

UNITED NATIONS
General Assembly
FORTY-FOURTH SESSION
Official Records

SECOND COMMITTEE
50th meeting
held on
Friday, 15 December 1989
at 6 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 50th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. GHEZAL (Tunisia)

CONTENTS

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

(f) ENVIRONMENT (*continued*)

AGENDA ITEM 83: PREPARATIONS FOR THE SPECIAL SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY IN 1990 (*continued*)

AGENDA ITEM 84: EXTERNAL DEBT CRISIS AND DEVELOPMENT (*continued*)

AGENDA ITEM 86: OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR DEVELOPMENT (*continued*)

AGENDA ITEM 25: SHORT-TERM, MEDIUM-TERM AND LONG-TERM SOLUTIONS TO THE PROBLEMS OF NATURAL DISASTERS IN BANGLADESH (*continued*)

AGENDA ITEM 153: EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE TO THE SUDAN (*continued*)

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

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 1002, United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session and will appear only before the Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.2/44/SR.50
28 December 1989

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 7.15 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 82: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued)
(A/C.2/44/L.48, L.83 and L.84)

Draft resolution on international co-operation for the eradication of poverty in developing countries (A/C.2/44/L.84)

1. Mr. DOLJINTSEREN (Mongolia), Vice-Chairman, introduced the draft resolution, which he was submitting on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.48. He recommended that the Committee adopt the text without a vote.
2. The CHAIRMAN noted that the statement of programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.48, contained in document A/C.2/44/L.83, did not apply to the Vice-Chairman's text just introduced.
3. Mr. CAHILL (United States of America) said that his Government was deeply concerned at the problem of poverty in the world. His delegation was therefore pleased to join in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.84. However, the draft resolution did not reflect the paramount importance of domestic economic policies as both a cause of and a solution to the problem of poverty. It was of critical importance that a balance should be struck between national and international efforts aimed at solving that problem.
4. The draft resolution also focused unduly on the negative aspects of the external environment, while overlooking a number of positive trends, such as an appreciable rise in the price of certain commodities and improved global economic growth. His delegation favoured co-ordination and action-oriented technical co-operation programmes for the eradication of poverty, as referred to in paragraph 5 of the draft resolution. However, such initiatives must be financed within existing resources and must not impinge upon the independent mandate of international financial institutions.
5. Nevertheless, the draft resolution represented an improvement over resolutions of previous years, and it was to be hoped that the changes that had been made in the current text represented the first step towards a more realistic approach to the problem of poverty.
6. Draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.84 was adopted.
7. Mr. FJAERTOFT (Norway), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries, welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus, particularly as it had been impossible to reach a consensus on a similar text at the Committee's forty-third session. The eradication of poverty was one of the top priorities of the Nordic countries' bilateral and multilateral aid policies. While the report of the Secretary-General (A/44/467) contained a valuable analysis of efforts to eradicate poverty in developing countries, the new report requested in the draft resolution

(Mr. Fjaertoft, Norway)

should study the interaction between national policies and international support measures. It was the understanding of the Nordic countries that, in preparing the new report, the Secretariat would draw on the work being done in that area by other United Nations bodies.

8. Mr. WOLFF (Colombia) welcomed the fact that, for the first time in the history of the United Nations, a consensus had been reached on the eradication of poverty viewed from an economic perspective. However, the adoption of the draft resolution represented only a beginning, as much remained to be done to eliminate the scourge of poverty.

9. The Group of 77 was to be commended for its courage in supporting a text which stressed the importance of national efforts to eradicate poverty.

10. Draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.48 was withdrawn by the sponsors.

(f) ENVIRONMENT (continued) (A/C.2/44/L.28/Rev.1, L.30/Rev.1 and L.81)

Draft resolution on large-scale pelagic driftnet fishing and its impact on the living marine resources of the world's oceans and seas (A/C.2/44/L.81)

11. Mr. PAYTON (New Zealand), Vice-Chairman, introduced the draft resolution, which he was submitting on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolutions A/C.2/44/L.28/Rev.1 and L.30/Rev.1. Many delegations had drawn attention to problems regarding the translation of technical terms in versions other than the English version, and he asked the Secretariat to ensure that all translations conformed to the original, English text. As a consensus had been reached on the draft text, he recommended it for adoption without a vote.

12. Mr. BEN MOUSSA (Morocco) noted that French was a working language of the United Nations and asked that several inconsistencies in the French version of the draft resolution be corrected. In paragraph 4 (c), the French text contained the words "et ailleurs", whereas the English text read "and all the other high seas". He therefore suggested that the entire phrase should be reworded in French to read "et dans toutes les hautes mers en dehors de l'Océan Pacifique". In addition, the French term employed by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) for the large-scale pelagic driftnet fishing was "la pêche aux grands filets pélagiques dérivants", and that term ought to be used in the French version of draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.81. Lastly, the words "of the world's oceans and seas," which appeared in the title, should be rendered in French by "des océans et de la mer".

