

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTIETH SESSION

Official Records



**SECOND COMMITTEE, 1008th  
MEETING**

Wednesday, 8 December 1965,  
at 10.50 a.m.

**NEW YORK**

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 37:</i>	
<i>Report of the United Nations Conference on     Trade and Development (continued) . . . . .</i>	303
<i>Organization of the Committee's work. . . . .</i>	306

*Chairman:* Mr. Pierre FORTHOMME  
(Belgium).

AGENDA ITEM 37

Report of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (*continued*) (A/5838, A/5852, A/5870/Rev.1, A/5886, A/6003/Add.1, A/6023 and Add.1-3; A/C.2/L.829, L.833 and Add.1-3, A/C.2/L.836/Rev.1)

1. Mr. WOULBROUN (Belgium) said that the organizational machinery of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development having been established, its procedures should be clearly laid down so that a technical and legal framework could be established for the future. The time had now come for it to choose whether it would merely discuss theories or become an effective organization for defining specific problems with a view to negotiations and practical results.

2. He fully supported the realistic approach of the Secretary-General of the Conference to practical problems in his introductory statement (1001st meeting). Negotiations on commodities were the real test of the ability of the Conference to promote agreement on specific questions. He had noted the Secretary-General's encouraging views regarding cocoa, and assured him that Belgium would not lack the political will to reach an agreement. The sugar situation was much less satisfactory, and the Secretary-General's suggestion that a small working group should be set up to study the problems was wise.

3. Some important ideas emerged from the discussions on trade policy. The first was that differences in the level of economic development between countries must be taken into account in framing such policy. Secondly, tariff reductions in favour of the developing countries were now recognized as accepted practice. Thirdly, the principle of non-reciprocity had been established. Fourthly, trade between developing countries should be liberalized and developed. As far as the last two ideas were concerned, the essential purpose was sometimes overlooked, in the developing countries' desire to find outlets for their goods in the industrialized countries. Industrialization did not mean only the production of goods

for export but also the raising of the level of living of the producer. At the Conference, there had been divergent views on the automatic extension of preferences to the developing countries. In that regard, the proposals submitted by Belgium to the Conference and known as the Brasseur Plan<sup>1/</sup> were not monolithic, to be rejected or accepted as a whole. The ideas it contained could be improved and should be discussed. His delegation believed that the granting of temporary preferences was a valid solution only if they were adapted to the particular circumstances of each case and to conditions in important markets. They would have their greatest impact if development was conceived in the context of regional organizations of developing countries. While a comprehensive trade plan for all countries and products had its attractions, experience had shown that, in such a technical and complex field, only agreements negotiated with full respect for the sovereignty of all parties could achieve useful results. Such agreements could be bilateral or multilateral, and might be general if they were related to a specific commodity.

4. His country had acceded to the Convention on Transit Trade of Land-locked States. However, the experience of the European Economic Community had shown that it was extremely difficult to reach agreement on even the limited abandonment of sovereignty. It would not be realistic for the Conference to seek a magic formula; its essential function was to define specific problems, to overcome the technical difficulties and to prepare the ground for negotiations.

5. Mr. LUBBERS (Netherlands) said that the draft resolution on the transit trade of land-locked countries (A/C.2/L.836/Rev.1) was in general very useful and that he would vote for it. At the end of the fourth preambular paragraph, the words "as a step towards the normalization of transit trade of land-locked countries" were too general, as there were already a number of land-locked countries whose trade was normalized, for example, certain European countries. Again, with respect to operative paragraph 1, the eight principles adopted by the Geneva Conference had already been reaffirmed in the preamble to the Convention itself. He suggested that the phrase "in accordance with the spirit of the Convention" or the words "the spirit of" should be deleted.

6. Sir Keith UNWIN (United Kingdom) said that the reason why the Committee had originally decided to hold the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development was that many members of the Committee considered that it was unable to tackle urgent prob-

<sup>1/</sup> See *Proceedings of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development*, volume II: *Policy Statements* (United Nations publication, Sales No.: 64.II.B.12), part three.

lems because its agenda was already over-loaded. The permanent Conference was now responsible for laying down the broad lines of work and the Board for their execution and supervision of its subordinate bodies. Both the Conference and the Board reported to the General Assembly, so that the Committee should express its views on their work. The comments at the present session had not been substantial. The Board had now organized itself and selected priority items for attention. The technical committees of the Board, if they followed its example, could show the way to detailed negotiations, which was the only way to obtain specific commitments.

