

# United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SEVENTEENTH SESSION

Official Records

**SECOND COMMITTEE, 832nd  
MEETING**



Thursday, 8 November 1962,  
at 3.20 p.m.

**NEW YORK**

## CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Tribute to the memory of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt</i> . . . . .	215
<i>Agenda item 84:</i>	
<i>The Cairo Declaration of Developing Countries</i> <i>(continued)</i>	
<i>Consideration of the joint draft resolution</i> <i>(concluded)</i> . . . . .	215
<i>Agenda item 36:</i>	
<i>Question of holding an international conference on trade problems (continued)</i>	
<i>Consideration of draft resolutions (continued)</i>	218
<i>Agenda item 35:</i>	
<i>Economic development of under-developed countries (continued):</i>	
(c) <i>Industrial development and activities of the organs of the United Nations in the field of industrialization</i>	
<i>Consideration of the draft resolution of Jordan and Poland</i> . . . . .	219

**Chairman:** Mr. Bohdan LEWANDOWSKI  
(Poland).

### Tribute to the memory of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt

1. The CHAIRMAN conveyed to the United States delegation the sympathy of the Committee for the great loss sustained by the people of the United States as a result of the death of Mrs. Roosevelt, who was particularly well known to the United Nations for her interest and participation in its work.

*On the proposal of the Chairman, the members of the Committee observed a minute's silence in tribute to the memory of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt.*

### AGENDA ITEM 84

**The Cairo Declaration of Developing Countries (A/5162, A/C.2/L.650/Rev.2) (continued)**

**CONSIDERATION OF THE JOINT DRAFT RESOLUTION (A/C.2/L.650/REV.2) (concluded)**

2. Mr. FARHADI (Afghanistan) said that he would be ready to withdraw the request he had made at the preceding meeting for a roll-call vote on the joint draft resolution (A/C.2/L.650/Rev.2) and that, if there was no objection, the Committee could consider adopting the draft resolution by acclamation.

3. Mr. SIDIKOU (Niger), supported by Mr. TRAORE (Mali) and Mr. VIAUD (France), thought that delegations should first be given an opportunity to explain their votes before any decision was reached on the draft resolution.

4. In reply to a question from Mr. CARANICAS (Greece), the CHAIRMAN said that, under the rules of procedure, the only case in which explanations of vote were out of order was when a vote was taken by secret ballot. While it was true that, under rule 128, a vote could be taken only by a show of hands, or by standing, or by a roll-call, a precedent had been established in the United Nations whereby certain draft resolutions on which unanimous agreement existed were not pressed to a vote. In the present instance, he would give the floor to delegations wishing to explain their votes before asking the Committee to decide what method of voting it wished to employ.

5. Mr. FRANZI (Italy) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution even though it regretted that the view expressed at the preceding meeting by the Belgian representative, which his delegation fully supported, had not been taken into consideration by the sponsors. In so voting, his delegation wished to indicate the interest with which his Government had followed the work of the Cairo Conference on the Problems of Economic Development and to express its appreciation of the efforts being made by some of the developing countries to speed up their economic progress. By its affirmative vote, moreover, his delegation wished to express its conviction that the economic and social problems of development should be resolved in a spirit of international co-operation and within the framework of the United Nations. However, the hasty closing of the debate a mere two days after the introduction of the first revision of the draft resolution and two hours after the introduction of the second revision had prevented his delegation from expressing its views on the draft, from contributing to an improvement of the text and from taking part in the discussion of the Cairo Declaration of Developing Countries (A/5162), which would have been all the more useful as some delegations attached fundamental importance to the results of the Conference. His affirmative vote, however, did not imply that Italy agreed with all the conclusions of the Cairo Declaration. It would vote for the draft resolution despite the fact that the views expressed and recommendations made at the Conference were those of only some of the developing countries. In fact, the majority of the developing countries had not been represented at the Conference and some of them had not even been invited to participate.

6. Miss HARELI (Israel) said that the Cairo Declaration contained many ideas and proposals with which her Government agreed. It reiterated a number of principles which Israel and all the other Member States had solemnly affirmed in resolutions 1515 (XV) and 1710 (XVI), adopted unanimously by the General Assembly. The Declaration advocated internal measures to be taken by the developing countries and international measures to be taken bilaterally and

through the intermediary of the United Nations, measures which had been formulated in many other resolutions of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council and which her Government fully supported. The Declaration stressed, *inter alia*, the importance of mutual co-operation between developing countries, an idea which her Government had, for some time, actively pursued in principle and practice.

