

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

SEVENTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



SECOND COMMITTEE, 836th
MEETING

Tuesday, 13 November 1962,
at 10.50 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 36:</i>	
<i>Question of holding an international conference on trade problems (continued)</i>	
<i>Consideration of draft resolutions (continued)</i>	239

Chairman: Mr. Bohdan LEWANDOWSKI
(Poland).

AGENDA ITEM 36

Question of holding an international conference on trade problems (A/5221, A/C.2/214, A/C.2/L.645, A/C.2/L.648/Rev.1 and Corr.1 and Add.1, E/3631 and Add.1-4) (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.2/L.645, A/C.2/L.648/REV.1 AND CORR.1 AND ADD.1) (continued)

1. Mr. VIAUD (France) wished, on behalf of his delegation, to congratulate the sponsors of the revised draft resolution (A/C.2/L.648/Rev.1 and Corr.1 and Add.1). Their efforts to work out a text acceptable to all delegations reflected a readiness to compromise which the French delegation fully appreciated. He was glad to see that the preambular paragraph dealing with regional economic groupings had been replaced, as the French delegation had suggested, by the corresponding text of Economic and Social Council resolution 917 (XXXIV), which had been adopted unanimously. The revised text therefore represented a considerable improvement, although it still called for some comment.

2. With regard to the final preambular paragraph, he agreed with other delegations that the word "organisation" in the French text was unsatisfactory, since in the context it conveyed the idea of an institution. That was certainly not what the sponsors of the draft resolution had had in mind. In the same paragraph, it would be advisable to substitute the wording "le cadre des institutions devra être adapté" for the present active construction, so as to bring the French text more into line with the original English.

3. Where operative paragraph 2 was concerned, there was general agreement that the Preparatory Committee should start work as soon as possible and that it would probably have to hold several sessions. Although the Economic and Social Council would certainly not be able to take any decision on the basis of a report submitted as early as at its thirty-fifth session, it would be useful for it to receive an interim report so that it could give the Preparatory Committee additional directives, if necessary. The French delegation therefore agreed to sub-paragraphs (b)

and (c) of the new text. If the membership of the Preparatory Committee was to be enlarged, the French delegation agreed with the United States delegation that it should include representatives of both the developing and the major trading countries of the world. Though it was not opposed to such an enlargement in principle, the French delegation was not yet convinced that adequate representation of the various groups of countries and interests concerned could not be ensured with a membership of less than thirty. Before adopting a definite position, it would like to hear the comments of other members and the replies of the sponsors.

4. With regard to the date of the Conference, which was specified in paragraph 3, the French delegation felt that while the General Assembly was entitled to urge the Economic and Social Council to convene the Conference as soon as possible, it should do so in a practical and realistic manner, taking account not only of the need for careful preparation of the agenda, but also of purely practical considerations. He did not see how, in July 1963, the Economic and Social Council could convene a Conference for a date which would only leave a few weeks for the appointment of representatives and for transmittal of the necessary documents and particularly the Council's final report. The date of September 1963 therefore seemed to be too soon after the thirty-sixth session of the Economic and Social Council. It was also inappropriate for the Assembly to stipulate the date on which the Council should convene the Conference when that power was quite rightly delegated to the Council under the terms of the United Nations Charter. The Assembly should leave the matter to the Council, while drawing its attention to the views expressed by various delegations. All that would be necessary for that purpose would be to delete the concluding phrase of paragraph 3 reading "and not later than September 1963". The Council would no doubt decide on the earliest possible date and the one most likely to ensure the success of the Conference.

5. The French delegation agreed with the United Kingdom delegation that paragraph 5 (b) should be made more explicit and it hoped that that suggestion would be accepted by the sponsors. He wished to reiterate the criticisms he had made in his earlier statement concerning paragraph 5 (c), which dealt with the removal of trade barriers. The removal of barriers must necessarily be a joint undertaking, in which every country, whether industrialized or developing, would have to take part to the best of its ability. The idea of that joint undertaking to remove barriers and liberalize trade was not sufficiently clearly conveyed by the wording of paragraph 5 (c). He hoped that the middle portion of that sub-paragraph would be deleted, and particularly the words "arising from industrialized countries, whether individually or from economic groupings". The deletion

of those words would not in any way restrict the scope of the text or lessen the emphasis on the need for efforts by the industrialized countries to reduce and eventually eliminate obstacles to trade.

