

draft resolution A/C.2/L.1355, as orally revised, without a vote.

The draft resolution, as revised, was adopted.

79. Mr. NARKHUU (Mongolia) wished the summary record to state that the words "States concerned" in

paragraph 1 meant all States, whether developing or developed, whether socialist or with market economies.

80. On behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution, he thanked the members of the Committee for their support.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.

1634th meeting

Thursday, 21 November 1974, at 10.45 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Jihad KARAM (Iraq).

A/C.2/SR.1634

AGENDA ITEM 42

United Nations Conference on Trade and Development: report of the Trade and Development Board (*continued*)* (A/9603/Add.1 (part I), A/9615, TD/B/503 and Supp.1 and Supp.1/Add.1, A/C.2/L.1357, 1358/Rev.1, 1359, 1365, 1366, 1383 and 1384)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the representative of Yugoslavia to introduce draft resolution A/C.2/L.1357, relating to the multilateral trade negotiations.

2. Mr. MADEY (Yugoslavia) said that, as most representatives were still trying to obtain the documents for the meeting he preferred to wait a few minutes before taking the floor.

3. Mr. CZARKOWSKI (Poland) pointed out that in the past the Department of Conference Services had distributed documents to delegations, and said it was not right that representatives should be obliged to queue up for them. He asked whether the Department of Conference Services could not revert to the former practice.

4. The CHAIRMAN said that the draft resolutions had been issued very late, and that was why the Department had not been able to distribute them.

The meeting was suspended at 10.48 a.m. and resumed at 11.15 a.m.

5. Mr. MADEY (Yugoslavia) recalled that Colombia, Dahomey and Singapore had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1357. In the course of consideration of the report on the first part of the fourteenth session of the Trade and Development Board (A/9615), almost all the speakers had emphasized the importance of multilateral trade negotiations. The developing countries had taken the opportunity of again pointing out that they expected that particular attention would be devoted to their position and that the negotiations would result in an improvement of their terms of trade. Unfortunately, those negotiations had not yet begun, despite the provisions of the Tokyo Declaration of 14 September 1973. The delay would not be

too serious, unless it proved detrimental to international trade in general and to the trade and development of developing countries in particular. Under the pretext of not prejudging developments and not rendering negotiations more difficult, some countries were blocking any attempt at finding, in UNCTAD, GATT and other international bodies, a solution to the basic problems of international trade.

6. The reasons why it would be desirable for multilateral trade negotiations to be undertaken as soon as possible were stated in the preamble of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1357. The sponsors were sure that the members of the Trade Negotiations Committee would heed the appeal made in paragraph 1 and that countries which had not yet done so would rapidly adopt appropriate legislative measures. The remaining operative paragraphs needed no elaboration, since the matters dealt with in them had been discussed at length during the informal consultations.

7. Mr. HAMID (Sudan), Vice-Chairman, introducing draft resolution A/C.2/L.1383, said that it could replace draft resolution A/C.2/L.1357, which had just been introduced by the representative of Yugoslavia. The new text had been the subject of intensive negotiations, during which all regional and political groups had been able to take part in formulating the text, which was now ready to be adopted by consensus. Before that was done, he wished to point out an error in paragraph 1; the reference was to the Trade Negotiations Committee of GATT, not of UNCTAD.

8. Mr. HEMANS (United Kingdom) said that draft resolution A/C.2/L.1383 was related to draft resolution A/C.2/L.1384, entitled "Participation of the Secretary-General of UNCTAD in the multilateral trade negotiations", which had not yet been introduced and on which he would like to comment. He therefore requested that draft resolution A/C.2/L.1383 should not be put to the vote until draft resolution A/C.2/L.1384 had been introduced.

9. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, in that case, the Committee should take up draft resolution A/C.2/L.1358/Rev.1. He announced that Ghana, Guinea, Nigeria, the Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda and Zambia had become sponsors of the draft resolution. He would give the floor to the Director of the Budget Division, who had some

* Resumed from the 1620th meeting.

additional explanations to offer concerning the financial implications, submitted in documents A/C.2/L.1365 and A/C.2/L.1366, of the draft resolution and of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1359 respectively.

