



ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Thursday, 11 April 1963,  
at 3.10 p.m.

Thirty-fifth Session  
OFFICIAL RECORDS

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 3: Declaration on international economic co-operation ( <i>continued</i> ) . . . . .	83

*President:* Mr. Alfonso PATIÑO (Colombia).

*Present:*

Representatives of the following States: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, India, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Senegal, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Yugoslavia.

Observers for the following Member States: Afghanistan, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, Hungary, Israel, Netherlands, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Spain, Thailand, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, United Arab Republic.

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

The representative of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

AGENDA ITEM 3

Declaration on international economic co-operation  
(E/3725, E/L.991) (*continued*)

1. The PRESIDENT said that, if there were no objections, he would give the floor to observers wishing to speak.
2. Mr. SCHWEITZER (Chile) said his delegation had noted the report of the Ad Hoc Working Group (E/3725) and was pleased with the progress made in the preparation of the draft declaration, which it was ready to accept as a whole. In particular, it whole-heartedly subscribed to article 8, which it considered fundamental.
3. The Working Group had sought to stress that one of the basic elements of international economic co-operation was the granting of facilities of access to the sea to land-locked countries, particularly if they were developing countries. It was only fair that such countries should participate in international life and international trade on an equal footing and that they should be able to export their products normally to world markets and to import without difficulty the goods they needed.
4. It was that principle which Chile had traditionally upheld and that it had applied to Bolivia. The Treaty

of 1904 allowed Bolivia, in perpetuity and without restrictions, the right of commercial transit to Chilean ports as well as the right to establish customs offices in those ports. That treaty had been supplemented by the Transit Convention of 1937, which guaranteed free transit of persons and goods through the territory and principal ports of Chile, at all times and without any restrictions as regards the quantity or category of the goods transported. Bolivia was also authorized to establish customs offices and warehouses and to conduct its trade operations with Bolivian personnel without any administrative or statistical control by Chile. Those measures had been further supplemented by the construction of a railway linking the Bolivian capital with the Chilean ports of Arica and Antofagasta and in 1957 by the building of a pipeline.

5. All those examples showed the importance which the Chilean delegation attached to article 8, which it would like to see approved in its present wording. The phrase "recognized by international law" could be deleted. That article quoted the Convention on the High Seas which, in article 3, paragraphs 1 and 2,<sup>1/</sup> referred to existing "international conventions". The point concerning international law was therefore already adequately covered. The article might also include the text of the Afghan amendment.<sup>2/</sup> The last preambular paragraph of the draft declaration failed to mention General Assembly resolution 1028 (XI) concerning land-locked countries, which was particularly important and which also explicitly referred to international law. That was an additional reason for deleting the reference to international law in article 8.

6. Paragraph 25 of the Cairo Declaration of Developing Countries<sup>3/</sup> recommended that transit facilities, including the use of ports, should be granted to land-locked countries. It was precisely those facilities that Chile granted to Bolivia and indeed they were one of the basic conditions of international economic co-operation, particularly in the case of the developing countries. When the Cairo Declaration had been submitted to the General Assembly, the Chilean delegation, as well as other delegations from the developing countries, had presented a draft resolution<sup>4/</sup> seeking official United Nations endorsement of it.

7. His delegation therefore supported article 8 and had no comments to make on the first seven articles of the draft declaration.

8. Mr. DIEZ DE MEDINA (Bolivia) said that his country could make a useful contribution by providing an example of the way in which a misinterpretation of the law affected the aspirations of the developing

<sup>1/</sup> United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, Official Records, Vol. II, Plenary Meetings, Annexes (United Nations publication, Sales No.: 58.V.4, Vol. II), p. 136.

<sup>2/</sup> Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Thirty-first Session, Annexes, agenda item 6, document E/L.899.

<sup>3/</sup> Official Records of the General Assembly, Seventeenth Session, Annexes, agenda items 12, 34, 35, 36, 37, 39 and 84, document A/5162.

<sup>4/</sup> Ibid., document A/5344 and Add.1, paras. 7-11.

countries. In that respect, article 8 of the draft was of basic importance.

