



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 40: Second United Nations Development Decade: report of the Preparatory Committee for the Second United Nations Development Decade (<i>continued</i>)	401

Chairman: Mr. Costa P. CARANICAS (Greece).

*In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Amirmokri (Iran),
Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.*

AGENDA ITEM 40

**Second United Nations Development Decade: report of the
Preparatory Committee for the Second United Nations
Development Decade (*continued*) (A/7525 and Add.1-3,
A/7603, chap. I; A/7603/Add.1, chap. I; A/7699, A/C.2/
L.1060, A/C.2/L.1094, A/C.2/L.1095)**

1. Mr. POSNETT (United Kingdom) said he appreciated the considerable amount of work which the Colombian delegation had put into preparing draft resolution A/C.2/L.1060 on an international strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade, but his delegation felt it would be preferable to indicate in the Committee's draft report that it had discussed the draft resolution and had decided to submit it for discussion to the Preparatory Committee for the Second United Nations Development Decade.

Mr. Caranicas (Greece) took the Chair.

2. Mr. VALLEJO (Colombia) thanked the delegation of the United Kingdom, whose suggestion appeared interesting, although it did not altogether meet the wishes of his delegation. It would perhaps be preferable to indicate in the draft resolution prepared by the Group of seventy-seven developing countries (A/C.2/L.1094) on the international development strategy, that the Preparatory Committee would take into account the draft resolution prepared by the Colombian delegation.

3. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) pointed out that his delegation was not among the sponsors of the draft resolution referred to by Colombia and could therefore neither accept nor reject that interesting suggestion.

4. Mr. VALLEJO (Colombia), in response to a question from Mr. BRADLEY (Argentina), said that the sixth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution prepared by the Group of seventy-seven (A/C.2/L.1094) could be amended. The amendment would involve beginning the

paragraph with the words "Taking into account document A/C.2/L.1060 and . . .". His delegation would decide whether or not to withdraw its draft resolution in the light of the reception given to that amendment.

5. Mr. PATRIOTA (Brazil) said that the draft resolution submitted by Colombia (A/C.2/L.1060) went much further than that to be introduced by the Tunisian delegation (A/C.2/L.1094). It was ambitious and seemed somewhat premature. From the practical viewpoint, the draft of the Group of seventy-seven had a much better chance of being accepted. In view of the difficulty which would be involved in introducing an amendment to draft resolution A/C.2/L.1094, it appeared preferable to refer draft resolution A/C.2/L.1060 to the Preparatory Committee.

6. Mr. CHTOUROU (Tunisia), introducing draft resolution A/C.2/L.1094, said it was one of the most worked on texts ever submitted to the Second Committee. In its preamble, the draft enumerated all the resolutions and decisions taken by the various bodies concerned with preparing the Second United Nations Development Decade. The fourth preambular paragraph mentioned the Charter of Algiers¹ and its "Programme of Action", to which the developing countries attached great importance. The fifth paragraph referred to the results of the second session of UNCTAD. The seventh paragraph expressed the concern which had become apparent at the inadequate progress made by the Trade and Development Board. The ninth paragraph was particularly important, stressing as it did the need for reciprocal commitments by the developed and the developing countries. Operative paragraph 2 took into account the progress made by the Preparatory Committee, which had agreed *inter alia* on the need to draft a preamble and to establish a target for the over-all growth rate for gross product. Operative paragraph 4, which had been among the most extensively discussed, was of primary importance. In view of the importance of the draft, which was the work not only of delegations members of the Group of seventy-seven, its components should not be discussed in isolation but it should be considered as a whole. The adoption of the text would encourage the Preparatory Committee and allow it to continue its work in the most favourable conditions. The sponsors were therefore unable to accept the amendment proposed by Colombia (see para. 4 above). Likewise, with regard to the amendment to operative paragraph 4 proposed by a number of delegations in document A/C.2/L.1095, the sponsors felt that the spirit of those amendments already underlay paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, when seen in the light of the ninth preambular paragraph.

¹ See *Proceedings of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, Second Session*, vol. I and Corr.1 and 3 and Add.1 and 2, *Report and Annexes* (United Nations publication, Sales No.: E.68.II.D.14), p. 431.

The Preparatory Committee would discuss, in the same spirit of co-operation and using a tried method, the nature of the commitments which countries participating in the strategy should assume in order to ensure its success. The sponsors would therefore welcome withdrawal of the amendment proposed in document A/C.2/L.1095 and hoped that unanimity could be reached on the present draft. The delegations of Guinea, Iceland and Nigeria should be added to the list of sponsors.