6. He might have some further comments to make on the draft resolution at a later stage.

7. Mr. KLUTZNICK (United States of America) expressed his delegation's satisfaction at the efforts which the sponsors had put into preparing the revised text. He hoped that they would achieve the same success as had been achieved the previous year with resolution 1710 (XVI) on the United Nations Development Decade, which had been adopted unanimously. He thanked the representative of Yugoslavia for the clear and precise manner in which he had explained the revised text at the preceding meeting. The United States delegation would like to be able to accept those proposals. He hoped that the sponsors would appreciate that the United States delegation was equally anxious for virtual unanimity on the subject. He wished to correct the quotation from the provisional summary record of the 828th meeting which appeared in the text of the statement made by the representative of Yugoslavia. The sentence quoted should read: "even if, as the Lebanese representative had said, the possible creation of new bodies should be studied in depth, the existing paragraph 4 did not exclude that possibility."

8. During the discussion of the question of convening an international trade conference, there had been numerous references to the need for all parties to co-operate, which implied the need to compromise in certain cases. The United States delegation had gone a long way in that respect. Initially, it had feared that a conference might give rise to polemics, which might disturb activities now being undertaken to assist the developing countries with their trade problems, and particularly the work of Committees II and III of GATT. Economic and Social Council resolution 917 (XXXIV) laid down the foundations for a conference which would not interfere with other activities in the field of trade and provided for the participation of GATT, IMF and other international organizations in the preparation of that conference. The United States delegation had then arrived at a very satisfactory agreement with the delegations of Brazil, Ethiopia, India and Yugoslavia and had given the Council resolution its full support. At the same time, it had expressed the view that a well-prepared and useful conference could not be held before 1964. In the light of what had been agreed in the Economic and Social Council, the United States delegation had not considered it wise to open the question of the agenda in the General Assembly, on the ground that the Preparatory Committee would be better equipped to handle it. However, since the United States was only one of 110 Members, its delegation had deferred to the views of those who had wished to give general indications to the Preparatory Committee. It would have preferred paragraph 4 (d) of the original text (A/C.2/L.648 and Add.1-4) to paragraph 5 (d) of the revised text, but it believed that, as the representative of Burma had indicated, the real work on the agenda and the real job of making the international conference successful would still be left to the Preparatory Committee.

9. Although it believed that a Preparatory Committee of eighteen members could work more effectively, the United States delegation was willing to accept an

increase, provided that there was equitable geographical distribution and that proper provision was made for the adequate representation of both the developing and the major trading countries. The slight amendment to paragraph 2 (a) proposed by the United States merely supported the thesis that the work of the Preparatory Committee should be a dialogue between the different interests and not merely a non-productive monologue.

10. The United States Government had made plans to participate in the first meeting of the Preparatory Committee in March 1963, in accordance with Economic and Social Council resolution 917 (XXXIV). The United States delegation was, however, willing to agree to the first meeting being held in January 1963, as suggested by the representative of Yugoslavia. As that representative had stated, the Preparatory Committee would probably have to meet three times, which would bring its work up to the end of August 1963.

11. The United States delegation had noted with satisfaction that the new text not only endorsed the Economic and Social Council's decision to convene a United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, but also clearly provided that the necessary documentation would be prepared on the lines indicated in the resolution, which meant that such agencies as FAO, IMF and GATT would play their appropriate role in the preparatory work.

12. Despite misgivings over certain other provisions, the United States delegation was prepared to support the draft resolution before the Committee except for one major point, the deadline for convening the Conference. It was convinced that no conference decided on by the Economic and Social Council in July 1963 could usefully be held before the early part or the middle of 1964. A shorter period would not give proper time for the preparatory work that would have to be done not only by the Secretariat and the other international agencies involved, but also by the Governments which would participate in the Conference. It thought that the representative of Yugoslavia had been wise to envisage the possibility of a third session of the Preparatory Committee in August 1963. However, documentation presented in August could not be translated, distributed to Governments and carefully considered during the few remaining months of 1963, particularly since that period would also coincide with the eighteenth session of the General Assembly. Governments would not be ready by September to deal with concrete proposals. The United States delegation appreciated that, under Article 62, paragraph 4, of the Charter, the Economic and Social Council had full power to set the date of the Conference, but it prided itself on honouring its commitments, whether explicit or implicit, and it could not in good conscience vote for a text setting a date which it was convinced was neither feasible nor desirable. Moreover, its fears were shared by many other delegations. It strongly urged, therefore, that the last six words of operative paragraph 3 should be deleted or replaced by the following: "Taking into account the views expressed during the General Assembly's consideration of that matter". Such language would bring to the attention of the Council the views of those who believed that the Conference should be held in 1963 as well as the views of those who were convinced that more time was needed. That amendment would enable the United States delegation to vote in favour of the draft resolution as presented.