9. In 1950, the Bolivian Ambassador had proposed to the Chilean Government that negotiations should be started in order to solve Bolivia's problems regarding free access to the sea. Chile had accepted but it was clear from the statement by the Chilean observer that the idea had changed; Chile's position seemed to vary depending on whether he was addressing Bolivia or other countries.

10. Free transit was a temporary solution which was far from satisfactory. Bolivia remained cut off from the outside world and could not trade freely. Indeed, the free transit granted by Chile had never been really free and unrestricted. In 1932, Chile had objected to the passage of arms to Bolivia which had been at war then. In 1952, Chile had placed an embargo on certain Bolivian goods. In 1956, when Bolivia had sought to transport its petroleum to Chilean ports, it had had to submit to special formalities. Less than two months previously, shipments of imported flour had been transported mixed with tar. Goods exported by Bolivia had to pass through Chilean customs. The Chilean authorities delayed the solution of those problems as often as they could. All those examples showed clearly that Bolivia's free access to the sea was only a myth.

11. Mr. SCHWEITZER (Chile) deplored the fact that the question of the right of transit should serve as a pretext for attacks against his Government. The violence of the language used merely served to conceal the weakness of the Bolivian arguments. It should be recalled that Chile had been accused before the Organization of American States of economic aggression against Bolivia and that the accusation had been unanimously rejected.

12. There was a White Book which contained all the elements of the dispute and summed up the Bolivian claims. The Council was not competent to take up the matter. In its preamble, the Charter called upon States to respect international obligations, but Bolivia was trying to do the exact opposite.

13. It had been claimed that free transit was not enough. Mention had even been made of the tragic plight of land-locked countries. However, did not the examples of Switzerland, Austria and Czechoslovakia provide a categorical refutation of such an argument?

14. As for the episodes quoted by the Bolivian observer, it should be recalled that in 1932, during the Chaco War, Chile had been neutral and had been afraid to breach its neutrality by allowing weapons intended for Bolivia to be shipped through its territory. It had moreover revoked that decision and had thus incurred the displeasure of the Paraguayan Government. The 1952 embargo had been decided upon by the courts, which were independent of the Chilean Government, and again that decision had been subsequently reversed. The matter of the flour shipments concerned the railways and not the Government.

15. The Chilean Government was convinced that it was discharging its contractual obligations loyally and could not recognize the territorial claims of Bolivia.

16. Mr. HAJEK (Czechoslovakia) said that in drafting the principles to govern international economic co-operation on terms of equality, due attention must be paid to respect for national sovereignty. For that reason, his delegation believed that a document defining such principles as precisely as possible was

not only useful, but necessary. It was true that the idea of co-operation was already expressed in the Charter and in some resolutions of the United Nations, as well as in many bilateral and international treaties and conventions, but account must be taken of the trend, since the time when that principle had been included in the Charter, to attribute more and more importance to it.

17. One of the fundamental factors shaping that trend was the economic position of the developing countries and the part those countries played in all aspects of international relations. Thus it was no longer sufficient to draw up a list of the international instruments in force; what was needed was a summing-up of the question and an indication of the general trend. That should form the basis of the proposed document; its form had already been defined by Council resolution 875 (XXXIII), and a declaration was the most appropriate form of presentation, since it would then be binding and a large number of countries could become contracting parties.

18. The Czechoslovak delegation was gratified by the progress achieved by the Ad Hoc Working Group, which proved the possibility of drafting such a declaration despite the misgivings expressed by some.

19. The sponsors of the draft declaration had not confined themselves to an enunciation of long-established principles, but had taken into account such new aspects of the problem as the need for general and complete disarmament and its important economic consequences. There remained, of course, some points on which no agreement had been possible, and there were others, such as the problem of peaceful co-existence, which had been a cause of concern to some. The phrase "peaceful coexistence" was a statement of fact, namely, the existence, side by side, of different social systems; the mere recognition of that fact constituted an admission that a starting point could be found for improving international relations. If it was recognized that the ideas and methods of the cold war must be buried, it would then be possible to agree on how to define and describe the problem, and subsequently to resolve it.

20. Czechoslovakia had solved the problem of free access to the sea through its friendly relations with neighbouring countries, but it believed that the question should be defined more precisely in the draft declaration, in order to give full satisfaction to all the countries concerned.

