

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

FORTIETH SESSION

Official Records*



SECOND COMMITTEE
30th meeting
held on
Monday, 11 November 1985
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 30th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BRODODININGRAT (Indonesia)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 84: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued)

- (g) HUMAN SETTLEMENTS (continued)**
- (a) INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY FOR THE THIRD UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT DECADE: REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE REVIEW AND APPRAISAL OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY FOR THE THIRD UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT DECADE (continued)**
- (d) SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT: REPORT OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued)**
- (f) ENVIRONMENT (continued)**
- (k) NEW INTERNATIONAL HUMAN ORDER: MORAL ASPECTS OF DEVELOPMENT: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL**
- (i) EFFECTIVE MOBILIZATION AND INTEGRATION OF WOMEN IN DEVELOPMENT: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)**
- (c) TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT (continued)**
- (e) ECONOMIC AND TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION AMONG DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (continued)**
- (j) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SUBSTANTIAL NEW PROGRAMME OF ACTION FOR THE 1980s FOR THE LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (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 IX.2.750, 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.2/40/SR.30
15 November 1985

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

85-57465 8614S (E)

/...

22 p

CONTENTS (continued)

- (m) IMMEDIATE MEASURES IN FAVOUR OF THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)
- (n) NEW AND RENEWABLE SOURCES OF ENERGY: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)
- (o) DEVELOPMENT OF THE ENERGY RESOURCES OF DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

/...

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 12: REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL (continued)
(A/C.2/40/L.14, A/C.2/40/L.15, A/C.2/40/L.17)

1. Mr. LEE (Canada) said that the three draft resolutions before the Committee had been prepared with due regard for the biennialization of its programme of work. However, many other draft resolutions which would come before the Committee had not. That factor would affect his own delegation's consideration of them, and no doubt that of other delegations as well.

2. Ms. ERIKSSON (Sweden), speaking in her capacity as Vice-Chairman, reported that no consensus had been reached in the informal consultations on the draft resolutions.

Draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.14

3. Mr. ELIASHEV (Israel), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said it was evident that the motives behind the resolution were political and that the main purpose of the initiators was to advance the cause of the "so-called PLO" rather than improve the well-being of the Palestinian Arabs. The text was based upon the most questionable premises, and his delegation would therefore vote against it.

4. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.14.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, 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.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

5. Draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.14 was adopted by 126 votes to 2.

6. Mr. KOUREISSY (Mali) said that his vote in favour of the draft resolution had not been recorded owing to a technical malfunction.

7. Mr. DMITRIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he wished to reserve the possibility of making a general statement after the adoption of the four draft resolutions relating to Palestine, including that submitted under agenda item 84 (g).

8. Mr. ALPTUNA (Turkey), speaking in explanation of vote, said that he had voted in favour of the draft resolution in accordance with his Government's views on the Middle East and Palestine.

9. Mr. ZIADA (Iraq) said that he had voted for the resolution because it was fitting that the United Nations, which had created the Palestinian problem by its decision to partition the land without the right to do so, should be responsible for taking care of the Palestinian people.

10. Mr. AL-HASSAN (Sudan) said that, had his delegation been present during the vote, it would have voted in favour of the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.15

11. Mr. ELIASHEV (Israel), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that the ports of Ashdod and Haifa were entirely at the disposal of the inhabitants of Judea, Samaria and the Gaza district. Products originating from those areas had free access to external markets, and development projects were considered solely on their economic merit. His delegation therefore rejected the draft resolution as being one-sided, and would vote against it.

12. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.15.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea,

/...

Ethiopia, Fiji, France, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, 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 Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Australia, Canada, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden.

13. The draft resolution was adopted by 125 votes to 2, with 6 abstentions.

14. Mr. MARTIN (Luxembourg), speaking in explanation of vote on behalf of the members of the European Community, said that although they had voted in favour of the resolution that implied no specific commitment on their part. While they recognized that economic development was important in reducing the difficulties in the region, they considered that projects to be implemented should be economically and technically sound in order to increase its economic prosperity in the interests of all.

15. Mr. OLSSON (Sweden), speaking in explanation of vote on behalf of Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden, said that they agreed with the sponsors of the draft resolution regarding the desirability of ensuring the economic development of the occupied territories. However, they had abstained in the vote because the draft implied that the General Assembly would have to pronounce itself in favour of specific proposals which had not been discussed or scrutinized by any relevant United Nations body.