7. On the other hand, she did not fully agree with every point of the Declaration. Other delegations had also indicated that their Government had different positions on some aspects of the Declaration. That was only natural since the Declaration had been formulated by a limited number of countries invited on a selective basis and outside of the United Nations. Nevertheless, her delegation took the occasion to affirm once again its adherence to the ideas and principles which must inspire actions necessary for the advancement of the developing nations.

8. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that his delegation paid tribute to the clarity and realism shown by the sponsors of the Cairo Declaration and thought that all delegations could agree on the general philosophy underlying both the Declaration and the consistent action taken by the United Nations to promote the economic and social advancement of the developing countries. While delegations would be able to agree with the principles of the Cairo Declaration taken as a whole, it was obvious that some might have doubts about some specific principles, such as the need to create a special United Nations fund for economic development mentioned in paragraph 49 of the Declaration.

9. The recommendation in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution which the Committee had before it should be interpreted to mean that Member States, the Economic and Social Council and other United Nations bodies should take into consideration the principles of the Cairo Declaration when dealing with subjects connected with economic and social development to the extent that those principles had been unanimously agreed upon by the United Nations. Moreover, operative paragraph 1 did not seem to reflect the thought of the sponsors: "Notes with interest" might be a better wording and closer to the original English text.

10. Mr. SIDIKOU (Niger) said that, while his delegation sympathized with the principles on which the draft resolution was based, it had reservations concerning both the form and the wording of certain passages. Believing that co-operation and solidarity were achieved through a progressive reconciling of positions and the free exchange of views, his delegation, while not opposed to the draft resolution, could not completely endorse a declaration in the drafting of which it had not participated and on which it had serious reservations. Unfortunately, an unusual and incomprehensible procedure had made it impossible to discuss those reservations objectively. Although those doubts concerned matters of form, they were nevertheless important. Any decision taken without the participation of his country could not bind it in any way. Since Niger had not had the opportunity of expressing its reservations on the Cairo Declaration, it would have to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution. In view of the importance of the debate, he would ask for the vote to be taken by roll-call.

11. Mr. LUBBERS (Netherlands) considered the Cairo Declaration a constructive document, which expressed the views of a number of developing countries on development problems of the highest importance. His Government would take their views into consideration whenever appropriate. He wondered, however, whether there was any useful purpose to be served by a resolution which endeavoured to formalize the attitudes of Governments which had not taken part in the drafting of the Declaration. Even without a resolution, those Governments and the United Nations bodies concerned would undoubtedly take into consideration the principles set forth in the Declaration. Moreover, if his delegation had taken part in the drafting of the Declaration, it would have asked for different wording in certain passages, for example, in the section dealing with regional economic groupings. However, since the draft resolution was a flexible text, his delegation would vote for it.

12. Mr. SERAFIMOV (Bulgaria) was pleased to note that the Cairo Declaration reflected an understanding of the socialist theories of economic development, and in particular such theories as the maximum mobilization of internal resources, planning, the paramount role of the State in industrialization, non-discrimination in international trade and land reform. While his delegation had certain reservations on other points, particularly paragraphs 36 and 48 of the Cairo Declaration, it warmly supported the draft resolution which was before the Committee.

13. Mr. AWOYAMO (Central African Republic) said that the Central African Republic, as an underdeveloped country, was vitally interested in proposals for economic and social development. He hoped that, despite the purely formal difficulties which had arisen in the discussion, unanimity would be achieved in the vote on the draft resolution. He would be unable to support it, however, not having received instructions from his Government.

14. Mr. UNWIN (United Kingdom) pointed out that the Cairo Declaration was useful but did not, of course, include the views of those countries which had not attended the Conference. His delegation could have accepted the original text of the draft resolution and would also vote in favour of the newly revised version. Nevertheless, its recognition of the importance of the Declaration and its warm regard for the statesmanship shown by the participants should not be interpreted as an endorsement of each of the principles adopted at Cairo.