21. The Czechoslovak delegation supported the five-Power draft resolution (E/L.991), particularly paragraph 2, and the more so because the Secretary-General, in paragraph 8 (i) of his report (E/3702), had pointed out that the definition of principles of international economic co-operation should be closely related to the work of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. His delegation also endorsed the decision to extend the mandate of the Ad Hoc Working Group.

22. Mr. BAYONA (Colombia) recalled that, although his delegation had expressed some doubt as to the need for a declaration on international economic co-operation, it had later agreed to the idea because of the attitude of most delegations, and it had participated in the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group. The representative of Colombia in the Group had submitted a number of amendments to the draft decla-

ration prepared by the Soviet Union delegation, one of which had been adopted.

23. The Colombian delegation agreed in principle with the draft resolution (E/L.991), and its only doubts related to operative paragraph 2, which would be more acceptable with the addition of the words: "without thereby expressing any opinion on them".

24. With reference to paragraph 3, he agreed with the Italian delegation that the words "of twelve members nominated by the President" might be deleted. It would also be desirable to refer to the Group by its correct name: "the Ad Hoc Working Group".

25. Mr. HIREMATH (India) did not feel that the Council was called upon to engage in a substantive debate on the complex problems raised by the Ad Hoc Working Group's report. In any event, such was not the intention of the draft resolution which his delegation had co-sponsored. The draft resolution left both the Working Group and the Council entirely free to consider those problems when the Group submitted a further report.

26. He feared, to judge from his statement at the 1255th meeting, that the observer from Afghanistan had misunderstood India's position on the principle of most-favoured-nation treatment. The misunderstanding seemed to be due to the fact that the summary record of the Working Group's meeting on 13 February had not been clear on the point. The Indian delegation had withdrawn its own amendment and had supported that of the Afghan delegation concerning access to the sea for land-locked countries and most favourable treatment, as derived from international law and from the 1958 Convention on the High Seas. The observer from Afghanistan must have misunderstood the position of the Indian delegation because of its criticisms of paragraph 3 of the Soviet Union's original draft,<sup>5/</sup> which provided for the application of the most-favoured-nation principle in trade relations. The Indian delegation did not think that that principle was in the interest of the developing countries in every case; such countries were interested especially in certain facilities for their exports, and the most-favoured-nation clause could not cover such cases.

27. Mr. UNWIN (United Kingdom) pointed out that his delegation had participated in the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group and was willing to do so again. The United Kingdom delegation's views on whether it was desirable to prepare a declaration of principles had already been stated. Despite the doubts it had expressed in the course of consultations on paragraph 2 of the draft resolution (E/L.991) before the Council—doubts which it still felt—it was prepared to vote in favour of the draft resolution if that was the will of the majority.

28. He felt a great deal of sympathy with the views contained in the statement by the Argentine representative that morning (1255th meeting), particularly with the suggestion that the Working Group should draw on all previous General Assembly and Council resolutions. A year ago, he would have agreed entirely with that statement. But the view expressed by the Argentine representative, which had been that of the United Kingdom delegation in 1962, had been rejected. The Working Group had, consequently, a rather limited task to perform, but had not been able to complete

it in three weeks' work. There had been, as other representatives had pointed out, fairly wide agreement on parts of the text, but on the sections relating to trade matters, not only had the Working Group not had time to discuss the existing texts, but it had generated about a dozen new texts of its own which were still to be considered. If the Working Group's mandate was to be renewed, it would be necessary to try not to overload it. That was the foundation of the United Kingdom delegation's dislike of paragraph 2 of the draft resolution. What would be the practical effects of transmitting to the Preparatory Committee of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development the many proposals which had been submitted to the Group? It might be useful for the Preparatory Committee to be kept informed of the Group's work, but it was important that it should appreciate the extreme complexity of the problems, particularly when it came to agreeing on articles relating to trade.

29. Although, therefore, the United Kingdom delegation was prepared to accept the draft resolution as it stood, that acceptance was based on the hope that there would not be a lot of proposals put before the Group. Neither the Preparatory Committee nor the Working Group could prejudice the results of the Conference, nor was it desirable or wise to establish principles that might not be found acceptable or universally applicable by the 110 members which would be taking part in the Conference. The Group's work could not therefore be completed until the results of the Conference itself were known.