7. As to the possibility of reaching commodity agreements, his delegation, while not subscribing to every detail of the analysis by the Secretary-General of the Conference, agreed that there was a reasonable hope of an agreement on cocoa provided that producers recognized the features to which consumers attached greatest importance and vice versa. With goodwill and understanding the problems could be overcome.

8. He hoped that the Committee's impatience to see results would not lead it into the error of trying to do the work of the Conference for it. Moreover, it was important to recognize and preserve what the Board had already done and agreed on. The United States representative had pointed out that the Board recognized the value of agreed solutions to which all countries could subscribe. The Committee's recent decisions showed that it shared that recognition. When the Board was unable, for lack of time, to discuss particular points which had been referred to it by the Conference, the Committee should not try to undertake to settle them at its higher level. An encouraging feature had been the Board's agreement on the site for the permanent headquarters of the Conference. That decision should be unanimously endorsed so that the Secretary-General could complete his organizational arrangements and continue preparations for the next session of the Conference.

9. Draft resolution A/C.2/L.833 contained references to the recommendations of the Conference and to a resolution of the Board. While the Board's decisions should be confirmed by a General Assembly resolution so that its work could proceed smoothly, the resolution adopted in the Assembly should adhere closely to the wording of the original decisions, to avoid re-opening the discussion of matters already settled.

10. His delegation would vote for draft resolution A/C.2/L.836/Rev.1 since operative paragraph 2 had been reworded. However, he would like the sponsors to clarify what they had in mind in operative paragraph 3. He was not clear in what way the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Secretary-General of the Conference could be guided by the terms of the resolution in assisting the land-locked countries.

11. Mr. BELEOKEN (Cameroon) said that Cameroon supported draft resolution A/C.2/L.836/Rev.1 as it had always sought to promote the trade of all countries, whether or not they had a sea coast. At the United Nations Conference on Transit Trade of Land-locked Countries it had played an active part and had been one of the first to sign the Convention. He there-

fore hoped that all Member States would sign the Convention so that it could enter into force as soon as possible. His country was already extending all possible facilities to its land-locked neighbours and would like to co-sponsor the resolution.

12. Mr. KARIM (Afghanistan), speaking on behalf of the co-sponsors, suggested in response to the comments by the Netherlands representative that the word "all" should be added before "land-locked countries" at the end of the fourth preambular paragraph. He also accepted the deletion of the words "in accordance with the spirit of the Convention" in operative paragraph 1. With regard to the comment by the representative of the United Kingdom, the request in operative paragraph 3 was not new as it had already appeared in a draft resolution (TD/TRANSIT/L.96/Rev.1) submitted by Afghanistan which the United Nations Conference on Transit Trade of Land-locked Countries had adopted unanimously.

*Draft resolution A/C.2/L.836/Rev.1, as amended, was adopted by 77 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.*

13. Mr. RENAUD (France) said that, at the Conference on Transit Trade, his delegation had voiced reservations regarding the results achieved. Moreover, France had not adhered to the Convention. Because of those reservations, which related particularly to operative paragraph 2, it had abstained on the draft resolution.

14. Mr. REISCH (Austria) said that his country had fully supported the preparations for the Convention and the Convention itself and had therefore voted for the draft resolution. It agreed with the Netherlands representative's comments on the words "all land-locked countries" in the last preambular paragraph, as amended, since it had no transit trade problems with neighbouring countries.

15. Mr. ALLANA (Pakistan) said that his delegation had abstained on the draft resolution for reasons it had made clear at the Conference on Transit Trade. Its main reservation concerned operative paragraph 2.

16. Mr. DJOUDI (Algeria) said his delegation had abstained on the draft resolution because its adoption by the Committee could in no way imply any obligation towards certain governmental authorities whose very existence was a negation of international law and was based either on the usurpation of territorial rights or on a reign of terror.

17. Mr. Saad KHALIL (United Arab Republic) said that, while his delegation in principle fully supported the draft resolution, he had abstained in the vote because operative paragraph 2, in particular, was not clear enough to indicate the extent to which the draft resolution could be binding on Governments which were still studying the Convention and had not yet decided whether they should sign it; furthermore, it made no reference to the reservations which Governments might have.

18. In so far as his Government was concerned, it had reservations concerning the trade of the occupied part of Palestine with all its surrounding areas. That was why, while supporting the principle, his delegation had cast an abstaining vote.

19. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) explained that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it would benefit the land-locked countries. As a transit State, the Soviet Union had consistently borne in mind the interests of its land-locked neighbours and was always ready to consider proposals for improving their position. The socialist countries had taken an active part in the formulation of the Convention and considered the draft resolution useful and necessary.

20. Mr. DELGADO (Senegal) said that, for reasons beyond his control, he had been absent during the vote but, if he had been present, he would have abstained. He was not opposed to the substance of the text but did not consider that the General Assembly was entitled to request States to sign the Convention by a certain date. That was a matter for Governments themselves to decide.

21. Mr. PETERS (Dahomey) said his delegation had abstained, not because it refused to co-operate in furthering the interests of the land-locked countries but because of the reservations it had expressed at the Conference on Transit Trade and because of the legal difficulties involved in operative paragraph 2.

22. Mr. SOLANO LOPEZ (Paraguay) said his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because, as a land-locked country, Paraguay firmly supported any measure designed to establish principles, standards and facilities which would help the land-locked countries to overcome the disadvantages of their geographical situation. If time permitted, Paraguay would have been glad to be included among the sponsors of the draft.

23. Mr. BLAU (United States of America) said his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution in order to express support of the Convention. Nevertheless, he had certain doubts as to the exact meaning of the words "as a step towards the normalization of transit trade of all land-locked countries" in the final preambular paragraph and could accept no commitment concerning any further steps the sponsors had in mind. There was no sign of the phrase in question in the Convention itself and it seemed unwise to include in the draft resolution conclusions different from those reached by the Conference on Transit Trade.

24. His delegation also wished to express reservations concerning operative paragraph 3. It was difficult to see what action the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Secretary-General of the Conference could take apart from following the provisions of the United Nations Charter and the directives of the General Assembly and other United Nations organs. In particular, the Secretary-General of the Conference could not assist in the settlement of political disputes, and the provision of technical assistance was the task of other parts of the Secretariat.

25. Mr. AL-GAILANI (Iraq) said his delegation supported the draft resolution in principle but had abstained for lack of instructions.

26. Sir Keith UNWIN (United Kingdom) said he had voted in favour of the draft resolution because, as a

trading nation, the United Kingdom was concerned with trade with the land-locked countries and because it believed the Convention on Transit Trade of Land-locked States would lead to the removal of practical difficulties. However, his vote did not imply any commitment by the United Kingdom as regards signature of the Convention. The text was being studied by the United Kingdom authorities but they had not yet reached a decision.

27. Mr. BRADLEY (Argentina) said his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because, as a transit country, Argentina had always advanced the interests of its two land-locked neighbours and had taken an active part in the formulation of the Convention.

28. Mr. HEWITSON (South Africa) said that he had voted for the draft resolution but wished to express a reservation concerning operative paragraph 2 and, in particular, the time-limit specified therein.

29. Mr. PARDO (Malta) said his delegation had voted for the draft resolution as a gesture of goodwill towards the land-locked countries and because the Convention would benefit both the land-locked and the transit States. However, he had grave doubts whether the time-limit laid down in operative paragraph 2 was either wise or juridically correct.

30. Mr. RAMACHANDRAN (India) said he had voted in favour of the draft resolution because of his country's great interest in the problems of the land-locked States and because it had participated in the drafting of the Convention in that spirit. India also had some difficulty regarding the time-limit mentioned in operative paragraph 2.

31. Mr. OSANYA NYNEQUE (Kenya) said he had voted in favour of the draft resolution because, as a transit State, Kenya fully recognized the interests of land-locked countries. It was essential to maintain a balance between the rights of the land-locked States and the rights of the transit States.

32. He supported the reservations expressed by the United States delegation concerning operative paragraph 3 and stressed that Kenya's affirmative vote did not mean that it was committed to signing the Convention by 31 December 1965.

33. Mr. INGRAM (Australia) said his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution but its vote did not imply commitment to accede to the Convention.

34. Mr. TARDOS (Hungary) explained that he had voted in favour of the draft resolution to express support for the principles it embodied. Nevertheless, the reservations voiced by Hungary at the Conference on Transit Trade were still valid and it could not assume any obligations concerning operative paragraph 2.

35. Mr. RAPHAEL (Venezuela) said his delegation's favourable vote should be construed as an endorsement of the principles contained in the draft resolution, but that his Government could not undertake to complete its study of the Convention and to sign it by 31 December 1965.