13. The United States delegation was convinced that the Conference should concentrate on the trade problems of developing countries. Its work should include a discussion of trade between the developing countries and the developed countries with centrally planned economies as well as those which used the system of free enterprise. In that connexion, it welcomed the language of paragraph 5 (a) (i).

14. It was quite aware that there were trade problems between the developed free-enterprise countries and the countries with centrally planned economies. The United States had its share of complaints against the trade practices of the Soviet bloc, but it felt that they would be out of place at the Conference. Whatever concrete steps were taken at the Conference should be directed solely towards promoting the trade of the developing countries. In the circumstances, why should the USSR insist on bringing its complaints to the Conference and attempting to obtain certain advantages? If the free-enterprise countries and the member countries of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (COMECON) stressed their mutual complaints at the Conference, the urgent problems of the developing countries would be thrust into the background. It seemed little enough to ask, since the Soviet Union representative had pointed out in his last statement that his country had no need of a trade conference for its benefit. The United States delegation interpreted paragraph 5 (c) as meaning that the Conference would consider the expansion of trade in general as a consequence of the improvement of markets for the developing countries, without dealing with any complaints which the Western industrial countries and the member countries of COMECON might have.

15. Any conference must in the nature of things be limited in its duration and agenda. The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development would have to deal with the various aspects of many trade problems; it could not deal with them all, whether it lasted two weeks or six. What was important was that it should devote itself to the trade problems of the developing countries. If it did anything else, it would belie all that had been said regarding the urgency of those problems and it would be missing an historic opportunity. The United States delegation was well aware that there were other problems, but it was anxious for the Conference to concentrate on its real aim. It was therefore willing to offer its full co-operation and it hoped that the Committee would be able to come to a unanimous decision.

16. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had been quite sincere in saying that it felt the sponsors of the revised draft resolution were displaying a spirit of co-operation and a constructive attitude. However, that did not in any way mean that the Soviet delegation was completely satisfied with the latest version of the draft resolution. The statements of the French and the United States representatives reflected a continuous effort to undermine the practical proposals that had been presented. Those representatives had apparently felt that the sponsors of the draft resolution were weakening on certain points. In order to obtain a version which was completely in line with their wishes, they were exerting constant pressure, which they applied in a different sector every day. The Soviet delegation deplored the general watering-down of the resolution. With regard to the

date of convening the Conference, for example, all sorts of arguments, as bizarre as they were groundless, had been produced in an attempt to show that the Preparatory Committee could not meet before a certain date and that the Conference could not take place before 1964. One might just as well say 1965 or 1966. The draft resolution, however, was perfectly clear. The Economic and Social Council had already decided at its thirty-fourth session that the Conference would be held in 1963. The same was true of the Cairo Declaration of Developing Countries (A/5162). Even though the draft resolution had postponed the Conference from July to September 1963, it was still under attack. The desire to convene the Conference in 1963 was evidence of a realistic attitude and showed a sincere desire for its success. On the other side, it looked as though increasing efforts were being made to stifle the draft resolution.

17. The United States declared, moreover, that it could not agree to the Soviet Union bringing its own complaints to the Conference. But the Soviet Union had no intention of doing so; it had already said that if the United States did not wish to trade with the socialist countries, that was its own affair. However, there were many questions of a practical nature which were of interest to all countries, such as the improvement of the terms of international trade, its expansion, the removal of all types of barriers to international trade. The United States had not objected to using an international conference as a framework for the discussion of coffee, wheat, tin or zinc; why then should it object to the forthcoming Conference dealing in a more general manner with the concrete problems of international trade? The representative of France, for his part, thought that the 110 Members of the General Assembly should be deprived of their right to consider the question of convening the Conference. He regarded that question as the private province of the Economic and Social Council and its eighteen members. Who had given the Council such powers? No one, it was a pure invention on his part. It was perfectly clear that all such arguments were merely being used as a pretext by certain countries to enlist support for their own points of view. The General Assembly would not be deceived and would make its decision quite independently, thus ensuring the success of the Conference.