16. Mr. LEE (Canada) said that his delegation had abstained for the same reasons that had been given by the representative of Sweden.

Draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.17

17. Mr. SECKA (Gambia) said that his country wished to be included in the list of co-sponsors of the draft resolution.

/...

18. Mr. ELIASHEV (Israel), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that the draft resolution ignored for purely political reasons the fact that Israel was currently engaged in promoting the well-being, safety and socio-economic development of the Palestinian Arabs. Under its administration, they had made spectacular progress in every aspect of life and their position was better than that of the people in most of the neighbouring countries. The ritual resolutions submitted each year were an effort to tarnish Israel's image and present it as opposing any form of international assistance to the Palestinian Arabs. However, Israel, while opposing assistance to the PLO, not only welcomed any assistance for constructive purposes through the proper channels, but co-operated with UNDP and other international organizations in implementing programmes to assist the Palestinian Arabs. It had made every possible effort to assist them, while the countries that were most vociferous on the matter gave them little or no aid. The resolution was motivated by political rather than humanitarian concerns; it was repetitious, and was based on false pretences, ignoring the truth; his delegation would therefore vote against it.

19. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.17.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, 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.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

20. Draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.17 was adopted by 131 votes to 2.

/...

21. Mr. ORLANDO (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote on the three resolutions just adopted, said that every year the Committee approved almost identical resolutions which were not likely to advance the goal of peace in the Middle East or benefit the people of the area. The improvement of the quality of life that Israel had brought to the Palestinian people should be acknowledged. The United States assisted international agencies such as UNRWA working in the territories and was prepared to do more as circumstances allowed. However, it was opposed to channelling assistance through the PLO, which it did not recognize as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people.

22. Mr. MARTIN (Luxembourg) speaking on behalf of the members of the European Economic Community, said that they had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.17. They provided assistance to the Palestinian people, including food aid and projects co-financed with non-governmental organizations, and would continue to do so directly, as well as through the appropriate channels of the United Nations system.

23. Mr. KAWASHIMA (Japan) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, but reiterated its previous position on aid to national liberation movements.

24. Mr. LUTFI (Jordan) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it was convinced that the Palestinian people had suffered under Israeli occupation since 1967 and therefore needed support to enable them to recover their legitimate rights. However, it had reservations on paragraphs 7 and 8, on the grounds that all activities and operations in the Jordanian territory must be undertaken with the approval of the Government of Jordan.

AGENDA ITEM 84: DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION (continued)

(g) HUMAN SETTLEMENTS (continued) (A/C.2/40/L.13 and L.26)

Draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.13

25. Ms. ERIKSSON (Sweden), speaking in her capacity as Vice-Chairman, reported that in the informal consultations on the draft resolution the sponsors had agreed to the deletion of the words "five-day" and "twenty" in operative paragraph 6, subparagraphs (a) and (c) respectively.

26. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the programme budget implementations of the draft resolution, contained in document A/C.2/40/L.26. In addition, he pointed out that the phrase "by April 1987" in operative paragraph 6 (a) of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.13 had not been correctly reflected in the French version and that the error would be duly corrected.

27. Mr. SCHULLER (Luxembourg), speaking on behalf of the members of the European Community, proposed the addition to operative paragraph 6 (a) of the words "including a comprehensive general housing programme as recommended in resolution 8/3 of 10 May 1985 of the Commission on Human Settlements".

/...

28. Mr. AL-HADDAD (Democratic Yemen) accepted the amendment on behalf of the sponsors.

29. Mr. ELIASHEV (Israel), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that the draft resolution was one-sided and based on false assertions and baseless allegations. Its motives were essentially political, and it aimed primarily at enhancing the status of the so-called PLO, a terrorist organization committed to the destruction of Israel. Furthermore, the draft ignored the substantial progress achieved in every sphere of human life in Judea, Samaria and Gaza, and instead called for yet another tendentious report and seminar.

30. The Arab States, despite their professed concern for the Palestinians, had done nothing for them in over 30 years. Instead, by ignoring the facts and concentrating instead on the submission of politically biased and worthless resolutions, they discredited the significant achievements made by the Palestinian Arabs, which had been described in the world press and in his own statement to the Committee. The assertion that a few thousand Israelis currently living among the Palestinian Arabs would cause a demographic change and were a major obstacle to peace was ludicrous: emigration from the administered areas had in fact slowed down since 1967, and the Israeli presence was helping create the coexistence which was essential to peace. He rejected all the allegations in the draft resolution and would vote against it because it served only to further political aims and perpetuate problems which could have been solved long ago.