13. Mr. OULD CHEIKH EL GHAOUTH (Mauritania) welcomed the consensus on the draft resolution but sought assurances from the Secretariat that implementation of paragraph 8 would respect the functions and mandate of FAO.

/...

14. Mrs. DUEÑAS de WHIST (Ecuador) said that for over 35 years, her country had sought recognition of its rights over the marine resources falling under its jurisdiction, as had Chile and Peru. The visionary policy pursued by those three countries had had a decisive influence on the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, leading to the extension of the limit of States' jurisdiction over the sea adjacent to their coasts to 200 miles.
15. Indiscriminate over-fishing by methods which frequently did irreversible harm not only to the species fished but to other species as well had always been condemned by Ecuador, and the international community must seek to promote a policy to end such fishing. Accordingly, her delegation fully supported the thrust of draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.81. However, as Ecuador had not signed the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, her delegation could not accept the references to that instrument in the draft text. Her delegation also understood the term "exclusive economic zone" to refer to zones under national jurisdiction, and would have preferred the latter wording, which would have enabled all States to support the draft text without difficulty. Nevertheless, Ecuador did not wish to stand in the way of the adoption of the draft resolution.
16. Mr. TER HORST (Assistant Secretary-General for Development and International Economic Co-operation) assured the representative of Mauritania that the Secretary-General would take the mandate of the specialized agencies, and of FAO in particular, into consideration in the report he would submit in accordance with paragraph 8 of the draft resolution.
17. Draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.81 was adopted.
18. Mr. SERSALE di CERISANO (Argentina) said that the references in the draft resolution to other areas of the high seas applied also to the South Atlantic, a region which should be included in any studies to be conducted in accordance with paragraphs 4 (a) and 6 of the resolution.
19. Mr. TANLAY (Turkey) said that his delegation had participated in the consensus on the draft resolution, which referred to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. However, that in no way modified his Government's position regarding the Convention, which Turkey had not signed, as reflected in the verbatim record of the 62nd plenary meeting of the General Assembly (A/44/PV.62).
20. Mr. DJOGHLAF (Algeria) said he was disappointed that the proposal to clarify the wording of the first preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 4 (a) had not been accepted. His delegation felt that paragraph 4 (a) should be read in the light of the overall field of application of the resolution, which was seas, notably the high seas, as well as oceans; he had the Mediterranean Sea specifically in mind. He also emphasized the need to recognize the central co-ordinating role of FAO in matters relating to fishing.
21. Mr. CAMARA (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations) said that the subject-matter of the resolution was under discussion in a number of FAO bodies. The Director-General of FAO had already made provision for the systematic collection of scientific, economic and other data.

(Mr. Camara, FAO)

22. Where feasible, and in the light of the General Assembly's discussions, FAO would undertake further scientific work to improve the quantity and quality of the information available. It had set up a multidisciplinary task force whose functions included ensuring that sustainability of development was accepted as fundamental in fisheries policy. FAO was ready to put its expertise on the subject at the disposal of the international community and to co-operate with the Secretary-General.

23. Draft resolutions A/C.2/44/L.28/Rev.1 and A/C.2/44/L.30/Rev.1 were withdrawn by the sponsors.

AGENDA ITEM 83: PREPARATIONS FOR THE SPECIAL SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY IN 1990 (continued) (A/C.2/44/L.70 and A/C.2/44/L.85)

Draft decision A/C.2/44/L.85

24. Mr. STOBY (Secretary of the Committee) announced some editorial changes to the text of the draft decision and the annex thereto contained in document A/C.2/44/L.85.

25. Mr. PAYTON (New Zealand), Vice-Chairman, introduced draft decision A/C.2/44/L.85, which he was submitting on the basis of informal consultations held on draft decision A/C.2/44/L.70. In view of the importance which the Committee attached to its subject-matter, there appeared to be general agreement that the draft should go forward as a proposal by the Chairman of the Second Committee.

26. Mr. KHALIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the text now before the Committee did not correspond to that agreed on during informal consultations. He trusted that the text submitted to the General Assembly would correspond in every particular to the agreements which delegations had reached.

27. Draft decision A/C.2/44/L.85, as orally corrected, was adopted.

28. Mr. CAHILL (United States of America) said that his delegation had joined in the consensus on the draft decision; wherever possible, it liked to encourage common understandings and agreements and to participate in them. He wished to make it clear, however, that his delegation had not supported the adoption of General Assembly decision 43/460, disagreeing in particular with many of the points raised in the annex to that decision. Its association with the consensus on draft decision A/C.2/44/L.85 did not imply that it in any way endorsed the earlier decision or the annex thereto.

29. During the discussion of the item in the Second Committee, his delegation had outlined a framework for discussions in the Preparatory Committee of the Whole for the special session. Since paragraph (d) of the decision just adopted recommended that the Preparatory Committee bear in mind the views expressed by delegations at the forty-fourth session of the General Assembly, he requested that his delegation's views, including the outline to which he had just referred, be brought

(Mr. Cahill, United States)

to the attention of the Preparatory Committee at its second substantive session. His delegation had some problems with the text of the annex to the decision, but would take them up at the Preparatory Committee's second substantive session.

