The Group

(Mr. Hussein, Malaysia)

of 77 was certain that the consultations would be successful and would allow the completion of those lengthy negotiations.

Draft resolution on the trade embargo against Nicaragua (A/C.2/44/L.51)

18. Mr. DOLJINTSEREN (Mongolia), speaking as Vice-Chairman of the Committee, introduced the draft resolution. The participants in the informal consultations had not arrived at a consensus. He therefore invited the Committee to vote on the draft resolution.

19. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.51.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Bahrain, Belgium, Brunei Darussalam, Canada, Chad, Chile, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Egypt, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Malta, Netherlands, Niger, Oman, Paraguay, Portugal, Samoa, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

20. The draft resolution was adopted by 78 votes to 2, with 32 abstentions.

21. Mr. CAKPO-TOZO (Benin) said that his delegation did not wish to participate in the vote.

22. Mr. KONN (Cameroon), Mr. KAKOURIS (Cyprus) and Mr. MUGUME (Uganda) said that, if they had been present during the vote, they would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.51.

23. Mr. DEVINE (United States of America) said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution because the United States believed that the Second Committee should not be used for political purposes. It was a technical body which should concern itself only with economic questions. The United States did not

/...

(Mr. Devine, United States)

accept that the trade measures it had taken against Nicaragua were inappropriate or illegal. Neither international law nor the United Nations Charter prohibited a State from protecting its security through the organization of its bilateral trade relations. Furthermore, the draft resolution did not take into account the destabilizing activities of Nicaragua in the region nor its repressive domestic policies.

24. The recent plane crash near El Transito (El Salvador) and the discovery of arms shipped from Nicaragua for the Salvadorian guerrillas as well as the strengthening of Sandinista military forces near the Honduran border showed Nicaragua's true intentions in the region. The draft resolution was an attempt by Nicaragua to distract attention from the commitment it had made to democratize its society and to stop using its territory for the subversion of other countries of the region.

25. The economic impact of the United States trade measures was actually limited. Nicaragua's mediocre economic performance was especially due to poor economic management, illegal government expropriations, internal political intimidation and subversive activities against its neighbours. The United States could agree to lift the embargo if the Nicaraguan Government were to honour its commitments under the Esquipulas II accords.

26. Mr. VILCHEZ (Nicaragua) said that the General Assembly had already adopted four resolutions on the subject of the draft resolution just adopted. The United States had not offered any new arguments to justify the trade embargo imposed by its Government against Nicaragua. Contrary to what the United States thought, that embargo would not promote democratic change but would only hinder it.

27. The United States should remember that none of the repressive measures taken throughout its history had produced the desired results. The best path was that of dialogue and promotion of trade and economic development. A vote in favour of the draft resolution was not necessarily a vote for Nicaragua, but for justice, honesty and the right of developing countries to more equitable trade relations.

AGENDA ITEM 85: PROTECTION OF GLOBAL CLIMATE FOR PRESENT AND FUTURE GENERATIONS OF MANKIND (continued) (A/C.2/44/L.38/Rev.1)

Draft resolution on possible adverse effects of sea-level rise on islands and coastal areas, particularly low-lying coastal areas (A/C.2/44/L.38/Rev.1)

28. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Federal Republic of Germany, Guyana, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Morocco and Poland had become sponsors of the draft resolution.

29. Mr. PAYTON (New Zealand) speaking as Vice-Chairman of the Committee, introduced the draft resolution, which reflected the agreement reached during informal consultations. He recommended that the Committee should adopt it without a vote.

30. Draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.38/Rev.1, as revised, was adopted.

31. Mr. BABINGTON (Australia) said that the number and geographical range of the sponsors reflected the concern of the United Nations about the potential catastrophic effects of a rise in sea-level, in particular on islands and low-lying coastal areas, and its desire that the situation of the countries that would be affected should be taken into account at the United Nations conference on environment and development to be held in 1992, and within the framework of the negotiations on a draft convention on climate and the work of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). He thanked all the delegations which had worked for the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.38/Rev.1 by consensus.