31. Mr. ZIADA (Iraq) said that the United Nations had been responsible for the partitioning of Palestine. As a result, the Palestinian people were living under alien occupation and were threatened with genocide. The draft resolution was therefore valid and his delegation would vote in favour of it.

32. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.13, as orally amended.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal,

/...

Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, 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.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

33. Draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.13 was adopted by 133 votes to 2.

34. Mr. DMITRIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in explanation of vote on behalf of the delegations of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, as well as his own, said that they had consistently supported the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination, national independence and sovereignty, as well as to the creation of their own independent State, and strongly condemned any Israeli action which hindered the attainment of those rights. Those who gave the Israelis political protection and supported their aggression were also obstructing the establishment of peace in the Middle East. All parties involved in the conflict, including the Palestine Liberation Organization, should be allowed to participate in efforts to find a solution to the problem. The Socialist countries would continue to support all United Nations action in that regard and had therefore voted in favour of draft resolutions A/C.2/40/L.14, L.15, L.17 and L.13.

35. Mr. ORLANDO (United States of America) said that his delegation had voted against draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.13 on the ground that it would simply perpetuate unproductive, if not counterproductive, activities which would in no way resolve the serious problems in the Middle East or improve the well-being of the Palestinian people living there. The Secretary-General's report (A/40/373) was so slanted as to be unworthy of the United Nations. His delegation was concerned about the financial implications of the resolution, contained in document A/C.2/40/L.26, as it considered that the sum of over \$125,000 to be allocated for a seminar would be better spent on helping the Palestinians directly. His delegation's vote against that draft resolution and the three others adopted under agenda item 12 should not be interpreted as a lack of concern or commitment as his country had been and continued to be actively involved in numerous bilateral and multilateral efforts to improve the quality of Palestinian life. However, such efforts were clearly no substitute for a negotiated settlement, which remained high on his country's foreign policy agenda. The fact that the parties in the region were not fully ready to address the political dimension of the problems was no excuse to ignore the human dimension. He therefore urged all countries to become active participants in programmes that could directly enhance the quality of Palestinian life.

36. Mr. MARTIN (Luxembourg), speaking on behalf of the States members of the European Economic Community, said that those countries had voted in favour of the draft resolution and would continue to support efforts to enhance the well-being of the Palestinian people in that region. However, the information given in document A/C.2/40/L.26 on the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.13 should have been more specific and, in so far as possible, any funds committed should be drawn from the Organization's existing resources. Initiatives to hold seminars on a given subject should be carefully co-ordinated in order to avoid a multiplication of such meetings, and efforts must be made to comply with the principle set forth in General Assembly resolution 31/140 that United Nations bodies should meet at their respective headquarters.

37. Mr. MULLER (Australia) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.13 despite some misgivings concerning its financial implications. However, the seminar referred to in the draft resolution could be held at any time prior to April 1987, and it was to be hoped that the Secretariat would hold it at a time when conference-servicing costs could be kept to a minimum.

38. In the vote on draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.15, adopted under agenda item 12, his delegation had abstained because, while it supported the rights of the Palestinian people to economic development, it considered that the General Assembly should not be placed in the position of approving specific project proposals without any assurance of their technical and financial viability; moreover, the approval of such proposals prior to the seminar referred to in draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.13 would prejudice the seminar's outcome.

39. Mr. ABU-KOASH (Observer, Palestine Liberation Organization) expressed his appreciation to all delegations which had voted in favour of the draft resolutions relating to Palestine adopted under agenda items 12 and 84 (g). He hoped that the six delegations that had abstained on draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.15 would vote in favour of it in the General Assembly once they had seen the relevant documents. Concerning charges that draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.14 had been politically motivated, it simply requested the Secretary-General to prepare a report on the financial and trade practices of the Israeli occupation authorities and in no way tried to influence the outcome of that report.

40. The Israeli and the United States delegations seemed to be suggesting that occupation of a land brought prosperity. If that were true, it was not clear why the United States had fought hard to free itself from British colonization or had in the past helped liberation movements to achieve the independence of their countries. If Israel was indeed helping the Palestinian people and living conditions had improved, it was not clear why Palestinians were demonstrating and being killed. Progress and development would not be possible until Palestine had been liberated.

