



SECOND COMMITTEE
60th meeting
held on
Friday, 14 December 1984
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

LIBRARY
JAN 17 1985

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 60th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. HARLAND (New Zealand)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 80: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued)

(c) TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT (continued)

(d) INDUSTRIALIZATION (continued)

(g) ECONOMIC AND TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION AMONG DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

(i) ENVIRONMENT (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (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 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 fascicle for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.2/39/SR.60
26 December 1984
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: SPANISH

The meeting was called to order at 11 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 80: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued)
(A/C.2/39/L.115 and L.128)

Draft decision A/C.2/39/L.115

1. Mr. DE LA TORRE (Argentina), speaking as Vice-Chairman of the Committee, said that no consensus had been reached on draft decision A/C.2/39/L.115 during the informal consultations held. However, some delegations had proposed that a vote be taken on the following draft decision: "The General Assembly decides to transmit the draft decision entitled 'International conference on money and finance for development' to the fortieth session of the General Assembly".
2. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) asked that the meeting be suspended to permit informal consultations on the draft decision which had just been submitted.

The meeting was suspended from 11.10 a.m. to 11.20 a.m.

3. The draft decision submitted by the Vice-Chairman of the Committee was adopted without a vote.
4. Mr. SAAD (Egypt) regretted the negative response to draft decision A/C.2/39/L.115, submitted by the delegation of Egypt, and the fact that, for the second year in succession, a draft decision on the holding of an international conference on money and finance for development had been postponed to the following session. The question was important for the developed countries and the developing countries and, in view of the existing international monetary and financial situation, the Group of 77 advocated the earliest possible convening of an international conference on money and finance for development, at which the changes that had occurred in the world economy over the past 40 years would be reflected.

Draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.128

5. Mr. DE LA TORRE (Argentina), speaking as Vice-Chairman of the Committee, announced that, despite the extensive consultations held on document A/C.2/39/L.128, no consensus had been reached.
6. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) requested that a vote should be taken on the following draft decision: "The General Assembly decides to transmit the draft resolution entitled 'Development and international economic co-operation' for consideration at its fortieth session".
7. Mr. LAVROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the request made to the Secretary-General in paragraph 3 of the draft resolution precluded the adoption of the measure proposed by the United States representative.

8. At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on the draft decision submitted by the United States delegation.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Against: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining: Greece.

9. The draft decision submitted by the United States delegation was rejected by 97 votes to 22, with 1 abstention.

10. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.128.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan,

/...

Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Austria, Finland, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden.

11. Draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.128 was adopted by 102 votes to 14, with 7 abstentions.

12. Mr. EKBLÖM (Finland), speaking in explanation of vote, said that the United Nations could not perform the task entrusted to it in Chapters IX and X of the Charter if there was no analysis of questions relating to money, finance, debt, resource flows and trade for development. Consequently, the report to be submitted on the subject should be prepared particularly carefully. The procedure proposed in paragraph 3 of document A/C.2/39/L.128 did not, however, take that need into account. For that reason, Finland had abstained in the vote.

13. Mr. TURJANSKIY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the delegations of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics supported the draft resolution just adopted. In recent years, the monetary situation had become critical. In the developing countries, the external debt had increased considerably and the problem of the flight of capital had become more acute. Paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.128 was important, because it requested the Secretary-General to take into account the effects of the economic crisis on the development of the developing countries, for which very little had been done. The socialist countries favoured the restructuring of the monetary system and review of loan repayment terms, so that the terms would not be used as a means of exerting pressure. In document A/38/479, the socialist countries had set out their position regarding the international conference on money and finance for development - a subject to which draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.128 was related. The goal of the conference should be the restructuring of the international monetary and financial system on an equitable basis. The socialist countries' position at the conference, were it to be held, would depend on the manner in which its objectives were stated and the extent to which the interests of all States were taken into account in the preparations for it.