18. In many respects, the revised draft resolution did not meet the views of the Soviet Union. In his statement at the preceding meeting, the Yugoslav representative had implied that the new text did not exclude the possibility of modifying the existing institutional arrangements. However, none of the new variants or suggestions represented the viewpoint of the Soviet Union in the matter. The Soviet delegation had supported the six-Power amendments (A/C.2/L.651/Rev.1), and that was the only text it could accept. Although the changes made in the new version of the draft resolution apparently satisfied the sponsors of the amendments, they did not correspond to the position of the Soviet delegation, which wanted the Conference to be able to examine the question of establishing a trade organization. Lastly, the fourth and tenth preambular paragraphs of the revised draft resolution rightly implied that the solution of trade problems must depend on the co-operation of all countries. However, the draft resolution said nothing about the need to invite to the Conference all countries which desired to participate in it, as the Soviet Union had proposed. It was quite clear that the

success of the Conference would depend on the widest possible participation, since its main purpose was to expand world trade. Unless that was clearly stated in the draft resolution, it would be of relatively little value.

19. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) expressed appreciation of the conciliatory attitude shown by the sponsors of the revised draft resolution and congratulated the representative of Yugoslavia on his able statement, by which the Committee should be guided in examining the provisions of the revised draft resolution. Although the two main difficulties—the membership of the Preparatory Committee and the date of the Conference—might not have been solved to the general satisfaction, they at least had been sufficiently reduced to enable the Committee to reach agreement.

20. He thought that the ninth preambular paragraph would be improved by adoption of the Soviet Union's suggestion. With regard to operative paragraph 2 (a), the Greek delegation still believed that, in the interests of efficiency, the membership of the Preparatory Committee should be limited, but it was prepared to bow to the majority view and to accept the existing text with the insertion of a reference to the major trading countries, as suggested by the United States. Where paragraph 3 was concerned, he remained convinced that it would not be possible to convene the Conference before the beginning of 1964. He would, however, vote for the text as it stood, because it probably offered the only possibility of securing a majority of the votes. After the exchange of views between the United States and the Soviet Union, there could be no doubt that the text of paragraph 5 (a) (i) was generally acceptable; the same applied to the drafting proposal which the United Kingdom had made in connexion with paragraphs 5 (a) (iv) and (b). With regard to paragraph 5 (c), he thought that the phrase to which the French representative had objected should be deleted and suggested that the word "progressive" should be inserted before the word "measures" and the words "as a consequence" after the words "developing countries and". Lastly, the text of sub-paragraph (d) was too long and cumbersome and might have been improved; delegations were apparently firmly resolved to maintain their positions with regard to possible organizational arrangements; in any event, the final decision would rest with the Preparatory Committee.

21. He therefore hoped that the text of the revised draft resolution could be adopted unanimously, subject to the small number of amendments that had been proposed.

22. Mr. KLUTZNICK (United States of America), exercising his right of reply, deplored the fact that the Soviet Union had seen fit to use military terms to describe the position of certain countries in the present debate. He was sure that the Soviet Union representative would be prepared to concede that the United States, for example, held as strong views as his own on certain points. The United States delegation had never wished to impede the discussion of any relevant question; it merely wished to emphasize that the Conference should concentrate its attention on the trade and development problems of the developing countries. It was true that the United States had taken part in an international conference on coffee, but there had been no question of discussing caviar at that conference. Similarly, the agenda of

the forthcoming Conference should be primarily concerned with the problem of the developing countries.

23. The Soviet Union suddenly appeared to have detected some sinister scheme behind the discussion of the date of the Conference. The United States had, however, never concealed its view that the Conference should be held in 1964; others were free to opt for 1963 if they wished. In that connexion, the Economic and Social Council had adopted a diplomatic formula, which had made it possible for all parties to adhere to their positions; that was still the best solution. The best way of avoiding what the United States regarded as impossible and the Soviet Union as undesirable was to leave the decision to the Preparatory Committee, which would be in a better position to settle the question in the full knowledge of the facts.