7. Mr. CORREA (Chile) said it was regrettable that the modern world was characterized not by a spirit of interdependence but by a permanent conflict of interests; it was the latter which bedevilled the preparation of the international development strategy, although the purpose was to relieve the misery of the majority of mankind. Fortunately, the developing countries were beginning to unite and had given timid proof of that fact in submitting the draft resolution being studied. His Government was convinced that the negative attitude of the industrialized countries in that respect should be stressed. Since the word "peace" was synonymous with "development", it was regrettable that the Preparatory Committee had not achieved better results; it was for that reason that his delegation had participated in the preparation of the working document which had served as a basis for draft resolution A/C.2/L.1094, but did not appear among the sponsors for reasons which it would explain.

8. His delegation, like those of Colombia and Peru, for example, would have liked the Assembly to take a specific decision on certain measures which it appeared essential to include in the strategy. That view had been confirmed by the conclusions of the report of the Commission on International Development,² but, to avoid forcing the pace of events, it had appeared more desirable to prepare a draft resolution of a procedural nature. However, that approach had not been understood by those for whom a draft stipulating specific measures would have raised considerable problems. It was at that stage that the third of the five draft texts discussed by the Group of seventy-seven had been drawn up and it had been decided to request the developed and the socialist countries to comment on it. The United States had proposed thirteen extensive amendments which would have changed the nature of the draft. In the preamble, it had wished, *inter alia*, to delete the fourth preambular paragraph referring to the Charter of Algiers, while in the eighth preambular paragraph it had asked for the word "requires" to be replaced by a less strong expression, although a commitment was essential if growth was to be accelerated. It had wished to delete the tenth preambular paragraph expressing concern at the very inadequate levels of living of millions of human beings in the developing areas, although it could not be denied that men were dying of hunger and cold and that, unless there was a positive will on the part of the countries in the best position to contribute to the development strategy, it risked being a failure. Was it not stated in the introduction to the annual report of the Economic and Social Council (A/7603) that, in spite of certain changes, the flow of resources from the developed countries continued to decrease and that the terms of aid were becoming increas-

² Commission on International Development, *Partners in Development* (New York, Praeger Publishers, Inc., 1969).

ingly severe? The developing countries, in a conciliatory spirit, had accepted changes in the wording of that paragraph in order to make it simply an appeal for a strengthening of political will.

9. With regard to the operative part of the draft, the working group of the Group of seventy-seven developing countries had rejected an amendment to paragraph 1 which had aimed at eliminating any criticism of the Preparatory Committee. There has been serious disagreement with regard to an amendment affecting the definition of the main objective of the Decade designed to restrict it to the general and constant improvement of the well-being of peoples. To the developing countries, that improvement was only one stage; they did not aspire merely to subsistence but to a decent life. Such an objective obviously demanded greater sacrifices from the industrialized countries, which must face up to their moral responsibilities.

10. The text of operative paragraph 2 (c) and (d), stating that there was a need to establish a target for the growth rate of the gross national product in real terms and some quantitative targets, had also been weakened. In view of the complexity of such a process as that relating to the strategy, no single criterion could be laid down for measuring its effects. Operative paragraph 7 had originally supported the decision of the Trade and Development Board at the second part of its ninth session,³ and had referred to an agreement on objectives and political measures, including a time-table for their application in its fields of competence, but that idea had completely disappeared. Yet the strategy should be conceived as a programme geared to a time-table for its execution; that was the only way of evaluating the progress made and the effectiveness of the participation of Governments; otherwise it would amount to merely one more statement of good intentions.

11. Those few comments sufficed to give an idea of the negative attitude of the major developed countries and of the efforts made by the developing countries to arrive at a compromise that would make it possible to adopt a draft resolution unanimously. With respect to operative paragraph 10, he could only repeat what the Secretary-General and many statesmen had said so often: it was an appeal to the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries to participate in the work of the Preparatory Committee. The working group of the Group of seventy-seven had met with the representatives of the socialist countries to discuss the problem, but those countries had categorically refused to co-operate in the strategy. It had proved impossible to open up any dialogue on the question, the excuse given being that there was a reference in the draft resolution to General Assembly resolution 2411 (XXIII), which the socialist countries rejected for the reasons given, *inter alia*, in a letter, dated 21 February 1969, from the representative of the USSR to the President of the General Assembly.⁴ The developed countries of Europe, Asia and the Americas, on the other hand, had been prepared to negotiate, and at the end of discussion that had sometimes been arduous, some

³ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 16 (A/7616)*, part four, annex I.