14. Mr. KANEKO (Japan) said that his delegation had voted against draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.128, but that it fully understood the need to expand international co-operation in the spheres of money, finance, debt, development assistance and

(Mr. Kaneko, Japan)

trade, in order to help the developing countries to overcome the many difficulties that they were encountering and to give the development process a solid basis. Japan had always made the maximum efforts along those lines, but international co-operation should be suitably strengthened. The proposals made in the draft resolution were not very useful, firstly because the International Development Strategy covered all the topics relating to trade, financial resources and international monetary and financial questions, and the review and appraisal of the Strategy would provide the opportunity for considering the questions raised in the draft resolution. Secondly, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank and other bodies were considering those questions within their respective spheres of competence. In particular, the IMF Interim Committee and the World Bank/IMF Development Committee would be considering those questions in detail at their 1985 spring session. His delegation regretted that the draft resolution had been put to a vote, since it was vital to reach a consensus on a question of that nature.

15. Mr. FIELD (United Kingdom) expressed regret that it had been necessary to proceed to a vote, and that the draft resolution had been submitted towards the very end of the Committee's work at a time when it was clear that many delegations would have reservations regarding the appropriateness of a draft resolution on the subject being submitted. Given the importance of the relationships between money, finance and trade, his Government would do everything possible to promote the success of the sessions to be held on the subject by the IMF Interim Committee and the World Bank/IMF Development Committee in April 1985. Practical measures were undeniably being taken to solve the problems, particularly with regard to debt rescheduling and the reduction of interest rates. The international community should contribute to ensuring that the measures being taken yielded satisfactory results.

16. Mr. BROWN (Canada) said that the financial and debt problems of the developing countries had recently received much attention, and the fact that those problems were currently being discussed in appropriate existing forums afforded grounds for satisfaction. Particularly welcome was the decision by the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund to hold special sessions of the Interim Committee and the Development Committee in April 1985 to focus on those financial questions which were of particular concern to developing countries. Those sessions would afford an opportunity for the establishment of a constructive dialogue on how to improve the functioning of the international monetary system. In his view, there was no need for the Secretary-General to consult the organizations of the United Nations system and Member States on how to expand international co-operation in that field. Those questions should remain the responsibility of more competent institutions, since another study of financial flows by the Secretariat would not contribute significantly to the understanding of the problems that existed. Now was not the right time for the Secretary-General to take an initiative, when discussions were already going on in the appropriate forums.

/...

17. Mr. DIECKMANN (Federal Republic of Germany) expressed regret that a resolution on such an important issue had been put to the vote. His delegation had entered into a firm undertaking with respect to international co-operation in the field of money, finance and trade, issues which were of vital importance to the entire international community. His Government's contribution to solving the developing countries' debt problems demonstrated clearly its desire to increase co-operation among nations in that field. Obviously, money, finance and trade were interrelated, and accordingly his Government was preparing meticulously for the meetings to be held by the World Bank/IMF Development Committee and the IMF Interim Committee in April 1985. It was to be hoped that the review to be conducted by the agencies within their spheres of competence would prove highly successful.

18. Mr. FAURE (France) said that it was regrettable for a number of reasons that the draft resolution had been put to the vote. There were concepts in the text which his delegation endorsed, particularly the idea that the consideration of monetary, financial and trade matters should take place in an integrated manner. Naturally, no one was opposed to those issues being discussed in the United Nations, since the dialogue was indivisible and took place in all forums. It would have been useful to ensure that the Committee's work and the views expressed in it were duly reflected in its decisions, so that the information could be made available to the IMF Interim Committee and the World Bank/IMF Development Committee. It was regrettable that a vote had been taken; the better course would have been to draft a simple procedural resolution. The text submitted had presented many problems, particularly with regard to relations between the United Nations and the competent agencies in the monetary, financial and trade fields.

19. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) said that he did not believe there was any point at the present juncture in the Secretary-General initiating consultations on an international conference to discuss monetary, financial and other related issues. Governments would have an opportunity to discuss the issues concerned in the governing bodies of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank during the preparations for the sessions of the Interim Committee and the Development Committee to be held in April, and would also be able to participate in those sessions. It would be premature for the Secretary-General to hold consultations at a time when Governments were studying how to improve the functioning of the international monetary system in the light of the initiative adopted at the Williamsburg summit. To date, no consensus had been reached regarding the need for reform of the system or on practical proposals to improve its functioning. The consultations to be initiated under the terms of draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.128 would be totally out of place, given that the areas concerned were within the competence of institutions such as the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank.