15. Mr. UZAMUGURA (Rwanda) observed that, as a newly independent country, Rwanda found the Cairo Declaration of great value and, as a developing country, could have adhered to its principles. However, as Rwanda had not been invited to the Cairo Conference, it would have to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

16. Mr. USHER (Ivory Coast) said that he too would abstain because, not having been invited to the Cairo Conference, the Ivory Coast could in no way be committed by the decisions adopted there. It was unacceptable that a restricted group of countries should meet and issue a declaration purporting to emanate from the developing countries without inviting many of the African countries concerned. Such an attitude was an affront to his country's sovereignty. He hoped that one day all the developing countries could meet and draw up a declaration that was truly representative.

17. Mr. DOE (Liberia) recalled that Liberia had not sent a representative to Cairo but that the President of Liberia had conveyed a message wishing the Conference every success. The Declaration was comprehensive in scope and forcefully expressed the aspirations of the developing countries. His delegation gave its unqualified support to the revised draft resolution.

18. Mr. GONZALEZ (Costa Rica) warmly supported the draft resolution. Costa Rica had not been represented at the Cairo Conference, but it faced the same problems as the developing countries which had attended. His delegation would vote for the revised draft resolution on the understanding that economic development was not an end in itself but a means towards the achievement of material prosperity, social well-being and democratic rights.

19. Mr. KONATE (Upper Volta) congratulated the countries which had participated in the Cairo Conference on their historic Declaration. Although his delegation agreed with the substance of the Declaration, it could not support the revised draft resolution because, for reasons difficult to understand, the Upper Volta had not been invited to the Cairo Conference. It would therefore abstain.

20. Mr. TOURE (Mauritania) said he would also abstain because, while sympathizing with the principles of the Declaration, Mauritania had not been invited to the Conference, although it was a developing country.

21. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) paid a tribute to the countries which had participated in the Cairo Conference for their wisdom and moderation. There were two or three points in the Declaration with which his delegation was not in full agreement. That was hardly surprising since Greece had not attended the Conference. Nevertheless, it would vote in favour of the draft resolution as a gesture of solidarity.

22. Mr. COOREMAN (Belgium) said that Belgium would vote in favour of the draft resolution because the Cairo Declaration was a useful statement of the problems facing the under-developed countries.

23. Mr. MONTENEGRO (Nicaragua) recalled that his country had been unable to attend the Conference, but it would warmly support the draft resolution because the Declaration was a historic document setting forth the lofty principles of international co-operation for the benefit of the developing countries.

24. Mr. BRILLANTES (Philippines) said that, although his country had not participated in the Conference and although further improvements could have been made in the draft resolution, he would vote for it.

25. Mr. KANE (Senegal) explained that, for the reasons already given by the representatives of Niger and the Ivory Coast, Senegal would abstain in the vote on the draft resolution. In addition, it was unable to accept the introductory words "Notes with appreciation", in operative paragraph 1.

26. Mr. DJENGUE N'DOUMBE (Cameroon) observed that the participants in the Cairo Conference had analysed the difficulties facing the under-developed countries. Nevertheless, Cameroon could not admit that a limited number of developing countries should speak on behalf of all developing countries. Many African countries which could obviously be described as "developing" had been deliberately excluded from

the Conference. His delegation had certain reservations about the text of the draft resolution and would have liked more time to consider further amendments. Unfortunately, the sponsors had pressed for an early vote, in which he intended to abstain.

27. Mr. DIMBU (Romania) welcomed the efforts of the developing countries meeting at Cairo to work out measures to promote their economic and social development and to eliminate the consequences of colonialism and neo-colonialism. The Cairo Declaration was a historic document and a call to positive action. Formerly, the developing countries had been under the domination of foreign monopolies; now they were the masters of their own destiny. As the Declaration rightly stressed, the developing countries must advance mainly through their own efforts, but at the same time, they must be assisted by international action. Some of the provisions of the Declaration called for further analysis, particularly such important matters as unequal trade, the effects of general and complete disarmament and the removal of trade barriers. His delegation warmly supported the draft resolution.

28. Mr. KOUMBOU (Congo, Brazzaville) paid a tribute to the countries which had participated in the Cairo Conference for the efforts they had made to solve the problems facing the under-developed countries. His country was ready to support any measures designed to rescue the under-developed countries from poverty. Nevertheless, it had been somewhat discourteous of the sponsors of the Cairo Conference to take decisions without consulting many developing countries of Africa. That attitude was hardly conducive to international co-operation. While sympathizing with the draft resolution, his delegation would abstain in the vote.