30. As regards the matter of States not having access to the sea, which the observer from Afghanistan had mentioned earlier, the United Kingdom delegation took the view that while the application of the principle of most-favoured-nation treatment was widely recognized, the principle nevertheless derived from bilateral agreements.

31. His delegation supported the United States delegation's view concerning the impropriety of a reference to international law in connexion with access to the sea. To be logical, it must be understood that, if the Council decided to refer to international law in that context, it would have to do the same elsewhere. The misgivings felt by some delegations in the Ad Hoc Working Group had resulted in a text which was unbalanced, since it only mentioned international law in certain places.

32. He could not agree with the Soviet Union representative's view that—if he had understood correctly—the decisions taken by the Ad Hoc Working Group were to be regarded as legal principles. If the points at issue were perhaps already embodied in agreements having force of law or even embodied in widely accepted agreements, it might be possible to prepare a draft which would itself prove widely acceptable. But that was not the case. The draft text itself had not yet been agreed upon even within the Working Group. It would still have to be accepted by the Council as a whole and perhaps by another body after that, and no part of it could be taken as binding at the present stage.

33. Mr. CVOROVIC (Yugoslavia) considered that the Working Group's report (E/3725) presented the Council with the first positive and encouraging results achieved in the preparation of a document which would embody the fundamental principles governing international trade relations. Those results, of course, were neither

<sup>5/</sup> See Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifteenth Session, Annexes, agenda items 12, 29 and 74, document A/4648, para. 48.

complete nor definitive, since the Group, despite a quite considerable convergence of views, had not managed to reach agreement on certain points and had not had time to examine all the proposals relating to international trade.

34. It was for the Council to adopt an adequate procedure for the continuation of the work, and the definitive drafting of the declaration. However, new events had taken place, and would take place, which would have a certain influence on the conduct of future work and even on the character of the document in question. He was thinking in particular of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, and the work of the Preparatory Committee of that Conference. The importance of international trade problems had emerged clearly from the debates at the seventeenth session of the General Assembly and the first session of the Preparatory Committee. If they were to be resolved, the practical steps to be decided would have to be backed up by principles for their application. For that reason, his delegation believed that future work on the declaration must be linked, at least in part, with the work of the Preparatory Committee; moreover, item I (5) of the provisional agenda drafted at the Committee's first session (E/CONF.46/PC/L.11/Add.3) dealt with principles governing international trade relations and trade policies conducive to development. The aims of the draft resolution before the Council (E/L.991) reflected those ideas. They indicated the need to co-ordinate the future work of the various subsidiary organs of the Council, given the new events which had taken place since the creation of the Working Group.

35. He was entirely in agreement with the representative of Uruguay as to the urgent need to take practical steps to resolve the grave foreign trade problems of the developing countries. Statements of principle must of course be followed by practical steps. That was why the sponsors of the draft resolution proposed that plans for practical action should go forward simultaneously with the drafting of principles.

36. He could not quite see how the views of the Italian representative differed from those of the sponsors of the draft resolution. The Italian representative believed, as they did, that the drafting of the principles governing international economic and trade relations was connected with the work of the Preparatory Committee and of the Conference itself. The work of the Working Group was also of a preparatory nature, and could be carried on parallel to that of the Committee.

37. The sponsors accepted the changes in operative paragraphs 1 and 3 suggested by the Italian representative, *viz.* insertion of the words "Ad Hoc" in paragraph 1, deletion of the words "of twelve members nominated by the President" in paragraph 3, and insertion in that paragraph of the words "Ad Hoc". On the other hand, the sponsors could not accept the suggestion that the word "Declaration" in the third preambular paragraph be deleted and that the words "Question of a" be added to the title. It was not desirable to try to specify forthwith whether the document would be a resolution, a declaration or even a charter. That would depend on its final contents. Nevertheless, "Declaration" had been the usual term for some years now, and it corresponded to the title of the original draft by the Soviet Union delegation. It was also the term used in item 3 of the Council's agenda. It could not therefore be changed without prejudice to the final result of the work.