36. Mr. TIGOUÉ (Togo) said he had voted in favour of the draft resolution out of sympathy for the position

of the land-locked countries, but felt that the inclusion of the time-limit in operative paragraph 2 was unwise.

37. Mr. WOULBROUN (Belgium) also expressed reservations concerning operative paragraph 2, although his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole. He hoped that the sponsors might change the wording of that paragraph before the text was submitted to the General Assembly. In particular, they might change the word "Requests" to the words "Expresses the hope".

38. Mr. GONZALEZ MACHADO (Dominican Republic) expressed reservations concerning operative paragraph 2 although his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution out of sympathy for the land-locked countries.

39. Mr. KONE (Upper Volta) expressed the hope that a way might be found to extend the time-limit specified in operative paragraph 2.

40. Mr. ABIOLA (Nigeria) said his delegation had abstained because it had strong objections to the words "as a step towards the normalization of transit trade of all land-locked countries" in the final preambular paragraph and because a liberal interpretation of the text might include the oppressive régime of Southern Rhodesia. He hoped that changes would be made in the text before it was voted on in plenary meeting.

41. Mr. CAMEJO ARGUDIN (Cuba) said he supported the principles of the draft resolution and had voted for it but expressed reservations concerning the time-limit in operative paragraph 2.

42. The CHAIRMAN asked the Director of the General Legal Division to give the Committee some guidance on the legal implications of the request contained in operative paragraph 2.

43. Mr. SCHACHTER (Secretariat) said that the date by which countries were requested in operative paragraph 2 to sign the Convention had not been introduced arbitrarily by the sponsors: 31 December 1965 had been specified, as was normal practice, in the Convention itself, as the last date for signature. It was open to States to accede at a later date.

44. Mr. VENEGAS (Colombia) said that he had been absent during the vote but would have voted in favour of the draft, with the same reservations as had been voiced by a number of other delegations on operative paragraph 2.

45. Mr. BARIGYE (Uganda), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that his delegation's sponsorship of the resolution should not be taken as indicating any dissatisfaction with the transit facilities provided for his country by neighbouring East African States, but as an expression of its desire to see the benefit of such excellent arrangements extended to other countries.

46. Mr. SUAREZ (Philippines) said that his delegation's vote in favour of the resolution did not imply

any commitment to sign or accede to the Convention by a given date.

47. Mr. CHAVEZ (El Salvador) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the resolution but had reservations on the time-limit laid down in operative paragraph 2.

#### Organization of the Committee's work

48. The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee to decide in which order it wished to consider agenda item 44 (Conversion to peaceful needs of the resources released by disarmament), item 45 (Permanent sovereignty over natural resources) and item 46 (Population growth and economic development). He pointed out that the order in which those items appeared in his note (A/C.2/L.791) did not imply any assignment of priority, and that the whole of Friday, 10 December, would have to be set aside for consideration of item 52 (World Food Programme). It should also be borne in mind that the Committee had not completed its consideration of item 37, that it had not considered item 100, and that draft resolutions had been submitted on items 44, 45, 46 and 96.

49. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), supported by Mr. BARIGYE (Uganda) and Mr. BLUSZTAJN (Poland), said that it might expedite the work if a representative of the sponsors of each of the draft resolutions on items 44, 45 and 46 introduced the draft resolution concerned before a decision was taken on the order in which they were to be debated.

50. Sir Keith UNWIN (United Kingdom), supported by Mr. RAMACHANDRAN (India), Mr. FORSHELL (Sweden), Mrs. WRIGHT (Denmark) and Mr. MWINGA (Zambia), suggested that items 44 and 46 should be considered first. Item 46 was particularly important, since there was a possibility of reaching a decision on demographic matters which could contribute greatly to economic development.

51. Mr. BRADLEY (Argentina) supported by Mr. O HEIDEAIN (Ireland), expressed the view that the Committee might make more rapid progress by first taking up item 44, which was non-controversial.

52. Mr. ATTOUNGBRE (Ivory Coast) suggested that the Chairman should suggest an order of priority on which the Committee could vote, if it so desired.

53. Mr. KANO (Nigeria), Mr. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) and Mr. VIAUD (France) agreed.

54. Mr. TELL (Jordan) proposed that the Committee should deal with the items in the order in which they appeared in the Chairman's note (A/C.2/L.791).

55. Mr. ROOSEVELT (United States of America) proposed that the meeting should be adjourned.

*The proposal was adopted by 50 votes to 8, with 14 abstentions.*

The meeting was adjourned at 1.30 p.m.