(a) INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY FOR THE THIRD UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT DECADE: REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE REVIEW AND APPRAISAL OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY FOR THE THIRD UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT DECADE (continued) (A/C.2/40/L.18)

Draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.18

41. The CHAIRMAN said that if there were no comments on the draft resolution, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt it.

42. Draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.18 was adopted without a vote.

43. Mr. LAVROV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking also on behalf of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, said that, although those countries had not objected to the adoption of the resolution without a vote, the complex compromise that had led to the adoption of the agreed conclusions by the Committee on Review and Appraisal made no sense unless it was followed by specific steps to change the unjust international economic order. All countries must therefore demonstrate the necessary political will to make possible the restructuring of international relations on a fair and democratic basis. He requested that the statement he had made in the Committee on Review and Appraisal on the occasion of the adoption of the agreed conclusions should be incorporated in the summary record of the meeting.*

44. Mr. SCHULLER (Luxembourg) said that the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus was an important step forward. In order to save time, he would not repeat the statement made on behalf of the European Economic Community and its member States in the Committee on Review and Appraisal on the occasion of the adoption of the agreed conclusions, but he requested that it should be incorporated in the summary of his statement in the summary record.*

45. Mr. WOKER (Observer for Switzerland) said that his country had participated in the work of the Committee on Review and Appraisal and therefore wished to associate itself with the adoption by consensus of the draft resolution.

46. Mr. ORLANDO (United States of America) said that the agreed conclusions adopted by the Committee on Review and Appraisal represented a delicate balance which took into account the views of all countries. However, his Government would have liked those conclusions to contain a more detailed discussion of the importance of international trade to economic development and to make a commitment to a new trade round. Moreover, the section on trade was too emphatic about the obligations of developed countries, while downplaying the reciprocal responsibilities of the developing countries.

47. His Government still had some reservations regarding the specific language used in the conclusions in discussing money, finance and debt. The current international monetary and financial system had functioned well in difficult circumstances, and thus did not require reform or a general overhaul, nor was

* See annex.

(Mr. Orlando, United States)

there any current need for an additional allocation of special drawing rights. Steps should, however, be taken to improve the functioning of the international monetary system. Concerning the debt problems of some developing countries, the conclusions were somewhat imbalanced as they failed to address the developing countries' primary responsibility for the adoption of sound domestic economic policies. Although his Government would continue to participate actively in high-level discussions of debt and other economic issues in the appropriate forums, it was not persuaded by calls for a high-level political dialogue on debt or a debt conference. Such meetings would only raise unrealistic expectations and undermine countries' individual efforts to solve their problems. Nothing in the discussion on money, finance and debt implied a change in his country's basic approach to those issues. Concerning paragraphs 3 and 15 of the agreed conclusions, his country had not supported the targets set in the International Development Strategy or the Substantial New Programme of Action, and reiterated its reservations on the adoption of those two documents.

48. Mr. SUDEN (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his Government had some reservations about the figures for ODA referred to in the agreed conclusions. His country had increased its ODA to the levels specified, but could not undertake to increase its commitment further at present.

49. Mr. FIELD (United Kingdom) reiterated the comments made by his Government when the agreed conclusions had been adopted: decisions concerning SDRs should be left to specialized international financial institutions, such as IMP. His Government was making every effort to achieve the ODA targets indicated in the agreed conclusions.

50. Mr. LAZAREVIC (Yugoslavia), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77, said that, in order to facilitate the debate between the developing and developed countries, the Group had refrained from insisting on many important points connected with the agreed conclusions. He emphasized that fact in view of the comments made by the representatives of the United States and Luxembourg. In order to save time, he would not repeat the statement made on behalf of the Group of 77 in the Committee on Review and Appraisal on the occasion of the adoption of the agreed conclusions, but he requested that it should be incorporated in the summary record of the meeting.*

(d) SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT: REPORT OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.19

51. The CHAIRMAN announced that the words "with appreciation" in paragraph 1 should be deleted. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution, as orally amended, by consensus.

52. It was so decided.

* See annex.

53. Mr. DMITRIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking also on behalf of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland and the Ukrainian SSR, said that it was essential for Member States to utilize the achievements of science and technology to achieve social and economic progress. The Centre for Science and Technology for Development did not yet make full use of its potential in that respect. The above-mentioned delegations endorsed the resolutions and decisions in the report of the Intergovernmental Committee with the proviso that they should be implemented from existing resources; in particular, research on a global scientific and technological information network should be carried out in the context of the existing United Nations information systems and should not involve any increase in the regular budget.