38. As to operative paragraph 2, the sponsors simply wished to draw attention to all parts of the report (E/3725) which concerned international trade, and in particular to paragraphs 58-64. Any member of the Preparatory Committee or of the Conference would naturally be free to raise any question he wished, and the content of those paragraphs could not be limited at the present stage.

39. With regard to the addition suggested by the Colombian representative, he pointed out that paragraph 2 simply invited the attention of the Preparatory Committee, and neither approved nor requested anything.

40. In conclusion, he emphasized that the developing countries were above all concerned to accelerate their economic growth and to secure for themselves an equitable place in the world economy. Their own efforts were not enough; they needed international collaboration. That was what they expected from the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, as indeed from any other international action.

41. Mr. TELL (Jordan) fully endorsed the remarks of the Indian and Yugoslav representatives on the draft resolution. He had been surprised at the reaction of certain representatives, and particularly of the United States representative who thought that discussion of such a resolution was a secondary matter. On that principle, the same could be said of all the discussions, in the Council or anywhere else. But it was well to remember that study of the most important problems had begun with secondary questions.

42. He saw no point in delaying discussion of the question until the Preparatory Committee had finished its work. The Council was bound by its decisions and must decide with regard to the draft resolution before it, which was purely procedural in nature.

43. Mr. ATTOLICO (Italy) informed the sponsors of the draft resolution that his delegation did not insist on the changes it had suggested, and thanked them for having accepted certain of them.

44. His delegation had considered that some formula should be found, for the title of the draft and for the last preambular paragraph, which would clearly indicate that an attempt was being made to draft a document which it was not yet known whether it would be a declaration, a resolution or some other instrument. As to operative paragraph 2, his delegation did not believe that the Working Group's report marked any progress so far as the principles of international trade were concerned. It therefore seemed excessive to draw the attention of the Preparatory Committee of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development to an unfinished piece of work which left much to be desired. It must however be hoped that the Conference would yield more positive results and would have a favourable effect on the trade of the developing countries.

45. Mr. CARRILLO (El Salvador) believed that the Council must continue the work which it had been carrying on for several sessions. Likewise, having entrusted consideration of the draft resolution and the amendments to an Ad Hoc Working Group, it must follow the latter's judgement and allow it to continue its work. Although the Working Group had not had time to decide the articles on international trade and the role of the United Nations and its organs in inter-

national economic co-operation, he considered that the Preparatory Committee should take cognizance of all the problems which had arisen and all the proposals which had been put forward; it would even be desirable for the Committee to prepare a report on the Working Group's document. His delegation did not therefore believe that operative paragraph 2 should be deleted, and was ready to support the draft resolution as a whole.

46. Mr. WODAJO (Ethiopia) recalled that, two years previously, at the Council's thirty-first session (1143rd meeting), his delegation had stressed the importance of having a declaration on international economic co-operation. Since then an event of capital importance had occurred: the economic organs of the United Nations had begun to concentrate mainly on action in practical fields, instead of confining themselves to general concepts. The organization of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development was bound up with this new approach to their role. It followed that, although the declaration on international economic co-operation had not declined in importance, it should be considered first and foremost in the context of that evolution and of the fact that that Conference would be held. However, the Preparatory Committee of the Conference would have a number of practical problems to deal with, and its agenda should not be unduly cumbered with general problems. For example, it would be pointless to devote general consideration to the application of the most-favoured-nation clause, since that clause was not always the most desirable one as far as the developing countries were concerned. A general discussion would therefore prove much more useful once the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development had taken place and had laid down concrete foundations. Accordingly, for the time being it would be best to extend the mandate of the Ad Hoc Working Group and to refrain from embarking on lengthy discussions of matters that were in any case already on the agenda of the Preparatory Committee. Since the Working Group had already dealt with those questions, it would of course be useful for the Preparatory Committee to be acquainted with the result of the Group's work, and for that reason his delegation was willing to support the five-Power draft resolution (E/L.991) as it stood.

47. Mr. ANJARIA (India) considered that, since the Yugoslav representative had already made all the comments which were called for, it merely remained to take a vote—as the representative of Jordan had already pointed out—on the draft resolution. His delegation simply wished to recall that the wording of the text was the result of numerous compromises and that, whatever the items with regard to which some delegations still felt hesitant might be, it was necessary, in the interests of international economic co-operation, that the draft resolution should be adopted.