⁴ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-third Session, Annexes*, agenda item 37, document A/7490.

possibilities of agreement had emerged. He therefore appealed to the socialist countries to set aside the political and procedural problems and co-operate in preparing the strategy, since it aimed at improving the lot of all mankind.

12. He then introduced an amendment (A/C.2/L.1095), on behalf of the sponsors, to operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution. It related to one of the most important points of the strategy and had been the subject of lengthy discussions, during which a number of different texts had been proposed. The strategy should be a joint commitment by the developed and developing countries, both in its preparation and in its execution. That was a basic principle that could not be the subject of any compromise. Without a commitment, there could be no development programme in the sense of General Assembly resolution 2411 (XXIII). The developing countries were weary of vain words and empty promises. Accordingly, in operative paragraph 4 of the third revised text, Governments were urged to undertake the necessary commitments for the implementation of the strategy. Australia, the United States, Japan and the United Kingdom had opposed that wording, on the grounds that they could not enter into any formal commitment before the strategy had been approved. Chile had adopted an equally firm attitude, stating that it was essential for the draft resolution to refer in the operative part to those commitments. The Netherlands had then proposed a new wording that the sponsors of the amendment (A/C.2/L.1095) had taken the liberty of using. Chile had accepted that amendment, which dealt with the implementation of the strategy, subject to the reservation that it should be stated in the preamble that the success of the strategy would depend on the commitments undertaken, which he was glad to say had been done.

13. Nevertheless, it had been impossible to reach agreement on the subject, and consequently the problem had been referred to the Group of seventy-seven, which had already said it favoured the inclusion of a paragraph on commitments. A draft resolution had been submitted which was obviously inadequate, because it lacked the element that was the very core of the strategy. The draft resolution was addressed to the Preparatory Committee; it should express the basic ideas of the developing countries, so that the developed countries could decide on their position. Who could be deceived by the omission of a provision on which all the developing countries were agreed? Tunisia had appealed to the authors of the amendment (A/C.2/L.1095) to withdraw it, but, if that were done, then operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.2/SR.1094 must be amended to include the idea of a commitment.

14. Chile certainly had no wish to state any view at the present time on the nature of the commitments to be undertaken: that was a matter for the Preparatory Committee. But he wished to emphasize the necessity of commitments. One of the reasons that had led to the proposal of a commitment in operative paragraph 4 was the need to mobilize public opinion in all countries as well as the political leaders. They must be shown that only a few industrialized countries were entrenched in a reactionary position. Moreover, the developing countries had a moral responsibility to certain developed countries in Europe, especially the Scandinavian countries, which were making an exemplary contribution to solving their problems. The

representative of France, for example, had stated that the developed countries should undertake commitments that would permit the developing countries to draw up sufficiently detailed plans. The Netherlands Minister in charge of Development Aid, describing the five basic aspects of the strategy in his statement at the Committee's 1269th meeting, had said that a strategy without any commitment was meaningless. The developing countries should therefore be as firm as the developed countries and refuse to drain their draft resolution of its content. As Mr. Lester B. Pearson had said (see 1284th meeting), in introducing the report of the Commission on International Development in the capacity as Chairman of the Commission, the aspirations of the developing countries were perfectly clear: for them development was a vital necessity. The developed countries, on the other hand, could make a choice, but they must realize the effect it would have on their own societies if they decided to evade their obligations. He therefore considered that the amendment (A/C.2/L.1095) deserved unanimous support.

15. The CHAIRMAN reminded representatives that their statements should be confined strictly to the draft resolutions before the Committee.

16. Mr. FRANZI (Italy) said he had nothing to add to the statement by the representative of Tunisia. The draft resolution submitted by Colombia (A/C.2/L.1060), its introduction (see 1262nd meeting, para. 3) and the statement by the representative of Colombia during the 1302nd meeting, were three valuable contributions that should be included in the Committee's draft report and drawn to the attention of the Preparatory Committee. The proposal by Chile was also most useful and deserved the attention of the Preparatory Committee. The drafting of the amendment to operative paragraph 4 (A/C.2/L.1095) had been most arduous; there had been at least six successive versions. His delegation considered that the ninth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution made it clear that success depended on commitments by all countries. The strategy should be the result of a joint effort, just as development was the responsibility of all. The best way of acknowledging that joint responsibility would be to adopt draft resolution A/C.2/L.1094 unanimously. His delegation accordingly asked the sponsors of document A/C.2/L.1095 to agree to their amendment being referred, together with draft resolution A/C.2/L.1060, to the Preparatory Committee, which would take them both into account in its future work.