(f) ENVIRONMENT (continued)

Draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.16

54. Mr. DE ROJAS (Venezuela) proposed that the word "developing" should be inserted in the third line of paragraph 2 after the word "affected".

55. After a procedural discussion in which Mr. SHAABAN (Egypt), Mr. LOPEZ (Ecuador), Mr. FAREED (Pakistan), Mr. ZIADA (Iraq), Mr. DE LA TORRE (Argentina), Mr. COSTA (Angola) and Mr. AL-HADDAD (Democratic Yemen) took part, Mr. ELFORGANI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that the sponsors of the draft resolution would accept the Venezuela amendment.

56. At the request of the representative of Italy, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.16.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), 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, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, 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 Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

/...

Against: None.

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

57. Draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.16 was adopted by 104 votes to none, with 22 abstentions.

58. Mr. KPAKPO (Benin) said that, had his delegation been present during the voting, it would have voted in favour of the draft resolution.

59. Mr. FIELD (United Kingdom), speaking in explanation of vote on behalf of the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy and his own delegation, said that the three delegations had abstained in the vote because of the reservations which they also expressed at the time of the vote on a similar draft resolution at the thirty-ninth session. They viewed the problem of remnants of war with great concern, but believed that it was a matter for bilateral negotiation and that the concept of the responsibility of certain States and the obligations referred to in draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.16 had no basis in international law. It was unfortunate that the Committee had not been given an opportunity to discuss the amendment to the draft resolution more fully before proceeding to a vote.

60. Mr. ORLANDO (United States of America) said that the fact that his delegation had abstained in the vote did not mean that it was unsympathetic to the problems caused by remnants of war; however, the removal of those remnants was best dealt with by the countries concerned on a bilateral basis. Furthermore, UNEP lacked both the means and the mandate for fulfilling the request in paragraph 2 and ought rather to concentrate on its priority activities.

61. Mr. DMITRIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because of its unwavering support for the just demands of the developing countries which were suffering from the presence of material remnants of imperialist and colonialist wars.

62. Mr. DABIRI (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution on the understanding that its implications for the removal of the remnants of war applied only to those developed countries which had planted the objects in question.

63. Mr. ATTIMER (Chad) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution in spite of its scepticism with regard to the intentions of the principal sponsor, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, which was stockpiling a vast quantity of weapons, ammunition, explosives and aircraft on more than 500,000 square kilometres of Chadian territory. Whole regions of his country had been mined, as friendly countries assisting Chad had discovered. In short, Chad had become a veritable powder-keg in the wake of the 1973 Libyan attack which ran counter to the principles espoused by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya in the draft resolution.

/...

64. Mr. HASSAN (Djibouti) said that, had his delegation been present during the voting, it would have voted in favour of the draft resolution.

65. Mr. OLSSON (Sweden) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote. Sweden continued to believe that practical results could best be achieved by setting aside the controversial issue of international responsibility and demands for compensation. There was no rule of international law that laid down obligations in connection with the laying of mines in armed conflicts; the most that could be implied was that all the States concerned had an obligation to co-operate after the cessation of hostilities in removing the remnants of war. Sweden urged States to engage not only in individual and bilateral measures but also in multilateral co-operation in the context of article 9 of the second Protocol to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects, which would be more constructive than assigning impossible tasks to the Secretary-General, as in the draft resolution.

66. Mr. OLAFSSON (Iceland) said that, had his delegation participated in the vote, it would have abstained.

67. Mr. NATHON (Hungary) said that, had his delegation been present at the time of the vote, it would have voted in favour of the draft resolution.

68. Mr. MALIK (India) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution for the reasons it had given at the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly.

69. Mr. BENMOUSSA (Morocco) said that his delegation had not only voted for the draft resolution but had also co-sponsored it because Morocco enjoyed friendly relations with the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. In addition, it sought to promote international co-operation in solving a problem with complex legal implications. Lastly, Morocco wished to see justice done to a developing country whose development had been impeded by remnants of war.

70. Mr. ELFORGANI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) thanked the delegations which had sponsored draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.16 and those that had voted for it, adding that the allegations made by the representative of Chad had no basis in fact.

(k) NEW INTERNATIONAL HUMAN ORDER: MORAL ASPECTS OF DEVELOPMENT: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

Draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.21

71. The CHAIRMAN said that Burkina Faso, Malaysia and Paraguay had become sponsors of the draft resolution.

72. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

73. It was so decided.

/...