10. Mr. LAVAU (Director, Budget Division) said the Committee might wish to note that the Fifth Committee, at its 1642nd meeting, on 11 October 1974, had decided that the Secretary-General should ensure that expenditure for consultant services was maintained within the approved figure for 1974-1975 and had asked the Secretary-General not to present any supplementary estimates, irrespective of the effects of dollar depreciation and inflation since the time when the original appropriations had been approved. The Fifth Committee had not expressly indicated whether the limitation of expenditure on which it had decided was also to apply to any further decisions that might be taken by intergovernmental organs up to the end of the current biennium. However, it had intimated something to that effect at its 1659th meeting, on 11 November in connexion with the financial implications of the draft resolution contained in the report of the First Committee on agenda item 32. The Fifth Committee had decided, on the recommendation of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, not to include among the supplementary appropriations a sum of \$5,000 for the use of consultants. If that interpretation were to be confirmed with regard to the two draft resolutions under consideration (A/C.2/L.1358/Rev.1 and A/C.2/L.1359), the services of the experts required, estimated at \$49,000 in all, would have to be financed from available appropriations and would thus be competing with the consultant requirements under programmes already approved by the Assembly.

11. Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta) asked the Director of the Budget Division whether what he had just said meant that the request made in draft resolution A/C.2/L.1358/Rev.1, paragraph 5, could not be implemented.

12. Mr. LAVAU (Director, Budget Division) said that it was for the Fifth Committee to decide whether it would approve the supplementary appropriations required or whether it would request that the implications of the two draft resolutions under discussion should be financed from the existing appropriations. That did not mean that the decisions of the Second Committee could not be implemented, but that the expenditure involved would have to be absorbed without any change in the appropriations and that the Secretariat would have to judge between the various priorities and finance those decisions by reducing the use of consultants for the other programmes already adopted.

13. Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta) said that, as a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1358/Rev.1, his delegation rejected the suggestion that the sponsors should leave to the Secretary-General the responsibility for judging between the priorities established by UNCTAD. His delegation hoped that the Committee's decision would be implemented in the spirit in which it was adopted and would not be subjected to interpretation, and that the Fifth Committee would give the Secretary-General the means to carry out the work contemplated in the draft resolutions in question.

14. Mr. MWANGAGUHUNGA (Uganda) agreed with the remarks of the representative of the Upper Volta.

15. Mr. BRITO (Brazil) noted that there was a mistake in draft resolution A/C.2/L.1358/Rev.1, paragraph 3, where the words "in order to sustain and promote stability and growth in world economic activity" should read: "in order to promote sustained growth in world economic activity".

16. Mr. FASLA (Algeria) said that in the French text the words "*de base*" should be added after the word "*produits*" at the end of the second preambular paragraph.

17. The CHAIRMAN assured the Committee that all the necessary corrections would be made.

A non-recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1358/Rev.1.

The draft resolution was adopted by 116 votes to 1, with 8 abstentions.

18. Mr. HEMANS (United Kingdom) said that his delegation could have accepted the draft resolution on the basis of a consensus and had not requested a vote; it had abstained because of the provisions concerning indexation.

19. Mr. BENNANI (Morocco) said that, if his delegation had been present during the voting, it would have voted for draft resolution A/C.2/L.1358/Rev.1.

20. Mr. KOCH (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation had had to abstain despite the progress that had been achieved during the informal consultations. There remained two points which had not been resolved to the satisfaction of his delegation. Firstly, in the last part of operative paragraph 3 there was no explicit link between the expansion of the exports of developing countries and the protection and expansion of the real value of their export earnings. Such a link was necessary because it did not seem realistic to envisage an abstract guarantee in the matter. His delegation would therefore have preferred the following wording at the end of paragraph 3: "and especially to expand the exports of developing countries and thus to protect and expand the real value of their export earnings".

21. As to the problem of indexation referred to in operative paragraph 5 and in Trade and Development Board resolution 124 (XIV), he wished to recall that his delegation had voted the previous year against General Assembly resolution 3083 (XXVIII) and had expressed reservations with regard to the provisions of the Programme of Action concerning the question of indexation. His Government had serious doubts whether indexation would be technically feasible and capable of functioning; it feared that it led to an automatic inflation spiral. For those reasons, his delegation regretted having been unable to accept a wording which assumed that indexation would be feasible. He would like his statement to be reflected in the summary record of the meeting.

22. Mr. WRIGSTAD (Sweden) said that the goodwill displayed by the sponsors of the draft resolution had enabled his delegation to vote for it. However, his delegation had some reservations concerning paragraphs 3 and 4. It interpreted paragraph 3 as meaning that the Secretary-General of UNCTAD would not exceed his powers in doing

what he was asked to do. As to paragraph 5, his delegation regarded it as a recognition of the need for more detailed studies of indexation, a matter on which his Government's views had been expressed on many occasions and were unchanged.