24. Mr. VIAUD (France), also exercising his right of reply, pointed out that, far from being an "invention" on his part, the authority of the Economic and Social Council to call international conferences was explicitly recognized in Article 62 of the Charter. If the General Assembly was absolutely resolved to do so, it could undoubtedly revoke that authority and substitute itself for the Council, but common sense suggested that a power that had once been conferred should not be withdrawn. The Assembly could, of course, give directives on points which were not covered by Council resolution 917 (XXXIV) or on points to which it attached special importance, but there again it was all a question of where the line should be drawn. The Council must be left sufficient freedom of action to take a decision in the light of the conclusions of the Preparatory Committee; the enlargement of that Committee would ensure that its work provided a basis for the best possible decision by the Council on the date and agenda of the Conference. In urging that powers and responsibilities should be divided between the Council and the Assembly, France was motivated solely by a desire for the most effective organization of the work.

25. Mr. UNWIN (United Kingdom) said that the sponsors of the draft resolution had made a number of improvements in their text and paid a tribute to their untiring efforts to reduce the differences of opinion that existed.

26. The new version submitted to the Committee was unfortunately still not entirely satisfactory, because it retained a number of provisions that were not readily acceptable. The United Kingdom was prepared to make the maximum concessions, but could not sacrifice the essential requirement of practicability. He agreed with the Yugoslav representative that countries which depended for their exports on a narrow range of agricultural products should be included among the developing countries. Although the United Kingdom was a highly developed country, it had very close ties with a number of those countries and fully appreciated the need to keep their problems in view; it might perhaps even be possible to refer to them specifically in the text of the draft resolution.

27. Furthermore, while the developing countries might have difficulties in their trade relations with the socialist countries as well as with the major trading nations, such problems might require a different solution and one which might be difficult to find, even though a relatively small volume of trade was concerned. The socialist countries did not for

the most part live on their trade and had not therefore felt the same need to organize themselves in institutions such as GATT, as had the Western countries. That organization had grown and was still growing. The United Kingdom agreed that the draft resolution should emphasize the need for increasing trade between the developing and developed countries irrespective of the differences in the foreign trade systems of the latter; but it saw no need to do so three times in operative paragraph 5. Nor did it think that the problem of East-West trade should be raised at the present time and, like the United States, was ready to refrain from all argument on that point, if the Soviet Union was prepared to follow suit.

28. The explanation which the Yugoslav representative had given at the preceding meeting with regard to sub-paragraph (a) (iv) of paragraph 5 had been extremely useful and the new text of that sub-paragraph was preferable to the old, because it limited the field to be discussed. The remainder of the paragraph seemed, however, much too detailed and might give the experts directives which were unduly rigid. In particular, it should be possible to delete "including a consideration of the development of trade relations . . ." at the end of sub-paragraph (d) (i), because the same idea was already expressed in sub-paragraph (a) (i). Similarly, it would be preferable to delete the words "of creating conditions for expanded membership" in sub-paragraph (d) (ii), because, if the bodies in question were United Nations bodies, they already had their rules of membership, and if they were not, it was not for the Preparatory Committee to discuss their membership.

29. The sponsors had deferred the date of the Conference from June 1963 to September 1963. That additional interval was, however, still too short to enable the Secretariat to prepare the necessary documentation or to allow Governments to study it. The United Kingdom had always held that it was not feasible to hold a useful conference until 1964. It therefore agreed with France and the United States that the words "and not later than September 1963" should be deleted from operative paragraph 3.

30. The membership of the Preparatory Committee should be determined with due regard to equitable geographical distribution and to an adequate representation of developing and major trading countries, as proposed by the United States representative. The United Kingdom was by no means sure that efficiency would benefit by appointing twelve new members but, in the interests of compromise, it was prepared to accept some increase.

31. Mr. ROSENSTAND-HANSEN (Denmark) said that he was in general agreement with the United States representative but wished to pay a special tribute to the conciliatory attitude shown by the sponsors of the draft resolution and to the Yugoslav representative's efforts. The main purpose of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development should be to develop trade between developing and developed countries, irrespective of the differences in the trade systems of the latter, as was very clearly stated in operative paragraph 5 (a) (i) of the draft resolution. The problem of East-West trade must not therefore take first priority, because they were not so urgent as those of the developing countries. Denmark maintained excellent trade relations with the countries of the East and hoped that they would become continuously closer in the future.