74. Mr. SADCHIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had raised no objections to the draft resolution because of its purely procedural nature. It was important that the issue of the new international human order should not be allowed to divert attention from the economic situation in developing countries or from the establishment of the new international economic order.

(i) EFFECTIVE MOBILIZATION AND INTEGRATION OF WOMEN IN DEVELOPMENT: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/C.2/40/L.23)

75. The CHAIRMAN announced that Poland had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.2/40/L.23.

(c) TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT (continued) (A/40/15, vols. I-II, 596, 717, 798, 815; A/C.2/40/L.8 and L.9)

(e) ECONOMIC AND TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION AMONG DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (continued) (A/40/39, 579 and Corr.1, 581, 656 and Add.1)

(j) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SUBSTANTIAL NEW PROGRAMME OF ACTION FOR THE 1980s FOR THE LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/40/826 and 827)

(m) IMMEDIATE MEASURES IN FAVOUR OF THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/40/597 and Corr.1)

(n) NEW AND RENEWABLE SOURCES OF ENERGY: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/40/548)

(o) DEVELOPMENT OF THE ENERGY RESOURCES OF DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued) (A/40/511 and Corr.1, 637)

76. Mr. MALIK (India) said that, given the uncertain and bleak prospects for the world economy described by the World Bank and IMF, attention should be focused on the consequences of certain economic policies that were being pursued at the international level. The main problems facing the world economy were directly attributable to its persisting structural and systemic problems whose solution required co-operative international action. Those problems had been analysed and discussed at length in recent years, and it was therefore disappointing that the Secretary-General's report thereon (A/40/708) contained little in the way of useful analysis.

77. The issues of money, finance and trade must be considered in a comprehensive and integrated manner, since the current approach - dealing only with individual areas - had proved inadequate. Efforts must be made to reach an understanding on the interrelationship of those issues, derive appropriate policy conclusions and adopt positive measures to improve the world economic outlook. The problem of indebtedness could not be solved unless greater access was provided to markets and financial resources. Likewise, access to financing for investment and stable monetary conditions were needed to stimulate exports. The increasingly apparent

/...

(Mr. Malik, India)

shortcomings of the international financial, monetary and trading systems reflected the fact that the multilateral system was a hostage to the economic policies pursued by major economic Powers in order to further narrow interests, in disregard of the rest of the world community.

78. While the developed countries had realized that there was a lack of policy co-ordination among the countries having the greatest impact on the world economy, the latter countries continued to seek solutions in limited consultations held by a small group of countries outside the multilateral framework. Statements such as the one recently attributed to the President of the United States endorsing the widest possible participation of developing countries in economic growth were of little value unless accompanied by assurances that the developing countries would have an equal say in the decision-making process. A major factor in the debt and development crisis was the failure of the international financial system to transfer adequate resources to the developing countries. While there had been an attempt to address that issue at the meetings of the World Bank and IMF at Seoul, the measures proposed for achieving adjustment through growth seemed to have been given only partial consideration. The World Bank needed a general capital increase if it was to play its prospective enhanced role, and an effort should be made to prevent Bank resources from becoming subject to further conditionality.

79. In monetary matters IMF lacked the necessary authority to ensure adequate co-ordination of the macro-economic policies of the countries whose policies had the greatest impact on the international economy. It was strange that creditor countries which imposed stringent conditions on recipients were unwilling to accept effective multilateral surveillance of their own policies. The budget and current-account deficits of the single largest national economy would soon have led IMF to impose measures of conditionality if such policies had been pursued by a developing country. At the same time, a proposal for a modest allocation of new SDRs continued to meet with resistance.

80. The international trading system was experiencing a rapid erosion of accepted norms as countries resorted increasingly to unilateral discriminatory practices and trading arrangements outside the system. One delegation had recently stated that its country's trade policy was founded on free and open markets; perhaps it could explain, then, why its Government continued to raise new trade barriers, or why restrictions on textile imports from developing countries were imposed at a much higher rate than were restrictions on imports from developed countries. Protectionism had also increased among the OECD countries.

81. The proponents of free and open trade were also engaging in serious disruptive practices, such as the virtual destruction of the international sugar market by means of EEC subsidies. Ironically, the developed countries were increasingly demanding reciprocity in trade, to the point of contravening GATT provisions. Clearly, those countries were unable to reconcile their own banking and trading interests with the policy advice they gave to developing countries. Yet increased protectionism and deflationary adjustment incurred a cost for the developed countries, too. Restrictive measures not only did not sustain employment, but usually also delayed necessary structural adjustment and made non-inflationary growth more difficult to maintain.