23. Mr. EKBLOM (Finland) said that the changes to which the sponsors had agreed had enabled his delegation to vote for the draft resolution. Nevertheless, while recognizing the value of paragraph 3, he felt that the roles of the Secretary-General of UNCTAD and the Trade and Development Board should be spelt out and their fields of competence clearly defined. As far as paragraph 5 was concerned, he considered it premature to contemplate schemes for implementation with regard to indexation, since it was not yet known whether indexation was feasible.

24. Mr. GONZALEZ DE COSSIO (Mexico) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution. In considering the question of indexation, regard must be had not only to raw materials but also to the agricultural products and manufactured and semi-finished goods of developing countries. The Committee on Manufactures should consider the matter.

25. Mr. BERLIS (Canada) said that his delegation had abstained from voting. He appreciated the efforts which had been made to reach agreement, particularly on the question of indexation, but he did not regard as satisfactory the text of the draft resolution which had been adopted.

26. Mr. KUNIYASU (Japan) said that his delegation had abstained from voting because of its difficulty in accepting paragraphs 3 and 5. There was, moreover, a contradiction between paragraph 2 and paragraph 5; he believed that it would be premature for the Secretary-General of UNCTAD to convene a group of experts before the Committee on Commodities had taken a decision.

27. Mr. HUME (United States of America) said that his delegation had voted against the draft resolution. He considered it premature to set up a system of indexation, since it was not known whether it would be feasible. In any case, schemes for implementation in that field should be decided primarily by consultation among Governments. He also considered the draft resolution ambiguous. Paragraph 3 prejudged the measures relating to indexation which were to be studied subsequently. In paragraph 5 the term "identifying", in connexion with schemes for implementation, was not clear. His delegation believed that the function of a group of experts should be not to formulate or develop schemes for implementation but solely to assess the feasibility of whatever schemes might be proposed.

28. Mr. AL-KHUDHAIRY (Iraq) said that he wished to clarify his delegation's interpretation of the draft resolution which had just been adopted by a large majority. In paragraph 3, his delegation understood the phrase "protect and expand the real value of their export earnings" to refer directly to all the actions which his Government took in order to expand the true value of its raw materials based on world demand, and to constitute an endorsement of any measure which his Government adopted in order to protect the real value of its raw materials and in reference to the

prices of industrial goods and technology which it imported from the developed countries.

29. Mr. ARVESEN (Norway) said that his delegation had voted for the draft resolution. It interpreted paragraph 3 as meaning that the Secretary-General of UNCTAD, in carrying out the mandate given to him in that paragraph, was not to take any action exceeding his field of competence, and that the question of indexation was not within that field. His delegation also considered that paragraph 5 did not prejudice the future work of UNCTAD in the field of indexation.

30. Mr. KUEN (Austria) said that the changes agreed to by the sponsors of the draft resolution had enabled his delegation to vote for it, although it had the same reservations with regard to paragraphs 3 and 5 as the Swedish, Finnish and Norwegian delegations.

31. Mr. OMAR (Libyan Arab Republic) said his delegation had voted for the draft resolution because the matters with which it dealt were very important to developing countries. He thought that indexation, referred to in paragraph 5, should apply only to the manufactures of industrialized countries.

32. Mr. CZARKOWSKI (Poland) said that his delegation had voted for draft resolution A/C.2/L.1358/Rev.1, which contained provisions aimed at improving the terms of trade in favour of the developing countries. He considered it necessary to establish a link between the prices of the primary products of developing countries and the prices of the manufactured products of the developed countries.

33. Mr. KJELDGAARD-OLESEN (Denmark) said that his delegation had been obliged to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution because, in spite of the efforts made, it had not been possible to bring the informal consultations to a successful conclusion. His delegation understood the problems affecting the developing countries in the field of trade relations, but it entertained doubts as to the possibility of establishing schemes for implementation in the matter of indexation. At the first part of its fourteenth session, the Trade and Development Board had adopted resolution 124 (XIV) which touched on that issue, and his delegation felt that it was not appropriate to go beyond the agreement reached at that time.