48. The Indian delegation had itself wondered whether the word "declaration" was appropriate; but, like the Yugoslav representative, it felt that, since the question did not have to be settled there and then, the best way to avoid prejudging the outcome was to keep to the current wording, which was traditional. Nevertheless, in order to meet the wishes of the Italian delegation, the sponsors of the draft resolution were willing to amend the title so that it read: "Question of a declaration on international economic co-operation". But the word "declaration" could not be altered where it appeared in the text of the draft resolution itself.

49. The wording which the Colombian delegation had suggested for addition to operative paragraph 2 seemed superfluous, since the purpose of that paragraph was simply to draw the Committee's attention to certain texts, without thereby implying any particular judgement or attitude. The draft resolution was intended merely to extend the mandate of the Ad Hoc Working Group in order to enable the Council, at its thirty-sixth session, to take the practical decisions that it had hitherto been prevented from taking owing to the complex nature of the problem. The Indian delegation urged all representatives to support the draft resolution as it stood.

50. Mr. VIAUD (France) recalled that at the 1255th meeting, the French representative had stated that the five-Power draft resolution (E/L.991) seemed to him to be generally acceptable, although he was not entirely satisfied with the wording of operative paragraph 2. Since then, several delegations had made various statements which showed that they did not all interpret that paragraph in the same way. His delegation for its part felt that, given the absence of any conclusions on the part of the Ad Hoc Working Group with respect to paragraphs 58-64 of its report (E/3725), the fact of drawing the attention of the Preparatory Committee to those points certainly did not imply that the Council was thereby giving an additional directive to the Preparatory Committee, or that it in any way shared any of the views expressed in those paragraphs. In those circumstances, the scope of paragraph 2 of the draft resolution would be very limited, and its adoption within the framework of the vote on the draft resolution as a whole would represent simply a procedural decision. On the other hand, if a separate vote was taken on that paragraph, the result would be to lend the latter a special significance to which, whatever it might be, the French delegation did not wish to subscribe. Accordingly, if a separate vote were taken on the paragraph in question, his delegation would abstain.

51. Mr. TELL (Jordan) said that he unreservedly shared the views expressed at the 1255th meeting by the observer from Afghanistan, and hoped that the statement of the latter would be published in extenso.

52. The PRESIDENT recalled that it was not the usual practice to publish in extenso the texts of statements made by Council representatives; the meetings of the Council were recorded in summary form. However, the Afghan delegation might wish to have the text of the statement in question distributed to the members of the Council.

53. Mr. WODAJO (Ethiopia) expressed surprise that it should be so difficult to have the text of the statement published in extenso as a separate document, since such a procedure was quite usual in various United Nations bodies.

54. Mr. MALINOWSKI (Secretary of the Council) recalled that the organs responsible for the Organization's financial policy had taken a number of decisions to the effect that the debates in several United Nations bodies, including the Economic and Social Council, should be recorded in summary records. Nevertheless, if the Council so decided, the full text of the statement of the observer from Afghanistan could be distributed when the Afghan delegation had supplied the Secretariat with the requisite number of copies.

55. Mr. SOLODOVNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) agreed with the representative of Jordan in thinking that the statement of the Afghan observer should be reproduced in extenso, either in the summary record of the meeting or as a memorandum.

56. Mr. FINGER (United States of America) also preferred that the statements made by the Afghan observer at the previous meeting should be included in extenso in the summary record. Perhaps the Afghan observer might circulate the text of his statement, but with the correction of certain inaccuracies of detail to which the United States and Indian delegations had already drawn attention.

57. Mr. TABIBI (Afghanistan) thanked the delegations which had shown an interest in the statement he had made at the previous meeting. While quite aware of the Organization's financial difficulties, he shared the view of the Ethiopian delegation that each organ of the United Nations could decide to publish in extenso any statement of particular interest to it. The statement in question had been made on behalf, not only of Afghanistan, but of all land-locked States, and if it were issued as a separate document it could more readily be made available to the members of the Working Group and the Preparatory Committee. His delegation would, therefore, gladly furnish the text of that statement to the Secretariat for publication in whatever form the Secretariat judged most appropriate. The statements of the representatives of India and of the United States of America which had been cited in the statement in question were in accord with the wording of the summary records and therefore could not be changed.