17. Mr. BRADLEY (Argentina) said that his delegation was not one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1094, but that he fully supported it. It did not seem possible for him to adopt the amendment in document A/C.2/L.1095, but he took the optimistic view and believed that the time would come when countries would take the necessary political decisions. The draft resolution submitted by Colombia (A/C.2/L.1060) appeared constructive, but Governments had not yet had time to study it in detail. His delegation approved of the suggestions made by the representatives of the United Kingdom and Brazil, which would enable that excellent proposal to be taken into account.

18. Mr. DUBEY (India) thanked the representative of Indonesia who had contributed a great deal to the

preparation of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1094. The main purpose of the draft resolution was for the General Assembly to make an assessment of the present position regarding the preparatory work for the Second Development Decade and give guidelines for the work during the remaining few months. The draft, through its second preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1, indicated that the Preparatory Committee had not fulfilled the mandate given to it by the General Assembly last year to prepare the preliminary draft of the development strategy. Secondly, the draft emphasized that preparatory work had come to a virtual standstill mainly because of lack of agreement on policy measures to be adopted for the fulfilment of the objectives of the Second Development Decade and urged that future preparatory work should concentrate mainly on that crucial problem. That was reflected in operative paragraphs 3, 4 and 6. Operative paragraph 7 highlighted the crucial nature of the contribution of UNCTAD, stating clearly that progress in the work of UNCTAD would enable the Preparatory Committee to complete its work not only in the areas within the competence of UNCTAD but also in other areas.

19. As to the amendment in document A/C.2/L.1095, many delegations would have very much liked specific reference to the word "commitments", but the Chilean amendment was not acceptable to his delegation, because it referred to commitments only during the Decade at the time of the implementation of the strategy and not prior to the commencement of the Decade. Besides, a compromise in the ninth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution in which the word "commitments" was mentioned, and in operative paragraph 4, was reached after difficult negotiations and in all good faith it should be adhered to. Consequently, his delegation requested the representative of Chile not to press for his amendment.

20. Mr. ASTAFYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had explained in detail its point of view with regard to the international development strategy during the general debate and in the communication, dated 19 November 1969, from the Permanent Mission of the Soviet Union to the Secretary-General which had been circulated as document A/C.2/248.

21. At the twenty-third session of the General Assembly, a situation had been created which had made it impossible for the socialist countries to participate in the work of the Preparatory Committee for the Second United Nations Development Decade. The reasons for that had been explained in the letter which the Permanent Representative of the Soviet Union had addressed to the President of the General Assembly at that time.⁵

22. From a study of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1094, it would be seen that the provisions of General Assembly resolution 2411 (XXIII), to which the USSR delegation had been opposed, were further strengthened by multiple references to the work of the Preparatory Committee which had been constituted in violation of the principles of the Charter.

23. Efforts to remedy the economic and social backwardness of the developing countries could only succeed if

they were accompanied by the normalization of the international political situation, by the strengthening of international security in general, by attempts to achieve general and complete disarmament, by opposition to colonialism and neo-colonialism and by the strict application of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. All those elements should be reflected in the international development strategy. The USSR delegation agreed with those who believed that the efforts of the developing countries themselves were a decisive component of that strategy. National economic and social development plans formulated by the developing countries should aim at the establishment of an independent national economy, the full mobilization of domestic resources and the introduction of radical reforms in the social structure.

24. In order to accelerate the economic development of the developing countries, it was absolutely necessary to put an end to the exploitation of their natural resources by foreign monopolies. Moreover, the developing countries were entitled to demand from their former colonial masters compensation for the exploitation to which they had been subjected; they had every right also to demand such compensation from the capitalist countries which were at present engaging in a neo-colonialist form of exploitation. It was important that the organizations of the United Nations system should determine the full extent of the damage caused by such exploitation.

25. During the Decade, the terms of credits and loans granted by the Western capitalist countries must also be radically improved. One of the most important components of the strategy should be the normalization of international trade, which should become an effective instrument of progress for the developing countries. The principles approved by UNCTAD at its first and second sessions should therefore be put into practice. In short, the international strategy for the Second Development Decade would only achieve results if it included a series of specific measures aimed at protecting the economic interests of the developing countries. If the success of the Decade was to be assured, the necessary conditions must be created for the participation of all countries, whatever their economic and social system. He felt bound to repeat that a grave error had been committed in preventing certain sovereign countries, in particular the German Democratic Republic, from participating in the work of the Preparatory Committee and, consequently, in the preparation and implementation of the strategy.