30. The special session must adopt its decisions by consensus if it was to arrive at a common understanding on the issues with which it would have to deal. While his delegation was participating in the preparations for the special session, no decision had as yet been taken on whether the United States would take part in the special session itself. That decision would be taken partly in the light of the outcome of the second substantive session of the Preparatory Committee.

31. In conclusion, he wished to thank all those delegations whose efforts and contributions had at length enabled a consensus to be reached.

32. Mr. LEMERLE (France), speaking on behalf of the 12 States members of the European Community, said that the Twelve welcomed the consensus on the draft decision. The fact that the General Assembly could send a unanimous message to the Preparatory Committee augured well for the outcome of the special session, even if some uncertainties remained.

33. Mr. KUECK (German Democratic Republic), speaking also on behalf of the delegations of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, expressed gratitude to all those who had helped make a consensus possible. It was his firm conviction that the spirit of co-operation that had prevailed would carry over to the special session itself.

34. Ms. ARMSTRONG (Canada) welcomed the consensus reached on the draft decision but felt that the annex focused too much on external factors and too little on the formulation and implementation of domestic, and particularly structural adjustment, policies to promote increased reliance on markets and improved competitiveness in an increasingly globalized economy.

35. Mr. WANG Baoliu (China) said that he was particularly pleased that a certain major Power had joined in the consensus, which had been achieved through substantial concessions on the part of many delegations. He hoped that that same important State would decide to participate in the special session.

36. Mr. HUSSEIN (Malaysia), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, expressed satisfaction at the consensus reached on decision A/C.2/44/L.85.

37. Mr. BOECK (Austria), speaking also on behalf of Australia, and Mr. WOLFF (Colombia) expressed satisfaction that a consensus had been reached.

38. Mr. ZEPOS (Greece), speaking in his capacity as Chairman of the Preparatory Committee for the special session welcomed the spirit of consensus which had prevailed and which he hoped would characterize the Preparatory Committee's second substantive session and, ultimately, the special session.

39. Draft decision A/C.2/44/L.70 was withdrawn by the sponsors.

40. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had concluded its consideration of agenda item 83.

AGENDA ITEM 84: EXTERNAL DEBT CRISIS AND DEVELOPMENT (continued)
(A/C.2/44/L.47/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.47/Rev.1

41. The CHAIRMAN noted that the statement of programme budget implications in document A/C.2/44/L.71 did not apply to the revised draft resolution in document A/C.2/44/L.47/Rev.1.

42. Mr. DOLJINTSEREN (Mongolia), Vice-Chairman, said that, following informal consultations, the revised draft resolution in document A/C.2/44/L.47/Rev.1 had been further amended. Paragraph 11 (g), had been deleted, so that paragraph 11 (h) now became paragraph 11 (g), and the word "appropriate" in the second sentence of paragraph 12 (b) had been replaced by the words "strengthened existing".

43. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.47/Rev.1, as orally amended.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist

Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

44. Draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.47/Rev.1, as orally amended, was adopted by 120 votes to 1, with no abstentions.

45. Mr. TAI (Malaysia), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, expressed regret that the draft resolution on finding a durable solution to the external debt problem had not been adopted by consensus. The debt crisis of the developing countries was very serious and greater efforts were needed to solve it. He hoped that a consensus would be reached on that issue in the near future.

46. Ms. ARMSTRONG (Canada) said that she had been pleased to support the draft resolution on the external debt problem because of the importance of the issue, but deplored the fact that the resolution lacked balance. It stressed external factors rather than the need for sound domestic policies, a supportive international economic environment and the adoption by debtor countries of structural reforms and measures to restore investor confidence.

AGENDA ITEM 86: OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued) (A/C.2/44/L.67 and L.79)

Draft resolution on future needs in the field of population, including the development of resource requirements for international population assistance (A/C.2/44/L.79)

47. Mr. PAYTON (New Zealand), Vice-Chairman, introduced draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.79, which he was submitting on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.67.

48. Draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.79 was adopted.

49. Draft resolution A/C.2/44/L.67 was withdrawn by the sponsors.

AGENDA ITEM 25: SHORT-TERM, MEDIUM-TERM AND LONG-TERM SOLUTIONS TO THE PROBLEMS OF NATURAL DISASTERS IN BANGLADESH (continued) (A/44/434)

AGENDA ITEM 153: EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE TO THE SUDAN (continued) (A/44/571)

50. The CHAIRMAN said that no draft proposals were being submitted under agenda items 25 and 153. He suggested therefore that the Committee take note of the report in document A/44/434 submitted by the Secretary-General under item 25 and the report in document A/44/571 submitted by him under agenda item 153.

51. It was so decided.

52. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had concluded its consideration of agenda items 25 and 153.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

53. Mr. OULD CHEIKH EL GHAOUTH (Mauritania) reiterated the strong objections he had voiced in the past to the informal way in which the Committee had been conducting its business, and stressed the need to respect the formal character of its meetings.

The meeting rose at 9.30 p.m.