34. The CHAIRMAN invited the representative of Yugoslavia to introduce draft resolution A/C.2/L.1384.

35. Mr. HEMANS (United Kingdom) welcomed the fact that, as a result of the patient efforts of the Vice-Chairman, Mr. Hamid, it had been possible to reach a consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1383. After lengthy negotiations, the sponsors had agreed to delete a paragraph of the draft resolution on condition that the other paragraphs should be adopted as they stood, without objection. It was in that spirit that his delegation had agreed to join in the consensus.

36. However, certain other delegations had decided to prepare, on the basis of that paragraph, a separate draft resolution which they were now submitting as document A/C.2/L.1384, without having at any time notified the

other delegations that had taken part in the negotiations on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1383. In his opinion, that was an unacceptable way of proceeding which could only create an unfortunate precedent and poison the atmosphere. When an agreement was reached, it should be respected by all.

37. Mr. KOCH (Federal Republic of Germany) endorsed the opinion expressed by the representative of the United Kingdom.

38. Mr. ROUGÉ (France) said that he hardly needed to remind the Committee yet again of the importance his country attached to the effective functioning of the United Nations. The economic problems which the Organization had to solve called for joint decisions and an efficient method of work. The texts which were prepared should therefore reflect the points of view of all, particularly in the interests of the developing countries. He accordingly regretted, like the representative of the United Kingdom, the methods which certain delegations had seen fit to adopt.

39. Miss GHOSE (India) said that she did not see why the delegations which had agreed to delete a paragraph in draft resolution A/C.2/L.1383 should not have the right to prepare another draft resolution on the basis of that same paragraph. Her delegation considered that to be a means of giving satisfaction to those delegations which, without wishing to dissociate themselves from the consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1383, did not wholly agree with the deletion of the paragraph in question.

40. Mr. DJAISI (Ghana) said he considered that, taking into account the positions clearly expressed by the representatives of the United Kingdom, the Federal Republic of Germany and France, further consultations should be held.

41. Mr. HEMANS (United Kingdom) said that he did not understand why the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1384 had not spoken to anyone of the step they were taking. That was not acting in good faith. The sponsors of the new draft resolution should respect the undertaking into which they had entered concerning draft resolution A/C.2/L.1383 and withdraw draft resolution A/C.2/L.1384, which had been prepared in violation of that undertaking.

42. He therefore proposed that, since a consensus had been reached on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1383, it should be adopted and consultations should then be held on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1384 if its sponsors should decide to retain it.

43. Mr. HAMID (Sudan) thanked the representative of the United Kingdom for summarizing the situation so clearly. He assumed that in asking for further negotiations to be held the representative of Ghana had in mind draft resolution A/C.2/L.1384 and not draft resolution A/C.2/L.1383, which was ready to be adopted.

44. Mr. BRITO (Brazil) associated himself with the remarks of the representative of the Sudan.

45. The CHAIRMAN said that if he heard no objection, he would take it that the members of the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.2/L.1383 without a vote.

The draft resolution was adopted.

46. Mr. STURKEY (Australia) said that his delegation had joined in the consensus. However, with regard to paragraph 6, it considered that since multilateral trade negotiations did not take place under the direct control of GATT but were governed by the Declaration adopted at the Ministerial Meeting held in Tokyo, it was not appropriate to invite the Director-General of GATT to prepare an interim report on them. In his opinion, it would be more suitable to entrust that task to the Chairman of the Trade Negotiations Committee. Furthermore, he was not sure that the Director-General of GATT was competent to submit a report to the General Assembly.

47. Mr. MADEY (Yugoslavia), introducing draft resolution A/C.2/L.1384, said that Ghana and Uganda wished to become sponsors of the draft resolution.

48. Members of the Committee were very familiar with the question of participation of the Secretary-General of UNCTAD in the multilateral trade negotiations, since it had been the subject of several General Assembly and Trade and Development Board resolutions. The delegations which had originated those resolutions would have liked to raise that question in draft resolution A/C.2/L.1357; in the course of informal consultations, they had prepared a formula which would have allowed the Secretary-General of UNCTAD to take part in the multilateral negotiations under the mandate which had been entrusted to him. The formula in question had met with the approval of the great majority of delegations, with the exception of two of them, whose opposition had made it impossible to retain that formula in the text of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1383: a certain number of delegations had therefore prepared draft resolution A/C.2/L.1384, which reflected their opinion on the matter. It was a very simple and clear text on which the Committee should vote without any further delay.

49. Mr. WONG (Singapore) said that his country should be deleted from the list of sponsors of the draft resolution under consideration.