26. None of the arguments which the USSR delegation had put forward was reflected in draft resolution A/C.2/L.1094. The Soviet Union wished to reaffirm that it assumed no responsibility, material or moral, for the economic backwardness of the developing countries. In the future, the Soviet Union would continue to support the legitimate demands of the developing countries which sought to eliminate the after-effects of colonialism. The Soviet Union would continue to spare no effort to apply the provisions of UNCTAD resolution 15 (II).⁶

⁶ See *Proceedings of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, Second Session*, vol. I and Corr.1 and 3 and Add.1 and 2, *Report and Annexes* (United Nations publication, Sales No.: E.68.II.D.14), annex I, p. 32.

⁵ See footnote 4.

27. For the aforementioned reasons, the USSR delegation would abstain from voting on draft resolution A/C.2/L.1094.

28. Mr. RABEARIVELO (Madagascar) drew attention to an irregularity of a legal nature: the sponsors of amendment A/C.2/L.1095 included one delegation which was also a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1094.

29. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that since the delegation concerned was not present, the Secretariat would clear up the matter.

30. Mr. KHALIL (United Arab Republic) said that his delegation was not a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1094, although it had participated in the preliminary consultations. His delegation supported the draft resolution in general, apart from operative paragraph 10. The wording of that paragraph did not allow for any modification of the composition of the Preparatory Committee for the Second United Nations Development Decade and therefore prevented the socialist countries from participating. If the sponsors retained that paragraph, the delegation of the United Arab Republic would ask for a separate vote on it and would not be in a position to vote in favour of it.

31. Otherwise, the draft resolution was acceptable, although it did not fully meet the wishes of the delegation of the United Arab Republic. The latter would, however, vote in favour of it, since the sponsors recognized the responsibility of the developed countries for the development of the developing countries, as well as the principle of formal commitments. It was a very constructive compromise, at least at the present stage of the proceedings.

32. Since the amendment introduced by the Chilean delegation (A/C.2/L.1095) added no really new element, he urged that it should be withdrawn.

33. Mr. SAMUELS (Guyana) said he was disturbed to note that, after one year's work, the Preparatory Committee had only reached agreement on the aspects of the strategy enumerated in operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1094. However, since agreement had been reached on those points, the Guyanese delegation approved of the text. It thought, moreover, that all countries should participate in the preparation and implementation of the strategy. It was therefore particularly in favour of operative paragraph 10.

34. The Guyanese delegation did not believe that the Second Development Decade had been established to enable the developing countries to demand reparations from their former colonial masters. The aim of the Decade was to make all countries aware of the need to mobilize all their resources with a view to eliminating the evils which afflicted the developing countries. During the Decade, the developing countries themselves should make greater efforts to ensure their own growth and the developed countries should endeavour to eliminate any obstacles to the progress of the developing countries. In general, the Decade had been envisaged as a means of ensuring universal peace and enabling the developing countries to work for their own success and not to beg.

35. Draft resolution A/C.2/L.1094 had been the subject of very long and difficult negotiations, so that it should receive the widest possible support. The amendment (A/C.2/L.1095) introduced by the Chilean delegation would only give rise to complications. The Guyanese delegation therefore appealed to the sponsors of that amendment to withdraw it.

36. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the general debate on the item under consideration had been concluded, but that many speakers were continuing to make observations which appeared to be somewhat out of place.

37. Mr. CORREA (Chile) thought that on such an important question it was essential that each delegation should indicate in detail the reasons why it adopted a given attitude.

38. Mr. BOZA (Peru) said he was aware of the difficulties experienced by the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1094 in preparing that text. The Peruvian delegation was not satisfied with the way in which operative paragraph 4 had been interpreted; if, however, the provisions of that paragraph were construed as meaning that specific commitments should result, the Peruvian delegation, for its own part, would consider withdrawing the amendment (A/C.2/L.1095) to that paragraph.