20. Ms. GOETSCH (Austria) said her Government considered monetary and financial questions to be of the greatest importance, and they should in principle not be excluded from the discussions taking place within the framework of the United Nations. Nevertheless, as a number of previous speakers had pointed out, now was not the right time to approve the draft resolution in question, particularly in view

(Ms. Goetsch, Austria)

of the meetings to be held in April 1985 by the Interim Committee and the World Bank/IMF Development Committee. Moreover, the time allowed for the preparation for the report referred to in paragraph 3 of the draft resolution seemed too short, given the complexity of the issues to be dealt with. Accordingly, her delegation had supported the United States proposal to postpone consideration of the draft resolution.

21. Mr. NDONG BINDANG (Equatorial Guinea) and Mr. SECKA (Gambia) said that, had they been present during the vote, they would have voted in favour of the draft resolution.

(c) TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT (continued) (A/39/192, A/39/462 and Add.1 and A/C.2/39/L.76)

Draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.76

22. Mr. DE LA TORRE (Argentina), speaking as Vice-Chairman of the Committee, said that draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.76, entitled "Development aspects of the reverse transfer of technology", had been the subject of intensive consultations, both informal and formal, and that in the latter no amendment had been proposed.

23. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.76.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

/...

Abstaining: None.

24. Draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.76 was adopted by 105 votes to 21.

25. Mr. MANNIX (Ireland), speaking on behalf of the countries members of the European Economic Community, said that they had been unable to vote in favour of the draft resolution because, although the question of reverse transfer of technology was very important, the approach it took was not the right one. The work to be undertaken in that field should begin with appropriate studies to determine whether human resource flows and their possible economic consequences could indeed be measured. The mandate of the Meeting of Experts was not suited to that situation. The countries of the European Economic Community were always prepared to undertake discussions in a positive spirit. They had held extensive discussions with the sponsors of the draft resolution with a view to arriving at a resolution which would make it possible to reconcile the different views, but unfortunately, it had not been possible to reach agreement.

26. Mr. SCHUMANN (German Democratic Republic), speaking on behalf of the socialist countries, said that those countries had voted in favour of the draft resolution in view of the fact that the outflow of professional personnel from the developing countries to some Western countries was a particularly reprehensible form of neo-colonialism and a problem linked with the required democratic restructuring of international economic relations. The socialist countries had done and would continue to do everything within their power to make a constructive contribution to the carrying out of the relevant United Nations activities, including implementation of General Assembly resolutions 37/207 and 38/154. It was regrettable that the Western countries in question had virtually boycotted those resolutions over the past two years. There was no question that they were not interested either in progressively restructuring international economic relations or in improving the developing countries' position in the world capitalist economic system. They were trying to perpetuate the outflow of trained manpower, as a major component of neo-colonialist exploitation and as a source of greater wealth for the imperialist centres, to the detriment of the population of the developing countries. In contrast, the socialist countries were endeavouring to support the political, social and economic development of the developing nations and to assist them in a disinterested manner in training skilled national manpower. The socialist countries' active involvement in the meetings of governmental experts, in accordance with General Assembly resolutions 37/207 and 38/154, was a further demonstration of that approach. The ultimate goal of United Nations activities in the field in question must be international acceptance of the principle that States benefiting from the outflow of trained personnel should compensate the States affected. However, the measures provided for in the resolution just adopted must be financed without any increase in the regular budget of the United Nations.

27. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) said that his delegation had not been able to support the draft resolution as the communist countries had. The latter had indicated that they were playing an extremely different role and that they did not support the outflow of trained personnel, which was understandable since there was virtually no incentive to trained people to emigrate, in that direction. No

(Mr. Goodman, United States)

progress would be made in the work of the United Nations system in the field in question if that work continued to be placed in the current context. The problem of the outflow of trained personnel was a purely domestic one, and the solution to it lay in creating incentives in the developing countries so that skilled manpower would not seek more favourable employment abroad.

28. Mr. EKBLÖM (Finland) said that he fully recognized how serious the problem of the reverse transfer of technology was and that Finland had attended the meetings of governmental experts held in Geneva as an observer. He welcomed the efforts made by the Group of 77 to devise more acceptable texts and hoped that the Group would be able to continue to develop the foundation for work on the reverse transfer of technology in a more generally acceptable manner. However, it was regrettable that paragraph 3 linked the draft resolution to resolution 38/154, since his delegation had voted against that resolution and had therefore been forced to vote against draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.76.