50. Mr. KASASA (Zaire) said that he felt the draft resolution under consideration, submitted by developing countries, was of great interest. It was desirable that the Secretary-General of UNCTAD should be able to take part in all the stages of the international trade negotiations to defend the interests of the developing countries.

51. He would therefore vote in favour of the draft resolution.

52. Mr. ARVESEN (Norway) said he thought, like Mr. Hamid, that draft resolution A/C.2/L.1384 should be the subject of consultations in order to arrive, if possible, at a consensus.

53. Mr. HAMID (Sudan) said that what he had meant was that the Committee should consider whether or not it was

appropriate to hold consultations on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1384.

54. Mr. KJAIISI (Ghana) proposed that negotiations should be held.

55. Mr. KANDÉ (Senegal) said that he did not see how negotiations would change matters. If it had not been possible to reach agreement on that controversial point in the consultations on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1383, there was little chance of achieving a consensus on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1384.

56. Mr. MADEY (Yugoslavia) thought that the Committee should be able to decide immediately on the draft resolution under consideration.

57. Mr. HEMANS (United Kingdom) said that he was not proposing formally that the Committee should postpone its decision on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1384, although he was entitled to do so under the rules of procedure, because he did not wish to prevent other delegations, in particular the delegation of the Upper Volta, from making their views known at the current stage if they so wished.

58. However, he would not be unduly surprised if the United Kingdom Government and the authorities of the EEC countries reached the conclusion that that draft resolution called into question the consensus reached with respect to draft resolution A/C.2/L.1383. It was therefore quite possible that when the latter draft was referred to the plenary it might not be adopted by consensus.

59. His delegation thought that in presenting their draft the sponsors had perhaps not considered the possible consequences of that step. He therefore suggested that the Committee should not take an immediate decision on the draft but should give the sponsors time to reconsider the matter.

60. Mr. KANDÉ (Senegal) reminded the Committee that he had formally proposed, before the statement by the United Kingdom representative, that a decision should be taken immediately on the draft resolution under consideration. However, he would have no objection if consultations were held first.

61. Mr. AL-EBRAHIM (Kuwait) proposed, as a compromise solution, that consideration of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1384 should be postponed to the afternoon meeting.

62. Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta) said that he was grateful to the United Kingdom representative for having urged that he should be given an opportunity to take the floor. He hoped that the United Kingdom delegation would adopt the same attitude in certain other United Nations bodies, in particular the Security Council, where, as a result of its right of veto, it was preventing nearly a hundred other delegations from adopting just decisions.

63. The United Kingdom representative had seemed to suggest that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1384 had acted without due consideration in submitting the draft and that, if allowed time for reflection, they might have second thoughts. He should be under no such illusion. The

fact was that nothing would be gained by waiting, since, as had been proved by the consultations held the previous day, the group to which the United Kingdom belonged was not ready to negotiate or to abide by a reasonable consensus. Nevertheless, his own delegation would agree to have the consideration of the draft resolution postponed to the afternoon meeting, as requested by the representative of Kuwait. The Group of 77 was prepared to negotiate at any time, but not to accept lame compromises, and members should have no illusions regarding the outcome of any possible negotiations. The question of the participation of the Secretary-General of UNCTAD in trade negotiations was not new and the Group of 77 attached great importance to it.

64. Mr. MWANGAGUHUNGA (Uganda) said that as far as economic questions were concerned, his delegation was prepared to co-operate and recognized the need for compromises. However, it did not think that some countries could, as occurred in a United Nations body where there was the right of veto, prevent the majority from taking a decision or make it reverse a decision which had already been taken. A compromise was a compromise and once it had been reached, it should be respected. The question of the participation of the Secretary-General of UNCTAD in the multilateral trade negotiations organized under the auspices of GATT was not new and his delegation attached great importance to it. It hoped that a decision would be taken on the subject, if not at the current meeting, at least at the one to be held in the afternoon.

65. Mr. VERCELES (Philippines) said that he thought it should be possible to wait a little before draft resolution A/C.2/L.1384 was put to the vote. That would give the sponsors, including his delegation, time to consult one another and to take account of the constructive proposals made by certain delegations. He was referring, in particular, to the proposal by the Norwegian representative.

66. Mr. HALL (Jamaica) said that while recognizing that draft resolution A/C.2/L.1384 posed a problem for the United Kingdom delegation, he found the terms used by the representative of that delegation regrettable.