29. Mr. GOLSALA (Chad) stressed that international co-operation to further economic development could not be organized piecemeal. It was intolerable that the organizers of the Cairo Conference had not invited Chad and a number of other African countries. While recognizing the importance of the principles adopted at the Conference, his delegation must regrettably abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

30. Mr. GNAMBAULT (Gabon) said that, while many paragraphs of the Cairo Declaration commanded his approval, Gabon would have submitted amendments to section IV, for example on regional economic groupings, had it been present at the Conference. It was impossible to secure united action by the developing countries if they were not all represented. For that reason, his delegation would abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

31. Mr. TEZEL (Turkey) explained that his vote in favour of the draft resolution should not be construed either as an abandonment of Turkey's reservations concerning the non-representative character of the Cairo Conference or as a complete endorsement of all the principles embodied in the Declaration.

32. Mr. AMIRMOKRI (Iran) observed that Iran had not been represented at the Cairo Conference but would vote for the revised draft resolution. He endorsed the Turkish representative's comments concerning the non-representative character of the Conference.

33. Mr. MITSAKIS (Madagascar) said that if his country had been represented at the Cairo Conference

it would have supported the Declaration. But since many developing countries of Africa had not attended the Conference and since the draft resolution might have been discussed at greater length, his delegation would abstain in the vote.

34. Mr. NARANJO (Ecuador) recalled that Ecuador had sent an observer to the Cairo Conference. It would vote in favour of the draft resolution because the Declaration proposed solutions to many of the problems facing the developing countries.

35. Mr. TCHEN (China) explained that his delegation would support the draft resolution, although it must express reservations concerning the partisan attitude of the participants in the Cairo Conference, an attitude which vitiated their Declaration to a large extent.

36. Mr. TELL (Jordan) explained that Jordan had not been represented at the Cairo Conference but would support the draft resolution because it felt that the principles adopted at Cairo were more important than the composition of the Conference.

37. Mr. LAVENTURE (Dahomey) shared the views which had just been expressed by the other countries of Africa south of the Sahara. The Dahoman delegation could not be committed by the Cairo Declaration and would abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

38. Mr. VIAUD (France), speaking on a point of order, asked the Secretariat to indicate whether the word "intérêt" would not be a more correct translation of the word "satisfaction", in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, and whether the French text should not be amended accordingly.

39. The CHAIRMAN considered that further discussion of the text was not in order as the Committee had reached the stage of voting on it. If a correction of the translation was found necessary, the Secretariat would make the appropriate change.

40. Mr. FRANZI (Italy), speaking on a point of order, said that the Secretary should clarify whether the French text of the draft resolution was correct and whether the change requested by the French representative was appropriate or not. If the existing text was maintained, his delegation would then accept it, but with its own reservations.

41. Mr. MALINOWSKI (Secretary of the Committee) said that he was not in a position to comment on the concordance of the various languages. The original text was English and any errors in the translations of that text would be corrected. He could not at present indicate, however, whether any modification of the translations would be required.

42. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that, in the light of the Secretary's statement and in view of the United Nations practice, according to which all the texts of resolutions were considered authentic, the French text of the draft resolution could not later be modified. His delegation would therefore consider that it was voting according to the text in its present form.

43. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the joint draft resolution (A/C.2/L.650/Rev.2).

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

*Cameroon, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Leopoldville), Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Tanganyika, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia.

*Against:* None.

*Abstaining:* Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Dahomey, France, Gabon, Israel, Ivory Coast, Madagascar, Mauritania, Niger, Rwanda, Senegal, Upper Volta.

*The draft resolution was approved by 84 votes to none, with 15 abstentions.*

44. Mr. CARRILLO (El Salvador) and Mr. MALHOTRA (Nepal) requested that the record of the meeting should indicate that, had their delegations been present at the time of the vote, they would have voted in favour.

## 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 and Add.1-4, E/3631 and Add.1-4) (continued)**

**CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.2/L.645, A/C.2/L.648 AND ADD.1-4) (continued)**

45. Mr. ROSENSTAND-HANSEN (Denmark) said that the complex task of promoting smoothly flowing international trade would require long and painstaking effort. The fundamental issue to be faced by the international conference on trade would be the trade problems of the developing countries, the solution of which would require much thought and new approaches, particularly on the part of the industrialized countries. The main problem was that of increasing the developing countries' participation in world trade. It was for that reason that his delegation had supported Economic and Social Council resolution 917 (XXXIV).