29. Mr. BROWN (Canada) said that his country recognized that migration by highly skilled people could have an adverse effect on the developing countries' economic development. Canada had encountered that problem in the course of its history and had supported efforts undertaken at the international level to formulate policies to mitigate its impact. However, the development of a policy called for much preliminary work in order to understand the problem and for objective ways of measuring flows of human resources. It was a question of a universal nature, which was of equal concern to all countries. Migration by trained people had implications in the North-South and East-West contexts. The loss that the migration in question represented for the countries of origin was not necessarily a gain for the receiving countries, which often made a major outlay in the area of education and in other fields in order to integrate the immigrants so that they could become productive. Furthermore, there was no guarantee that the immigrants who benefited from the services in question would remain in the receiving country. A recent study had shown that one third of the immigrants who had come to Canada in the post-war period had left the country. Many people who had been born and educated in Canada had emigrated to other countries, and many foreigners who had been given training in Canada had returned to their own countries or settled in other countries.

30. UNCTAD had not taken account of those factors in its deliberations. The suggestion that a value should be set on human capital that emigrated and that the receiving countries should pay some sort of compensation was neither practical nor feasible. An endeavour must be made to establish a universal and mutually agreed upon statistical basis, before the problem of migration by skilled people could really be studied; a concerted effort must be made to determine whether flows of human resources could be measured objectively. In the course of the negotiations in question, his delegation had put forward proposals concerning the establishment of such an objective and acceptable basis. Despite its efforts, it had been unable to convince other parties concerned, and his Government would therefore be unable to support such resolutions until a framework allowing participation by all the groups concerned was established.

/...

31. The CHAIRMAN said that he wished to invite the Committee to adopt the following draft decision:

"The General Assembly takes note of:

(a) The note by the Secretary-General on progress in the implementation of specific action related to the particular needs and problems of the land-locked developing countries (A/39/462 and Add.1);

(b) The report of the Secretary-General on the status of the Agreement Establishing the Common Fund for Commodities (A/39/192)."

32. The draft decision submitted by the Chairman was adopted.

33. The CHAIRMAN said that he wished to announce that the Committee had completed consideration of agenda item 80 (c).

(d) INDUSTRIALIZATION (continued) (A/C.2/39/8, A/C.2/39/L.140, ID/CONF.5/46)

Draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.140

34. Mr. KAABACHI (Tunisia), speaking as Vice-Chairman of the Committee, said that, following informal consultations, a consensus had been reached on the text of the draft resolution on world industrial restructuring and redeployment referred to the General Assembly by the Fourth General Conference of UNIDO in document ID/CONF.5/C.1/L.13. He wished to propose that the text should be adopted as a draft resolution of the Committee.

35. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution.

36. Draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.140 was adopted.

37. Mr. TURYANSKIY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), speaking on behalf of the group of Eastern European States, said that although they had not opposed the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.140, those States believed that proposals to intensify investment activities should be considered solely in the context of assistance to the developing countries in their efforts to obtain and mobilize resources in keeping with the objectives of their national development plans. The vain attempts made by certain Western countries in the course of the informal consultations on the draft resolution to convince the other delegations of the "great importance" of foreign investments were inadmissible. Neither the System of Consultations nor any other UNIDO activity should be used as a means whereby private foreign capital could penetrate the economies of the developing countries.

38. Mr. KAABACHI (Tunisia), speaking as Vice-Chairman of the Committee, proposed the adoption of the following draft decision, in connection with draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.140, just adopted:

"The General Assembly decides to request the Secretary-General to attach resolution 39/____ (draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.140) to the report of the Fourth General Conference of UNIDO as an addendum."

39. The CHAIRMAN said that if he heard no objection he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft decision.

40. The draft decision submitted by the Vice-Chairman of the Committee was adopted.

41. Mr. KAABACHI (Tunisia), speaking as Vice-Chairman of the Committee, proposed that the Committee should adopt by consensus the following draft decision, also in connection with draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.140:

"The General Assembly decides to transmit the draft resolution entitled 'Mobilization of financial resources for industrial development' (ID/CONF.5/C.1/L.16), contained in the letter dated 17 September 1984 from the President of the Fourth General Conference of UNIDO addressed to the Secretary-General (A/C.2/39/8), to the General Assembly for consideration at its fortieth session."