(Mr. Malik, India)

82. The developed countries' allegiance to GATT principles and to the free multilateral trading system must be demonstrated by individual and joint action to dismantle the restrictions those countries had imposed. They must also agree to a process of multilateral surveillance to ensure that no additional barriers were raised; a real test of their willingness would be progress achieved in bringing the textile trade under the GATT régime.

83. His delegation did not oppose the idea of a new trade round, but diversionary tactics, such as the inclusion of new themes which were contradictory to GATT, were not solutions to the pressing problems of international trade. Thus far, little of the free-market spirit had been in evidence in the case of exports of developing countries' products to the markets of developed countries. For its part, India had consistently sought to liberalize its import régime.

84. The problems afflicting the international monetary, financial and trading systems required an urgent response on the part of the international community. An important step forward could be taken by convening an international conference on money and finance for development, as requested at the seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries. It was to be hoped that agreements regarding the preparations of such a conference could be reached during the current session of the General Assembly.

85. Mr. BAHADIAN (Brazil) said he wished to echo the call made by a certain delegation for a more thorough debate in the Committee on the issues of trade, trade relations and trade liberalization.

86. Brazil rejected that delegation's allegation that it was time for the developing countries, and especially those that had made substantial progress in their development programmes, to assume a genuinely responsible role in the world trading system, whereas GATT was in fact being weakened by the behaviour of developed countries that no longer observed its rules. The major trading partners were increasingly reluctant to accept the rules of free trade and face domestic macro-economic problems which could not be solved by trade policy measures or multilateral trade negotiations.

87. The allegations made against the developing countries were also misleading. The same delegation had suggested that discussions of trade should move beyond the traditional subject-matter with its emphasis on the exchange of goods and dealt with areas such as trade in services and the protection of industrial property. In fact, trade in services did not fall within the mandate of GATT.

88. For a number of years, Brazil and other countries had been proposing that an intergovernmental group of experts should study transborder data flows and services in general, in order to make recommendations to the Commission on Transnational Corporations and the Economic and Social Council. The developed countries had consistently refused to participate in that debate. Why, then, were they proposing negotiations in the context of GATT on that very subject if it was generally agreed that services were not covered by GATT? Furthermore, why should those countries be unwilling to discuss transborder data flows in the Commission on Transnational Corporations and yet be willing to negotiate on them in the context of GATT?

/...

(Mr. Bahadian, Brazil)

89. It had also been suggested that industrial property should be given greater protection. However, at the time when negotiations on the revision of the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property had been in deadlock because of a certain country's actions, it had not seemed appropriate to conduct negotiations on intellectual property within the framework of GATT, rather than in the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) which had the mandate and expertise to deal with that issue.

90. The third suggestion, that trade in high-technology products and associated services should be governed by GATT, was also unacceptable. The attempt to consolidate the existing division of labour, whereby developing countries were permanent importers of services and high-technology groups, was unacceptable. The main problems encountered in the negotiations in UNCTAD on an International Code of Conduct on the Transfer of Technology had little to do with technology but rather with the desire of parent companies to control the exports of their subsidiaries. It was interesting to note that some delegations approved of intra-firm trade even when it was not in the interest of developing countries, while claiming that national measures taken by those countries to protect their development targets were unjustifiable.

91. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee had concluded its consideration of agenda item 84.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.

/...

Annex

Statements made on the occasion of the adoption by consensus of the agreed conclusions of the Committee on the Review and Appraisal of the Implementation of the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade

On behalf of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

The delegations concerned had from the outset attached great political importance to the work of the Committee on Review and Appraisal. In the course of that work, they had proposed ways of overcoming the negative trends in international economic relations, their position on which was set forth in documents A/39/228 and A/40/327, and they had supported the position paper of the Group of 77 (A/AC.219/L.1).

Unfortunately, the constructive attitude they and many other delegations had shown had not been matched by all groups of countries. The attempts of some Western States to weaken all proposals for an equitable restructuring of international economic relations and the financial, monetary and trade systems had resulted in the rejection of almost every new text put forward during the Committee's current session and their apparent interpretation of "consensus" as meaning unconditional acceptance of their demands by other delegations suggested that their familiar talk about seeking a "new international economic consensus" was simply a pretext for bending United Nations economic activities to serve their own interests.

