



CONTENTS

Agenda item 6:

| | |
|--|------------|
| Question of a declaration on international economic co-operation (concluded) | Page 43 |
|--|------------|

President: Mr. Foss SHANAHAN (New Zealand).

Present:

Representatives of the following States: Afghanistan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Denmark, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Italy, Japan, Jordan, New Zealand, Poland, Spain, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Observers for the following Member States: Austria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, India, Israel, Peru, Romania, Thailand, Yugoslavia.

The observer for the following non-member State: Holy See.

Representatives of the following specialized agencies: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; International Civil Aviation Organization; World Health Organization; World Meteorological Organization.

The representative of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

AGENDA ITEM 6

Question of a declaration
on international economic co-operation
(E/3467; E/L.899, E/L.900/Rev.1, E/L.902/Rev.1)
(concluded)

1. Mr. PAZHAWAK (Afghanistan) said that, in the light of the discussion in the Council, his delegation had decided to withdraw its amendments (E/L.902/Rev.1) to the draft resolution submitted by El Salvador (E/L.900/Rev.1). It would, however, propose to amend that draft resolution as follows: first, replace the words "their views on", in the last preambular paragraph, by the words "their general views, including"; secondly, replace the word "thirty-third", in operative paragraph 2, by the word "thirty-second". He pointed out that the retention of the words "may be", in operative paragraph 2, left it open to the Council to take any action it wished at the thirty-second session, and should therefore satisfy those representatives who felt that the views of Governments on the draft declaration (E/3461) might not be available in time for discussion at that session.

2. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) stated that, in the spirit of co-operation shown by the Afghan representative, he would accept his first amendment, but would leave the decision on the second amendment to the Council. A compromise solution might be to provide that the question should be considered at the resumed thirty-second session.

3. Mr. PAZHAWAK (Afghanistan) replied that, if the Council encountered any difficulty in discussing the matter at the thirty-second session, it could always defer it at that time. There seemed no reason to prejudge the question at present.

4. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that his delegation regarded the last preambular paragraph as an essential part of the draft resolution, since it was not at present sure that a draft declaration was the most appropriate form of action and wished to hear the views of Governments before any decision was taken. However, it agreed that the statements to be submitted by Governments might well deal with the question as a whole, and it would therefore be prepared to support the paragraph as amended.

5. His delegation continued to feel that it would be impossible to reach a final decision on a subject as important as the draft declaration in the course of a few sessions of the Council. However, in view of the Afghan representative's desire to see work on the draft declaration begun at the thirty-second session, he would suggest that, as a compromise solution, the words "at the thirty-third session", in operative paragraph 2, should be replaced by the phrase "which would be initiated by the Council at the thirty-second session".

6. Mrs. MIRONOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) remarked that her delegation appreciated the spirit of co-operation displayed by the Council, although it regretted that a more detailed discussion of the draft declaration had not been possible at the current session. While it continued to feel that such a discussion should be entered into promptly, it would not press its earlier suggestion that a special session of the Council should be held for the purpose.

7. As the draft resolution before the Council was purely procedural in nature, there was no need for the references to previous documents made in the second and third preambular paragraphs. She also saw no reason to restrict the replies by Governments referred to in the last preambular paragraph by specifying in advance what they should contain. With regard to operative paragraph 2, she agreed with those representatives who had said that discussion of the draft declaration should in any case be resumed at the Council's next session. The Council would remain free to alter its agenda at the thirty-second session; there was no reason, therefore, to decide now that it would not prove possible to discuss the draft declaration at that time, and she appealed to members of the Council not to do so.

8. Mr. KLUTZNICK (United States of America) said that the most important thing the Council would do at the current session was to place consideration of the draft declaration on its agenda for a time when it would be possible to discuss it in a less strained atmosphere. He continued to believe that it would be very difficult to obtain the replies from Governments in time to discuss the question at the thirty-second session. However, the wording proposed by the French representative would make it possible to initiate that discussion at the thirty-second session if those replies were received in time. As

a compromise solution, he therefore supported that suggestion.