46. The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development would require very careful preparation if it was to develop new ideas and constructive proposals and not be merely an extraordinary session of the Second Committee. The Preparatory Committee would have to perform an important intellectual feat and its conclusions, including those of the agenda of the Conference, would have to be confirmed by the Council and then submitted to member Governments to enable the latter to form their final views on the agenda items. Denmark did not have the necessary resources to offer the constructive contribution which it felt was its duty to make, if the Conference was held in June 1963.

47. While his delegation supported the decision of the Council concerning the membership of the Preparatory Committee, it understood the position of the countries which preferred a larger membership and considered that their desire should be met, as far as possible, provided that it did not hamper or delay the Committee's work. For that reason, his delegation would prefer some modification of operative paragraph 2 of the twenty-eight-Power draft resolution (A/C.2/L.648 and Add.1-4).

48. His delegation did not believe that the Conference should discuss the establishment of a new international trade organization. It should concern itself rather with the urgent practical problems of creating markets for the developing countries. The aim should be to create substantive agreements with the aid of existing machinery such as GATT.

### AGENDA ITEM 35

#### Economic development of under-developed countries (A/5220) (continued):

##### (c) Industrial development and activities of the organs of the United Nations in the field of industrialization (A/C.2/L.649 and Add.1, A/C.2/L.658, E/3600/Rev.1, E/3656, E/3656/Add.1)

#### CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT RESOLUTION OF JORDAN AND POLAND (A/C.2/L.649 AND ADD.1)

49. Mr. NATORF (Poland), introducing, on behalf of its co-sponsors the draft resolution on activities of the United Nations in the field of industrial development (A/C.2/L.649 and Add.1), said that a new phase in the efforts of the United Nations to further the development of the under-developed countries was the current action to promote industrial development. That action was only in its initial stages and would presumably develop as further resources became available. The primary concern at present was to create an appropriate organizational structure. The purpose of the draft resolution sponsored by Jordan and Poland was to encourage the development of that structure in two respects.

50. The sponsors did not seek to modify the procedure laid down by the Economic and Social Council in resolution 873 (XXXIII), and their draft did not enter into the advisability of establishing an agency for industrial development. Its objective, as indicated in section I, was to ensure that the Advisory Committee of Experts established under Economic and Social Council resolution 873 (XXXIII), took into account the need to deal with the problems of industrial development, not in isolation, but in conjunction with the study of natural resources, energy, and water resources and within one organizational

structure. The relationship between such resources and the industries which might use them was quite obvious, and any machinery which might be set up should ensure co-ordinated investigation in both fields. At the regional level, both ECA and ECAFE had a procedure for joint consideration of the two subjects and the link between them should also encourage co-ordination at Headquarters.

51. The Committee for Industrial Development had found itself hampered to some extent by its terms of reference in dealing with the resources aspect of industrial development. Some modification of its terms of reference therefore appeared to be desirable. There was also a need to rationalize the administrative structure of the governmental and Secretariat organs in order to derive the greatest possible benefit from the limited resources available. There already existed an Industrial Development Centre and a Water Resources Development Centre, but the need might well arise to establish centres to deal with other natural resources, and problems bearing on the demarcation of responsibility would then arise. Such difficulties would be eliminated by concentrating all activities in those related fields within a single organizational structure. That would be of particular benefit to the smaller countries which had difficulties in sending technically qualified representatives to a large number of different bodies.

52. The need for the structural revision he had mentioned was urgent and the sponsors of the draft resolution felt it necessary to recommend them to the Advisory Committee of Experts with a view to having the necessary organizational changes made in 1963, as that would obviate the need for further structural reform in 1964. The changes proposed would necessitate some modification of the staff, which would require some time, and it would therefore be desirable to take the decision as soon as possible. Planning should start forthwith so that any new structural arrangement decided upon could be ratified by the General Assembly at its eighteenth session.

53. Section II of the draft resolution was not, as some delegations appeared to have thought, connected with the question of the proposed international conference on trade problems. Its sole purpose was to have long-term theoretical studies undertaken which might eventually form the basis for United Nations action. The Committee for Industrial Development, at its second session, had noted the need for such theoretical studies (E/3600/Rev.1, para. 67).

54. The draft resolution was, in his view, non-controversial and he hoped that it would be adopted unanimously.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.