That the Committee's work had not broken down was largely due to the constructive attitude of the Group of 77. Naturally, the document finally agreed upon had certain shortcomings - for example, it made no mention of the objectives of implementing the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, starting global negotiations, eliminating colonialism, neo-colonialism, apartheid and the harmful consequences of the activities of transnational corporations, preventing the use of coercion as a means of economic and political pressure and convening an international conference on money and finance with universal participation. Moreover, it did not contain clear proposals on the genuine reform of the international monetary system, the elimination of protectionism, the settlement of foreign debt problems and support for progressive social and economic reforms in the developing countries. In some respects, its assessment of the current international economic situation was over-optimistic, and did not adequately reflect the interests of developing countries.

Those shortcomings were explained by the unbending negative position of a number of Western countries, primarily the United States, which had shown once again that they were opposed to a just restructuring of international economic relations and a genuine improvement in the economic position of the developing countries, and wished to maintain their privileged position in the world economy

/...

and their policy of neo-colonialist exploitation. In that respect, the results of the session had reflected the current disquieting state of the North-South dialogue.

The socialist countries had nevertheless joined in the consensus adoption of the document, the main virtues of which were its affirmation of the goals and objectives of the International Development Strategy and its emphasis on the link between the implementation of the strategy and the establishment of a new international economic order. It also contained important provisions relating to the need for peace, security, disarmament and mutual confidence and co-operation among States, for diversion of resources from the arms race to peaceful purposes and for collective efforts to promote the economic and social development of all peoples, the right of each country freely to determine its own economic and social policy and the principles of most-favoured-nation treatment and non-discrimination. Particularly noteworthy were the references to the need to remedy the outflow of financial resources from developing countries and the calls for an easing of the social and economic situation in Africa, an improvement in the situation of the least-developed countries and the eradication of hunger and disease.

The socialist countries, which supported the developing countries' efforts to solve their economic and social problems, establish a new international economic order and win the right to choose their own path of development, categorically rejected the attempts made by certain Western delegations to exploit the review and appraisal exercise to justify their attempted interference in the internal affairs of developing countries. They reaffirmed their position as set forth in their joint statement at the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly during the adoption of the Strategy, whose implementation must genuinely facilitate the restructuring of the international economic order on a just and democratic basis and the development of equitable co-operation among all States.

On behalf of the European Economic Community and its member States

The European Economic Community and its member States welcomed the adoption by consensus of the agreed conclusions of the Committee on the Review and Appraisal of the Implementation of the International Development Strategy. The fact that the Committee had been able to appraise the past, focus on common aspirations in the midst of differing views and agree on realistic conclusions attested to the prevailing sense of responsibility and climate of confidence, which augured well for the future. In particular, he thanked the Group of 77 for its spirit of co-operation and pragmatism.

The adoption of that document had made it possible to reaffirm commitments made at the time of the adoption of the International Development Strategy. During its deliberations, the Committee had taken note of the impact of indebtedness on numerous developing countries and the grave threat posed by that situation to the international monetary and financial system as a whole. Any lasting solution must take into account all aspects, including international interest rates, an adequate transfer of resources, the strengthening of the world economic recovery and an expansion of international trade. Individual cases of indebtedness should be dealt with in diversified ways. It was in the light of those considerations that the Community interpreted paragraph 14 of the agreed conclusions.

/...

On behalf of the Group of 77

The Group had sought during the negotiations to create a climate of understanding not only as a means of reaching consensus on the review and appraisal exercise, but as a guide to future constructive dialogue as a follow-up to the important consensus reached. It had demonstrated its constructive spirit by accepting the first text of 9 September 1985 as a basis for negotiation, by proposing that the 13 September text, with all the difficulties it contained for the Group, should be accepted as a package, and by maintaining the same positive and flexible attitude, when faced at that stage with an even more serious situation.

The Group regarded the consensus agreement as a first step towards continued negotiation on vital issues to which it attached great importance, among them money, finance, debt and trade and the close interrelationship between them. It hoped that, on the basis of the agreement reached, delegations at the fortieth session of the General Assembly would be able to explore those important issues in more depth.

The document did not, of course, fully or adequately meet the Group's concerns, in that it did not reflect the main proposals put forward by the Group, such as those relating to the international conference on money and finance with universal participation and the abolition of restrictive measures. Nevertheless, it contained substantial elements which were in the collective interests of the Group's members, and the Group would spare no effort to build on it in pursuit of a common objective which would be beneficial to all.