39. Mr. VIAUD (France) expressed the view that document A/C.2/L.1060, submitted by the Colombian delegation as a draft resolution, was more in the nature of a draft final declaration for the launching of the Second Development Decade. It was, in fact, the kind of document the General Assembly would be required to adopt at its twenty-fifth session. In the meantime, it was doubtful whether the Committee could embark upon a full-scale and constructive debate on the document, which might, however, provide a useful basis for the work of the Preparatory Committee at its forthcoming session. As a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1094, his delegation was inclined to suggest that in its draft report on the item the Committee should propose that the General Assembly should refer the text of the Colombian draft resolution to the Preparatory Committee for consideration. His delegation would entrust the Rapporteur with the task of preparing a draft decision to that effect.

40. His delegation found the amendment (A/C.2/L.1095) a little disconcerting, because the proposal posed a genuine question of conscience. He naturally ruled out the possibility that the Chilean delegation, which had introduced the amendment, was seeking to bring pressure to bear on certain delegations. The Chilean delegation, like the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1094, was certainly sincerely anxious to ensure that the Second Development Decade was a truly collective undertaking. If that was the purpose of the amendment, it was obviously desirable that the launching of the Second Development Decade should be associated with practical measures or statements of intent that would be conducive to its success. The Chilean delegation's wishes were therefore quite natural; nevertheless, it was not altogether justified in introducing the amendment. As the representative of India had rightly pointed out, the Second Development Decade was to cover a period of ten years and its success would not be solely

dependent or measures taken prior to its launching. The amendment made a distinction between practical measures to be taken before and after the launching of the Decade. Moreover, as the Tunisian representative had rightly pointed out, the notion of commitments had not yet been defined clearly enough and the Preparatory Committee had reached no agreement on that subject; the question was to be considered in detail by the Preparatory Committee in 1970. In those circumstances, the amendment, too, might be referred to the Preparatory Committee as a working document. In any event, should the amendment not be withdrawn, his delegation would have to vote against it.

41. As the Second Development Decade was necessarily to be a common undertaking, the main problem was to reach a consensus on what had been done and what remained to be done. Draft resolution A/C.2/L.1094 was merely a provisional measure which in no way prejudiced future action. An attempt to precipitate matters, on the other hand, might well complicate the further work of the Preparatory Committee. If the amendment was adopted, there was no doubt that a large number of delegations would abstain on the draft resolution A/C.2/L.1094, as amended, as a whole, and that would certainly not augur well for the success of the Second Development Decade.

42. His delegation was prepared to associate itself with any decision by the General Assembly to refer the amendment to the Preparatory Committee.

43. Mr. NAJA (Lebanon) said that his delegation fully supported the remarks made by the Tunisian representative. The amendment introduced by the Chilean delegation (A/C.2/L.1095) was, of course, most interesting, and was completely in accordance with his delegation's wishes, but there was no possibility of its being adopted by a large number of delegations. It would thus prove to be yet another document whose prospects of implementation were doubtful. His delegation had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1094 in the belief that it represented a step forward. If the amendment was put to the vote, his delegation intended to abstain.

44. Mr. KASPRZYK (Poland), explaining his delegation's position concerning draft resolution A/C.2/L.1094, said that despite its reservations and doubts about the document, Poland was anxious to maintain its friendly relations with all the sponsors of the draft and fully appreciated the importance of the problem under discussion.

45. Throughout the twenty-third session of the General Assembly Poland, like all the other socialist countries, had spared no effort to achieve a satisfactory compromise on General Assembly resolution 2411 (XXIII). The sponsors of that resolution had, unfortunately, not taken his delegation's observations into account: the resolution had been adopted by a majority vote and the Preparatory Committee for the Second United Nations Development Decade had been set up. It was a well-known fact that the composition of that Committee had made it impossible for his delegation to participate in its work.

46. Draft resolution A/C.2/L.1094 was based on the work of the Preparatory Committee and on General Assembly resolution 2411 (XXIII). Accordingly, his delegation could

not take a favourable position regarding the document. It would not comment on the details of substance of the text, although it might do so if certain conditions were met and if, for example, Assembly resolution 2411 (XXIII) was amended in such a way as to enable all countries, irrespective of their political systems, to participate in the preparatory work for the Second Development Decade.

47. Mr. RUTTEN (Netherlands) said that his delegation associated itself with the remarks made by the French representative (see para. 39 above) concerning draft resolution A/C.2/L.1060.

48. With regard to draft resolution A/C.2/L.1094, his delegation endorsed the interpretation of that document offered by the Tunisian representative (see para. 6 above), particularly with regard to the connexion between the ninth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 4.

49. His delegation had listened carefully to the representative of Chile and was grateful to him for having recalled the position of the Netherlands Government, which considered a strategy without commitments to be meaningless. It was also true, however, that a strategy without participants was just as meaningless.