9. Mr. TCHOBANOV (Bulgaria) agreed with the USSR representative that the wording of the last preambular paragraph was inappropriate since, as the Ethiopian representative had pointed out, the question of a declaration on international economic co-operation had already been discussed by Member States in the General Assembly and a decision had been taken that it should be discussed by the Council. His delegation also considered that the wording suggested by the French representative for operative paragraph 2 was unnecessary, as the Council could in any case decide to postpone discussion of the item at its thirty-second session, should it deem it necessary.

10. Mr. FRANZI (Italy) observed that the important point, for his delegation, was not whether the Council would have time to discuss the matter at its thirty-second session, but that, since it was requesting the views of Governments on a very important declaration, it should make sure that the views of all Governments were available to it before initiating that discussion.

11. He proposed that the word "economic" should be inserted between the words "international" and "co-operation" in the last preambular paragraph, as economic co-operation was the subject of the draft resolution.

12. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) accepted that amendment.

13. Mr. PAZHAWAK (Afghanistan) agreed with the French representative that the declaration on international economic co-operation would require lengthy consideration. However, if, at its thirty-second session, the Council found that it was unable to reach a final decision, it could then consider an appropriate procedure. In that connexion, he would like the Secretariat to inform representatives of the possibility of discussing the draft at the resumed thirty-second session.

14. He also agreed with the United States representative that it would be easier to reach a decision on the draft declaration in a more relaxed atmosphere. However, the General Assembly had discussed many items which actually increased tension, and they had not been postponed. On the other hand, the item now before the Council might itself contribute to a relaxation of international tension because it dealt with a non-political subject. It was therefore undesirable to delay discussion of the draft declaration or to give the impression to the under-developed countries that it was being shelved indefinitely.

15. Mr. MALINOWSKI (Secretary of the Council), in reply to the question raised by the Afghan representative, drew attention to Council resolution 557 B II (XVIII) which dealt with the agenda of the resumed part of the July session.

16. Mr. SILVA SUCRE (Venezuela) said that his delegation did not share the view that the draft declaration submitted by the Soviet delegation should be discussed at the resumed thirty-second session. The resumed sessions of the Council, which were held each year at the end of autumn, were always very short and were devoted to questions which completely took up the time allotted for the purpose. His delegation, therefore, felt that a question as broad as the one proposed should not be left for consideration at that time. It would accordingly support the Afghan amendment to the effect that the draft declaration should be discussed at the thirty-second session.

17. Mr. WODAJO (Ethiopia) felt that the draft declaration should be discussed at the thirty-second session. It was true that the agenda of that session was heavy, but many of the items were concerned with routine matters and would not take much of the Council's time. In any case, a mere list of items gave no indication of the length of the debate; that depended on the readiness of Council members to co-operate. There did not seem much merit in the French proposal that the Council should merely begin discussion of the item at its thirty-second session, because, in fact, the General Assembly had already initiated the discussion and had requested the Council to consider the draft declaration at its present session. Nor did it seem very useful to request Governments for their opinion of the draft declaration when they had already had an opportunity to state their views at the fifteenth session of the General Assembly.

18. Mrs. MIRONOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) found it difficult to understand the position of those delegations which seemed reluctant to discuss the draft declaration. Such a discussion would contribute to a relaxation of tension and the sooner it took place the better. As the Ethiopian representative had just pointed out, the General Assembly had already initiated discussion of the subject and had specifically requested the Council to deal with it. The item should therefore be included in the agenda of the thirty-second session and the Council should be allowed, at that session, to handle the matter as it thought fit.

19. Mr. NATORF (Poland) also felt that the Council should not defer consideration of the draft declaration until the thirty-third session. The fact that Governments had had the matter before them since the fifteenth session of the General Assembly should enable them to transmit their views on it to the Secretary-General very rapidly. The thirty-second session might not conclude its consideration of the draft, but, in that case, the Council should decide at that time how to proceed and should not be tied down by an earlier decision.

20. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that his suggestion relating to the last operative paragraph seemed not to have met with the necessary support and he would therefore withdraw it.

21. Mr. PAZHAWAK (Afghanistan) wished to make it clear that the fact that he had already submitted an amendment (E/L.899) to the USSR draft declaration did not mean that his delegation would have no other proposals to make concerning the substance of that draft.

22. Mr. KLUTZNICK (United States of America) remarked that, if it came to a vote, his delegation would support the Salvadorian draft resolution (E/L.900/Rev.1) as it now stood. While having no strong objections to the inclusion of the item in the provisional agenda of the thirty-second session, he doubted whether in practice replies of Governments would be available by then.

23. Mr. DUDLEY (United Kingdom) also supported the Salvadorian draft resolution in its present form, on the ground that the thirty-third session was the earliest time at which the Council could usefully take up discussion of the draft declaration.

24. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan) and Mr. PENTEADO (Brazil) supported the Afghan amendment to operative paragraph 2.

25. Mr. GREEN (New Zealand), Mr. KAKITSUBO (Japan), Mr. FRANZI (Italy), Mr. DE PINIES (Spain) and Mrs. WRIGHT (Denmark) preferred the existing wording of operative paragraph 2.

26. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that his delegation would have to abstain in the vote on the Afghan amendment. It could not agree to discussion of the item at the thirty-second session unless it was made clear that such discussion could not, in fact, for practical reasons, take place until the resumed thirty-second session.

27. Mr. NATORF (Poland) asked for a separate vote on the latter part of the last preambular paragraph as amended, beginning with the words "including whether . . ."

28. Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan) requested a separate vote on the last preambular paragraph, as a whole, and a further separate vote on operative paragraph 2.

29. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the Afghan amendment to operative paragraph 2, which called for the substitution of the word "thirty-second" for the word "thirty-third".

At the request of the Afghan representative, a vote was taken by roll-call.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela, Afghanistan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Ethiopia, Jordan, Poland.

Against: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Denmark, El Salvador, Italy, Japan, New Zealand, Spain.

Abstaining: France.

The Afghan amendment was rejected by 9 votes to 8, with 1 abstention.

30. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the latter part of the last preambular paragraph of the draft resolution (E/L.900/Rev.1), as amended, beginning with the words "including whether . . ."

At the request of the Afghan representative, a vote was taken by roll-call.

The United States of America, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: United States of America, Uruguay, Brazil, Denmark, El Salvador, France, Italy, Japan, Jordan, New Zealand, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Against: Bulgaria, Poland, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstaining: Venezuela, Afghanistan, Ethiopia.

The latter part of the last preambular paragraph, as amended, was adopted by 12 votes to 3, with 3 abstentions.

The last preambular paragraph as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 14 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 2 was adopted by 11 votes to 1, with 6 abstentions.

31. The PRESIDENT invited the Council to vote on the draft resolution (E/L.900/Rev.1) as a whole, as amended.

At the request of the Afghan representative, a vote was taken by roll-call.

The United States of America, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Brazil, Denmark, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Italy, Japan, Jordan, New Zealand, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Against: Afghanistan.

Abstaining: Bulgaria, Poland, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 14 votes to 1 with 3 abstentions.

32. Mr. WODAJO (Ethiopia) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on the latter part of the last preambular paragraph because, in its view, the General Assembly's reference of the item to the Council for consideration had decided the question of suitability raised in that part of the paragraph. Furthermore, it considered that the Council, having been entrusted with certain functions under the Charter, had no need to undertake a further consultation of all Member States.

33. Mrs. MIRONOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that her delegation was unable to associate itself with a decision of the Council which was a step backward as compared with the positive decision taken by the General Assembly. The last preambular paragraph of the resolution, as adopted, cast doubt on the need for a draft declaration such as the one submitted by her delegation. The Council had been directed to consider the draft declaration, but had failed to do so and had postponed the matter. Her delegation therefore reserved the right to raise the question again at the sixteenth session of the General Assembly.

The meeting rose at 1.55 p.m.