42. The CHAIRMAN said that if he heard no objection he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft decision.

43. The draft decision submitted by the Vice-Chairman of the Committee was adopted.

44. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to adopt the following draft decision:

"The General Assembly decides to take note of the report of the Fourth General Conference of UNIDO (ID/CONF.5/46)."

45. The draft decision submitted by the Chairman was adopted.

(g) ECONOMIC AND TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION AMONG DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/39/154 and Corr.1, A/C.2/39/L.48 and L.137)

Draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.137

46. Mr. DE LA TORRE (Argentina), speaking as Vice-Chairman of the Committee, proposed the adoption by consensus of draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.137, with the following amendments. The third line of paragraph 1 should read "giving one regard to the ..." instead of "in particular the ...". In the fourth line of paragraph 2 of the English text, the word "estimates" should be replaced by the word "proposals". At the end of paragraph 6, the words "in accordance with his mandate" should be added. In paragraph 7, the first and second lines should read "... of the United Nations system for the implementation, by the developing countries, of the Caracas Programme of Action".

47. Mr. SAAD (Egypt), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, said that in subsequent consultations it had been agreed that paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.137 should read as follows:

"Requests the Secretary-General to report on the implementation of this resolution to the General Assembly at its fortieth session."

48. The CHAIRMAN said that if he heard no objection he would take it that the Committee adopted draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.137, as orally amended by the Vice-Chairman of the Committee and with the text of paragraph 7 read out by the delegation of Egypt.

49. Draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.137, as orally amended, was adopted.

50. Mr. SCOTT (United States of America) said that his delegation had joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.137 because it supported the concept of economic co-operation among developing countries, although it still held the view that such support should be a universal activity and that the United Nations system, in performing its functions in that area, should therefore not confine itself to the Caracas Programme of Action. It should be noted that paragraph 2 conferred no additional mandate on the Secretary-General, so that any activities should be carried out within existing resources.

51. Mr. GEZER (Turkey) said that his delegation had joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.137 because of the importance his country attached to economic co-operation among developing countries. The classification of a country as a "developing country" could not be determined by its membership in a given group of countries but could be determined only in the light of objective socio-economic factors and criteria; applying such criteria, Turkey was undoubtedly a developing country. It was unfortunate that the selective references contained in the draft resolution did not reflect the socio-economic factors and criteria on which the United Nations was virtually founded. He hoped that that selective approach to determining what was a developing country would not constitute a precedent for the future work of the Committee and of the bodies and specialized agencies of the United Nations.

52. Mr. MANNIX (Ireland) said that the members of the European Economic Community (EEC) believed that the draft resolution was consistent with the mandate and norms of the United Nations system, but hoped that the question of the modalities of United Nations involvement in the programme of economic co-operation among developing countries would be resolved in Geneva as soon as possible.

53. Mr. HILLEL (Israel) said that although his delegation attached great importance to economic co-operation among developing countries, it could not accept resolutions which restricted a country's eligibility to participate in the exercise. It therefore had serious reservations concerning the draft resolution as a whole.

54. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to adopt a decision whereby it took note of the Secretary-General's report on the analysis of the mandates of, and problems addressed by, the United Nations system in economic and technical co-operation among developing countries (A/39/154 and Corr.1).

55. The draft decision submitted by the Chairman was adopted.

56. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee had concluded the consideration of item 80 (g).

(i) ENVIRONMENT (continued) (A/39/25, 432; A/C.2/39/L.24/Rev.1)

57. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to adopt the following draft decision:

"The General Assembly takes note of:

(a) The report of the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme on the work of its twelfth session (A/39/25);

(b) The note by the Secretary-General in which he transmitted the report of the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme on international conventions and protocols in the field of the environment (A/39/432)."

58. The draft decision introduced by the Chairman was adopted.

59. MR. QUINLAN (Australia) deplored the fact that at the current session no consensus had been reached on the draft resolution on the relationship between development and international economic co-operation, on the one hand, and the environment, on the other (A/C.2/39/L.24/Rev.1), since in previous years similar resolutions had been adopted by consensus. His delegation objected not to the substantive amendments proposed in relation to disarmament, but to the context in which those amendments had been made and the procedures followed, which had led to a division of opinion that had obliged the sponsors to withdraw the draft. His delegation would in future not tolerate any kind of coercion designed to force adoption of a text, on a topic of such importance, regarding which there was no real consensus.

60. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee had concluded the consideration of item 80 (i).

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued) (A/39/128, 223, 272, 289 and Add.1, 326; A/C.2/39/L.37/Rev.1 and L.139)

61. Mr. KAABACHI (Tunisia), speaking as Vice-Chairman of the Committee, introduced draft decision A/C.2/39/L.139 and said that, after an arduous process of consultation, consensus had been achieved on the wording of the guidelines for consumer protection. In order to give delegations time to consult with their respective technical departments, it was proposed in the draft that adoption of the draft resolution should be considered at a resumed General Assembly session in 1985.

62. The word "draft" in the title of the second annex to the draft decision should be deleted, and in paragraph 46 the word "co-operate" should be replaced by "work".

63. Mr. LAVROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed that the wording of subparagraph (b) of the draft decision should be changed to read "at a resumed session in 1985, if one is held".

64. Mr. GOODMAN (United States of America) said that it would be preferable to keep the present wording, because incorporation of the changes suggested by the delegation of the Soviet Union would oblige the General Assembly to resume the current session.
65. Mr. LAVROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, since the United States delegation had difficulties with the changes which he had suggested, he would not insist on his amendment.
66. Draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.139 was adopted as amended orally by the Vice-Chairman.
67. Mr. TURIANSKIY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), speaking on behalf of the delegations of the socialist countries, reaffirmed their position of principle on consumer protection, set out in the replies to the questionnaire sent by the Secretary-General. Although consumer protection was a question that States had to resolve at the national level, it ceased to be an internal matter when it related to international trade, especially with developing countries. The adoption of international measures was justified in that area when their aim was to defend the interests of the large masses of workers in developing countries and to counteract the negative effects of the activities of transnational corporations. It was regrettable that the text of the draft made no provision for a system to monitor transnational corporations, as there had been in earlier versions. As a result of the sponsors caving in to pressure to delete any mention of transnational corporations, the draft had become unrealistic and had acquired an abstract character; it had therefore lost its initial meaning and importance, which had inevitably led the delegations of the socialist countries to change their position with regard to the draft decision.
68. Mr. FAREED (Pakistan), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/39/L.37/Rev.1, was pleased that, as a result of the efforts made by the Vice-Chairman and the participants in the consultations on draft decision A/C.2/39/L.139, consensus had been reached on postponing the adoption of a definitive measure, so that States would have time to resolve the problems that they had with the item.
69. He did not agree with the delegation of the Ukrainian SSR that the sponsors of draft decision L.139 had caved in to pressure. It was important that initiatives should be taken in that area and the guidelines contained the necessary basic elements to protect the consumer from the activities of all kinds of organizations. The guidelines also provide an incentive for Governments to adopt national consumer protection legislation.
70. Mr. KURLIN (Sweden) welcomed the consensus reached on the draft decision. Consumer protection was important in itself and was one of the few areas in which the Committee could point to tangible and concrete results, since it was a matter which affected people's daily lives. He trusted that at the resumed General Assembly session the guidelines would be adopted by consensus, for the benefit of consumers everywhere.

71. Mr. KAABACHI (Tunisia), speaking as Vice-Chairman of the Committee, paid tribute to the experts who had participated in the preparation of the guidelines, in particular the United States and Swedish experts.

72. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to adopt the following draft decision:

"The General Assembly decides to take note of the following reports:

(a) Report of the Secretary-General on the world population situation in 1983 (A/39/128);

(b) Report of the Secretary-General entitled 'Transport and Communications Decade in Africa: implementation of General Assembly resolution 38/150' (A/39/223);

(c) Report of the Secretary-General on the Transport and Communications Decade in Africa (A/39/272);

(d) Report of the Secretary-General on special measures for the social and economic development of Africa in the 1980s (A/39/289 and Add.1);

(e) Report of the Secretary-General on permanent sovereignty over national resources in the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories (A/39/326)."

73. The draft decision introduced by the Chairman was adopted.

74. THE CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee had concluded its consideration of agenda item 12.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.