50. Draft resolution A/C.2/L.1094 embodied a compromise solution which should be acceptable to all delegations. As the representative of France had pointed out, the draft resolution was merely a provisional measure. The Netherlands delegation urged the sponsors of document A/C.2/L.1095 to withdraw their proposal, so that draft resolution A/C.2/L.1094 might receive the widest possible measure of support.

51. Mr. RANKIN (Canada) whole-heartedly endorsed the comments of the representatives of France and the Netherlands.

52. Mr. CONSTANTIN (Romania) said that his country had welcomed the initiative taken by the United Nations concerning the preparation of a development strategy for the forthcoming Decade. His country, which was itself involved in the development process, reaffirmed its solidarity with countries having the same problems and would support their efforts. His delegation would therefore vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1094. It wished, however, to stress once again that it was essential to secure the widest possible participation of all countries interested in the work which was to be undertaken whatever their social systems. For reasons which had been explained repeatedly, General Assembly resolution 2411 (XXIII), was not based on that principle; consequently, certain countries, including Romania, had found it impossible to participate in the work of the Preparatory Committee. Accordingly, his delegation's vote in favour of the draft resolution would not imply acceptance of those parts of it which referred to Assembly resolution 2411 (XXIII) or to the Preparatory Committee and its work. Should those parts be put to the vote separately, his delegation would be unable to support them.

53. Mr. FERNANDEZ (Venezuela) said that his delegation, although it was a sponsor of neither the draft resolution nor the amendment, nevertheless understood

perfectly the considerations that had led to their submission. It had, moreover, kept in touch with the consultations and negotiations which had taken place and wished that it had been possible to produce an even more emphatic text. In any case, the meaning of operative paragraph 4, when considered in conjunction with the ninth preambular paragraph, was clear enough and his delegation would therefore vote in favour of the draft resolution, despite its imperfections. It joined other delegations in urging the sponsors of the amendment (A/C.2/L.1095) to withdraw it, in view of the fact that the explanations which had been given showed that the draft resolution reflected their basic thinking. On the subject of operative paragraph 10, his delegation did not share the opinion of the United Arab Republic delegation, because countries which had not participated in the work of the Preparatory Committee would have an opportunity to collaborate in the common undertaking, if they wished.

54. His delegation, like those of the United Kingdom, Brazil and Argentina, believed that the draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1060) submitted by the representative of Colombia contained extremely valuable ideas; the Committee should therefore propose to include in its draft report a statement that the General Assembly should refer that draft resolution to the Preparatory Committee.

55. Mr. BAKOTO (Cameroon) expressed the hope that those delegations to whom urgent appeals had been addressed would reveal their intentions.

56. Mr. ALI (Iraq) said a tribute to the sponsors of the draft resolution. He thought, nevertheless, that the amendment (A/C.2/L.1095) submitted would, if accepted, strengthen the text. The wording of operative paragraph 10 was not sufficiently precise and his delegation had already stated its point of view and its reservations. The participation of the Federal Republic of Germany and the exclusion of the German Democratic Republic was an act of discrimination of which Iraq could not approve. It was regrettable that the socialist countries had been unable to participate in the work of the Preparatory Committee. In conclusion, he said that his delegation supported the United Arab Republic proposal concerning a separate vote but would nevertheless vote for the draft resolution as a whole.

57. Mr. EL-ATTRASH (Syria) recalled that his country had always urged that Member States should be requested to undertake specific commitments concerning the implementation of the development strategy. That was why his delegation was a sponsor of the proposed amendment (A/C.2/L.1095). It admitted, however, that the wording of operative paragraph 4, although not entirely satisfactory, could be accepted. It had no objection therefore to consulting the other sponsors of the amendment with a view to reaching a solution acceptable to all. It would be necessary however to delete operative paragraphs 10 and 11, which could be construed as a reproach to the socialist countries—a judgement which his delegation could not support.

58. Mr. SAHLOUL (Sudan) endorsed the comments made by the representatives of the United Arab Republic, Iraq and Syria. For reasons already stated, he hoped that operative paragraphs 10 and 11 would be deleted. His

delegation's vote would depend on the results of the appeal addressed to the sponsors. Sudan, which was a sponsor of the amendment (A/C.2/L.1095), considered that the developing countries had already made enough concessions. The developed countries' position was not very clear. If the Sudanese delegation was assured that adoption of operative paragraph 4, as it now stood, meant that the Governments of those countries would agree to undertake specific commitments, it would have no objection to an attempt to reach a compromise solution.