67. Mr. BENNANI (Morocco) recalled that the principle of the participation of the Secretary-General of UNCTAD in the trade negotiations had already been accepted, both in the Second Committee and in the General Assembly. He even seemed to recall that General Assembly resolution 3085 (XXVIII), which had invited the participants in the multilateral trade negotiations to ensure that the Trade Negotiations Committee would enable the Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development to attend its meetings, had been adopted by consensus. As the principle had been accepted, the problem which arose was merely one of formulation.

68. Miss GHOSE (India) said that she did not see the purpose of postponing consideration of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1384, since a decision would have to be taken in any case. She did not agree with the representative of Morocco that the draft posed merely a problem of formulation. It was clear from the informal consultations in which she had participated that there continued to be a lack of agreement between the developing and the devel-

oped countries and she did not think, therefore, that anything should be expected from further consultations.

69. The CHAIRMAN said that unless there was an objection or a formal proposal, he intended to put draft resolution A/C.2/L.1384 to the vote at the beginning of the afternoon meeting.

70. Mr. HEMANS (United Kingdom) asked the Chairman to reconsider his decision in the event that, after consultations, the delegations concerned recognized that it would be useful to prolong the negotiations.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

1635th meeting

Thursday, 21 November 1974, at 3.15 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Jihad KARAM (Iraq).

A/C.2/SR.1635

AGENDA ITEM 42

United Nations Conference on Trade and Development: report of the Trade and Development Board (*continued*) (A/9603/Add.1 (part I), A/9615, A/C.2/L.1359, 1366 and 1384)

1. The CHAIRMAN announced that Madagascar and Mexico had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1384, and informed the Committee that the second part of the third preambular paragraph, beginning with the word "suggesting", of that draft resolution should be deleted.

2. Mr. MADEY (Yugoslavia) announced that Iraq had become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

3. Mr. MBATCHY (Gabon) said that his delegation had also become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1384.

The draft resolution, as revised, was adopted by 104 votes to 12, with 7 abstentions.

4. Mr. EKBLOM (Finland), speaking in explanation of vote, stressed that at the first part of the fourteenth session of the Trade and Development Board his delegation had adopted a favourable position on the question of participation by the Secretary-General of UNCTAD in the multilateral trade negotiations. It had found the ideas put forward by the Secretary-General of the Conference at the third session of the Trade Negotiations Committee and the fourteenth session of the Board, regarding the presence of UNCTAD at the negotiations and its access to the relevant documents, were constructive and realistic. It had specifically noted his recognition that there were occasions during the trade negotiations when meetings and documentation should be private—a view which was in line with its own position. Since the operative paragraph of the draft resolution did not reflect that position, his delegation had felt obliged to abstain in the voting.

5. His delegation was seriously concerned at the procedure followed in submitting the draft resolution. Its abstention should not be regarded as signifying indifference with regard to that procedure.

6. Mr. GATES (New Zealand), speaking in explanation of vote, said his delegation very much regretted that it had been obliged to vote against the draft resolution. His Government wished developing countries to be given the maximum assistance in preparing for and participating in the multilateral trade negotiations, and it recognized the important role the Secretary-General of UNCTAD could play in that respect. It could have supported any text, including the compromise text, which would have led to the right result through legitimate and practical steps. The draft resolution just adopted, however, asked the General Assembly to take a decision which was not within its competence, but was a matter for the members of the Trade Negotiations Committee. He assured the developing countries that New Zealand, which was a member of that Committee, would support all efforts to ensure that the Secretary-General of UNCTAD was enabled to participate in its meetings as appropriate and to have access to all relevant documentation.

7. Mr. CROS (France), speaking on behalf of the members of EEC, said the fact that the members of the Community had voted against the draft resolution would have come as no surprise, since it was well known that they found the operative paragraph unacceptable. The reasons for their position had been explained at the fourteenth session of the Trade and Development Board at Geneva and in the informal consultations preceding the vote. The Community felt that there were times when the presence of the Secretary-General of UNCTAD in the Trade Negotiations Committee and its subsidiary bodies was appropriate and times when it was not. That had been officially recognized by the Secretary-General himself and had been accepted by all the members of the Group of 77 when they had joined in the consensus on Board resolution 116 (XIV). Moreover, the sponsors of the draft resolution had accepted that position the previous week during consultations on a compromise proposal very different from the text finally adopted. The Community could not but express its regret that, in supporting draft resolution A/C.2/L.1384, many of its friends had gone back on their word.

8. Mr. HUME (United States of America) recalled that his Government's position on the question covered in draft