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued) (A/44/812; A/C.2/44/L.59)

Draft resolution on the World Decade for Cultural Development (A/C.2/44/L.59)

32. Mr. DOLJINTSEREN (Mongolia), introducing the draft resolution in his capacity as Vice-Chairman of the Committee, said that a consensus had been reached as a result of informal consultations and the following amendments: in paragraph 8, the word "proposed" in the sixth line should be replaced by the words "recommended" and the word "relevant" should be deleted; and in the seventh line the words ", with a statement of the financial implications," should be deleted. In paragraph 9 the words "to convene a mid-Decade conference in 1993" in the second line should be replaced by the words "for the conduct of an evaluation at the mid-point of the Decade in 1993". He hoped that the Committee would adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

33. Draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.49, as amended, was adopted.

34. Mr. SARR (Chief, ECA/UNIDO Industry Division), introducing the report of the Secretary-General on preparations for the Second Industrial Development Decade for Africa (1991-2000) (A/44/812), said that it had been submitted in accordance with Economic and Social Council resolution 1989/115 and had been the subject of consultations with the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) since September 1989. Those consultations had taken place during the third General Conference of UNIDO held in Vienna from 20 to 24 November 1989, which had adopted a resolution calling for the General Assembly at its current session to proclaim the Second Industrial Development Decade for Africa.

35. Outlining the main features of the report, he described the conditions in which the programme for the first Decade had been implemented: a situation of serious economic crisis in Africa, particularly in the industrial sector, which had led to the adoption of the United Nations Programme of Action for African Economic Recovery and Development 1986-1990. He also recalled that, following the mid-term evaluation of the first Decade carried out in 1988, a decision had been taken to consider a second Decade, which had resulted in Economic and Social Council resolution 1989/115.

36. The report also contained the timetable drawn up by the ninth meeting of the Conference of African Ministers of Industry for the preparation of the Second

(Mr. Sarr)

Industrial Development Decade, covering the period from the second half of 1989 to the second quarter of 1991. Lastly, he referred to the proposals of the Secretary-General concerning preparatory activities, which consisted of assistance to countries, and of organizing two meetings of the working group of governmental experts. The total cost of the preparations was estimated at \$1,296,000, of which \$833,900 would be provided by UNIDO and \$462,100 by the United Nations. Of the amount to be provided by the United Nations, \$280,000 would come from the programme budget resources for the biennium 1990-1991 allocated to the regular Technical Co-operation Programme. The balance of \$182,100 had not yet been included in the draft programme budget. If, therefore, the Second Committee supported the Secretary-General's proposals, the appropriate procedures would be carried out for obtaining the additional resources.

37. Mr. FERNANDEZ (Liberia), speaking on behalf of the African States, recalled the enormous difficulties faced by the African States in the 1980s, which explained the failure of the First Industrial Development Decade for Africa. He also recalled the circumstances in which the decision had been taken to proclaim a second Decade.

38. In spite of the series of crises that had afflicted the African continent in the 1980s, it had been encouraging to note from the report of the independent team of experts that some progress had been made in some components of the internal engines of growth. The embers of industrial development could certainly be rekindled in Africa and the support of the international community would be indispensable in that endeavour. The African countries would continue to count on the useful assistance of the United Nations system, in particular UNIDO and the Economic Commission for Africa. The African States therefore endorsed the proposals of the Secretary-General in his report (A/44/812) and, emphasizing the modest sum requested, called upon all countries to do likewise.

#### OTHER MATTERS

39. The CHAIRMAN announced that the following countries had joined the sponsors of the following draft resolutions: A/C.2/44/L.33: Togo; A/C.2/44/L.40: Belgium and China; A/C.2/44/L.56: Brazil, Canada, Ireland, Morocco, New Zealand and Nigeria; A/C.2/44/L.61: Poland; A/C.2/44/L.64: Austria and China; and A/C.2/44/L.67: Togo.

The meeting rose at 11.50 a.m.