59. Mr. GUELEV (Bulgaria) said that his country had already explained its position several times in the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council. In view of the importance of the Second Development Decade it was essential that all countries should be able to participate both in the preparatory work and in implementing the strategy. His delegation could not therefore support a General Assembly resolution which had the effect of legalizing a policy of discrimination against certain sovereign States and would be unable to vote for the draft resolution. Moreover, there was no doubt that the elimination of the economic and social backwardness afflicting a large number of countries as a result of colonialist and imperialist exploitation posed one of the greatest and most urgent problems of the time. Neo-colonialist methods and practices must also be eradicated from international economic relations. His Government's interest in the problem of international economic co-operation was explained by the fact that the Bulgarian Government and people had had to face the problem of under-development long before the question had become the subject of discussions in the United Nations. As a result of its efforts, Bulgaria had succeeded in overcoming its economic backwardness without United Nations assistance. Being aware, however, of the advantages of such assistance it supported the idea of a plan for the co-ordination of efforts to promote the economic and social development of the third world. But it would first be necessary to eliminate all forms of economic exploitation without exception. It would also be necessary to provide for effective measures to protect the economic interests and sovereignty of the new States. However, no matter how effective international initiatives might be, it was the efforts of the developing countries themselves which would determine their economic progress. Bulgaria, which had long been treated as a cheap source of raw materials and agricultural produce, well understood the problem of the third world. Thanks to the fraternal support of the socialist countries, it had succeeded in overcoming the obstacles encountered and considered that more attention should be paid to that type of international co-operation, which was based on the principles of equal rights, respect for mutual interests and collaboration without discrimination.

60. Mr. AHMED (Pakistan) said that the statements of the sponsors of the draft resolution and those of the sponsors of the amendment should make it possible to reach a compromise. In the opinion of some delegations which he had consulted, the inclusion in the draft report of a paragraph specifying the interpretation given to operative paragraph 4 and to the ninth preambular paragraph should provide a solution satisfactory to all. If the sponsors of the draft resolution accepted that proposal, the amendment could be withdrawn.

61. Mr. CHTOUROU (Tunisia) thanked the delegation of Pakistan for its proposal and expressed the hope that the other sponsors would accept it. It had not been possible to learn their opinion on operative paragraphs 10 and 11, but some delegations had already agreed that they should be deleted. Tunisia therefore hoped that the draft resolution could be adopted unanimously.

62. Mr. CORREA (Chile) said that the delegations he had consulted were prepared to accept Pakistan's proposal.

63. Mr. SAHLOUL (Sudan) supported the proposal made by the delegation of Pakistan. While welcoming the spirit of compromise evinced by several delegations he nevertheless wished to state that if during the explanations of vote it became clear that some delegations did not accept the interpretation given to the paragraph in dispute, the Sudanese delegation would reserve the right to resubmit the amendment (A/C.2/L.1095) in the General Assembly.

64. Mr. PARRA (Colombia) thanked the delegations that had supported the draft resolution (A/C.2/L.1060) submitted by his delegation. While appreciating the understanding they had shown towards the sponsors of the draft resolution on the international development strategy (A/C.2/L.1094), he must state that his delegation would have to abstain in the vote. The Colombian delegation thanked those delegations which had proposed the inclusion in the Committee's draft report of a paragraph stating that the Colombian draft resolution should be referred to the Preparatory Committee for the Second United Nations Development Decade.

65. The CHAIRMAN said that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1094, who had been joined by Argentina, Guinea, Iceland, Kenya and Nigeria, agreed to delete operative paragraphs 10 and 11. Consequently, former paragraph 12 would become paragraph 10. He invited the Committee to vote on the draft resolution as amended.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 84 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.

66. Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom) said that he was pleased that the draft resolution had been adopted by such a large majority. The United Kingdom would support the efforts of the developing countries but could not make any commitment before the beginning of the Second Development Decade. The Chilean representative had said that he was tired of broken promises; the United Kingdom delegation quite understood his feelings, but it was common knowledge that Governments examined very carefully all texts which might entail obligations. The greatest caution was therefore necessary when adopting certain terms. That did not mean that his Government rejected the idea of development assistance. On the contrary, its recent statements showed that it intended to contribute substantially to the development of the third world.

67. Mr. CORREA (Chile), speaking on behalf of the Peruvian as well as his own delegation, said that he could not agree that adoption of a strategy did not necessarily imply adoption of the commitments required for its implementation.

The meeting rose at 7.15 p.m.