58. Mr. DELGADO (Senegal), without wishing to prejudge his Government's position as to the substance of the problem of the access of land-locked States to the sea, would like to express his delegation's complete understanding of the views stated by the Afghan observer. Moreover, Senegal traditionally held very liberal views on that subject, since the port of Dakar had always been available to several African States. He joined the previous speakers in requesting that the statement made by the Afghan observer should be published in extenso in so far as the resources of the Secretariat permitted.

59. The PRESIDENT suggested that the statement made at the 1255th meeting by the observer from Afghanistan should be reproduced as fully as possible in the summary record of the meeting.

*It was so decided.*

60. Mr. MALINOWSKI (Secretary of the Council) noted that the sponsors of the draft resolution had accepted the following amendments: The title of the draft resolution now read: "Question of a declaration on international economic co-operation". The term "Ad Hoc" was added in operative paragraphs 1 and 3, before "Working Group". In paragraph 3, the words "of twelve members nominated by the President" were deleted.

61. The PRESIDENT announced that the Argentine representative had requested that a separate vote be taken on operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution.

62. Mr. PARSONS (Australia) did not oppose that request but would have preferred it had such a request not been made. The wording of the draft resolution was the result of delicate compromise in which many delegations had made concessions in a spirit of con-

ciliation. It would be preferable to consider the draft resolution as a whole rather than to look at its various parts separately. His delegation would vote for paragraph 2, but would hope that the vote would be interpreted as acceptance of the draft resolution as a whole, rather than for just one part of it, as he thought it undesirable to isolate certain parts of the text for separate consideration.

63. Mr. TETTAMANTI (Argentina), while fully understanding the standpoint of the Australian representative, regretted that he could not accede to the Australian request, since paragraph 2 was unacceptable to the Argentine delegation.

64. The PRESIDENT put to the vote, first, paragraph 2 of the five-Power draft resolution (E/L.991) and then the draft resolution as a whole, as amended.

*Paragraph 2 of the draft resolution was adopted by 10 votes to 1, with 7 abstentions.*

*The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 17 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

65. Mr. FINGER (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote, said he had voted for the draft resolution on two understandings: first, that the purpose of paragraph 2 was merely to inform the Preparatory Committee of the existence of the Ad Hoc Working Group and of paragraphs 58-64 of its report, and not to require any action on those paragraphs; secondly, that the scheduling of the Working Group's next session would depend on the relative priority that the Council, at its July or December sessions, might attach to the Group's assignment as compared to the work of other bodies, such as the Social Commission or the Commission on Human Rights. He had abstained from the vote on paragraph 2 because he simply felt that it was pointless to devote a special paragraph of the draft resolution to drawing the attention of the Preparatory Committee to certain already existing texts. Commenting next on paragraph 3, he said that his delegation was prepared to give its full support to the Working Group, provided that the work of the Group did not interfere with that of the Council or other more important organs. His delegation was gratified that all representatives had stressed the need for the Preparatory Committee to apply itself essentially to practical questions. The United States believed that it would be best for the Working Group to resume its sessions after the conclusion of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. It reserved the right to reconsider the scheduling of the Working Group when the Council reviewed all the activities of its subsidiary organs with a view to reducing the number of meetings in 1964.

66. Mr. PASTORI (Uruguay), in explanation of vote, stated that his delegation had had to abstain because it felt that international economic co-operation was a vital necessity for all countries, and particularly for the developing countries. The text of the draft resolution just approved could only weaken already accepted principles and complicate their practical application. In view of the considerable gap existing between declarations of principle and their actual application, it would have been much more useful if the Council had taken a number of practical decisions.

67. Mr. SOLODOVNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) expressed his satisfaction at the results of the vote. He attached all due importance to paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, for the Preparatory

Committee should concern itself with the problems of international economic co-operation and could with advantage profit from the work already done by the Working Group. His delegation could not understand the objections which some representatives had raised to that paragraph.

68. Mr. BROWN (International Confederation of Free Trade Unions) said that, in order to expedite the work

of the Council, he would refrain from making the statement which he had asked permission to make on that item of the agenda.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.