32. In paragraph 5 (c), it would be preferable to make the deletion requested by the French representative and to add the words "as a consequence" before the words "the expansion of international trade in general". In addition, the words "and not later than September 1963" in paragraph 3 should be deleted, because it would be neither possible to complete the necessary preparations before September 1963 nor practical to convene the Conference at the same time as the General Assembly. It was for the Economic and Social Council to set the date for the opening of the Conference, bearing in mind the Preparatory Committee's recommendations. If paragraph 3 was so amended and if the words "as a consequence" were added in paragraph 5 (c), the Danish delegation would be able to vote for the draft resolution.

33. Mr. TODOROV (Bulgaria) considered that it was going too far to maintain a rigid position and to postpone the convening of the Conference until 1964 on the pretext that the Preparatory Committee would necessarily have to hold a particularly important third session. It would be preferable for the preparations for the Conference to be successfully completed at the second session of the Preparatory Committee; in addition, even if it proved necessary to hold a third session, its purpose would certainly be only to put the finishing touches to some points of detail.

34. He announced that his delegation had joined with that of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic in submitting an amendment (A/C.2/L.672) to operative paragraph 4 of the revised draft resolution.

35. Mr. BRONNIKOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) explained that the amendment of the two Powers consisted of the insertion, at the beginning of operative paragraph 4, of the following new sub-paragraph (a): "To invite all States Members of the United Nations, and any other States which so desire, to take part in the Conference;". The absence of such a provision was indeed inexplicable, especially in view of the universality of international trade. A sense of reality must not be lost. Obviously, all countries of the world must be invited to the Conference, because they all took part in international trade, whether States Members of the United Nations or not or whether they maintained diplomatic relations with others or not. To invite them was in the interest of the developing countries. In any event, there were precedents, because it was precisely in order to be realistic that the Social Commission had agreed to include a similar provision in its draft resolution on the planning of balanced economic and social development.^{1/} The sponsors of the amendment therefore hoped that their proposal would be duly taken into account.

36. Mr. WEIDINGER (Austria) felt that, at the current preliminary stage, care should be exercised to avoid any action which would diminish the chances of obtaining at the Conference practical results in the interest of all countries and, first and foremost, of the developing countries. His delegation had hoped that the sponsors of the draft would produce a text that would be generally accepted; he therefore regretted that the time for convening the Conference specified in the revised version was still too early. In his opinion, it would be wiser to abide by the compromise, at which the Economic and Social Coun-

^{1/} See Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Thirty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 12, para. 109, draft resolution II.

cil had arrived in resolution 917 (XXXIV) and to refrain from mentioning any specific date. It was possible that, by the time the Preparatory Committee finished its work, the situation might have altered or that some countries now advocating an early Conference might have changed their position. It was more realistic to let time have its effect; the essential point was not to establish a rigid time-table for the work. He therefore urged all delegations to accept the deletion of the words "and not later than September 1963" in operative paragraph 3 in order to promote the agreement on which the success of the Conference would depend.

37. Mr. BOLT (New Zealand) recalled that the problems with which the Conference would deal were of direct concern to his country. If New Zealand was invited to participate in the Preparatory Committee of thirty members, it would certainly make its full contribution. It was precisely because it was fully aware of the technical difficulties to be resolved and of the need to undertake long and careful preparation that New Zealand urged that the date of the Conference should not be set finally at the present stage. As it was obvious that the Conference could hardly give proper attention to the problems submitted to it if it was convened in 1963, the best plan would be to decide that the Conference was to be held as soon as possible after the Preparatory Committee had com-

pleted its work. He hoped that the sponsors of the draft resolution would make their text more flexible in order to muster the widest support.

38. Mr. TODOROV (Bulgaria) said that if the sponsors submitted or accepted a formal amendment designed to not hold the Conference in September 1963, his delegation reserved the right to correct such an unfortunate step by reintroducing a proposal to convene the Conference in 1963.

39. Mr. STANOVNIK (Yugoslavia) assured the Committee that the sponsors of the draft resolution would carefully study all the suggestions made in the course of the discussion. As the Committee's agenda was very heavy, it was essential for it to vote soon on the draft resolution. If the sponsors wished to submit a new revised version of their text or if delegations submitted oral amendments at the last moment, he hoped that the Chairman would not interpret rule 121 of the rules of procedure too strictly and would not insist on putting to the vote only texts circulated to all delegations not later than the day preceding the meeting.

40. The CHAIRMAN, observing that no delegation objected to that suggestion, said that he would take it into account when applying rule 121 of the rules of procedure.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.