

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**  
TWENTY-FIRST SESSION  
Official Records



1497th  
**PLENARY MEETING**

Saturday, 17 December 1966,  
at 3 p.m.

**NEW YORK**

**CONTENTS**

	<i>Page</i>
<i>Agenda item 83:</i> <i>Progressive development of the law of international trade</i> <i>Report of the Sixth Committee .....</i>	1
<i>Agenda item 13:</i> <i>Report of the Economic and Social Council [chapters II to IX, X (section II), XII, XIII (sections II to VII), XIV and XV] (continued)</i> <i>Report of the Second Committee .....</i>	2
<i>Agenda item 37:</i> <i>United Nations Conference on Trade and Development: report of the Trade and Development Board (concluded)</i> <i>Report of the Second Committee (part II) ..</i>	2
<i>Agenda item 46:</i> <i>Population growth and economic development</i> <i>Report of the Second Committee .....</i>	2
<i>Agenda item 41:</i> <i>Activities in the field of industrial development (concluded)</i> <i>(b) Report of the <u>Ad Hoc</u> Committee on the United Nations Organization for Industrial Development</i> <i>Report of the Second Committee (part II) ..</i>	2
<i>Agenda item 33:</i> <i>Comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all their aspects: report of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations</i> <i>Report of the Special Political Committee ..</i>	16
<i>Agenda item 35:</i> <i>Effects of atomic radiation: report of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation</i> <i>Report of Special Political Committee .. .</i>	26

**President: Mr. Abdul Rahman PAZHWAK  
(Afghanistan).**

**AGENDA ITEM 88**

Progressive development of the law of international trade  
REPORT OF THE SIXTH COMMITTEE  
[A/6594 AND CORR.1]

Mr. Arangio-Ruiz (Italy), Rapporteur of the Sixth Committee, presented the report of that Committee and then spoke as follows:

1. Mr. ARANGIO-RUIZ (Italy), Rapporteur of the Sixth Committee: The item now before the General

Assembly was placed on the agenda of the Assembly at its twentieth session on the initiative of the Hungarian delegation.<sup>1/</sup> By its resolution 2102 (XX) the Assembly requested the Secretary-General to prepare a comprehensive report on the work done in the field of the progressive development of international trade law, and a study of the possible role of the United Nations in this field.

2. The report [A/6396 and Corr.1-2 and Add.1-2] was prepared by the Office of Legal Affairs on the basis of a preliminary study by Professor Schmitthoff, a well-known authority in the field, and following request for advice from a number of eminent experts, namely: Dr. Arguas of Argentina, Dr. Elias of Nigeria, and Professors Eörsi of Hungary, Reese of the United States and Yasseen of Iraq. The Secretary-General had also had consultations with a number of United Nations organs and units, including the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and the International Law Commission, with the specialized agencies and with inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations operating in the field, or concerned therewith.

3. The report contained a survey of the work done in the field at various levels, presented a picture of the progress made and expressed the view that the General Assembly might consider the possibility of establishing a subsidiary body for the purpose of furthering the progressive development and harmonization of the law of international trade.

4. The debate in the Sixth Committee, which followed the introduction of the subject by the initiating delegation and statements by the representatives of institutions operating in the field of unification of law and private international law, revealed at an early stage that the members of the Sixth Committee were generally convinced of the great value of the Secretary-General's report, and that it would be expedient for the United Nations to create a subsidiary body of the kind indicated therein—and this especially in view of the importance of international trade law both for the promotion of world trade in general, and in order to meet the special problems of developing countries in the field. The rest of the debate centred upon the functions of the proposed commission, collaboration with other organizations, relationship with UNCTAD, size and composition of the proposed commission and terms of office of its members, place of meeting, time of election, and so forth.

5. A draft resolution was submitted to the Sixth Committee by thirty-five States, representing the

<sup>1/</sup> Official Records of the General Assembly, Twentieth Session, Annexes, agenda item 92, document A/6206.

various legal and socio-economic systems in the world, as well as developed and developing countries. Following a number of consultations among the sponsors, this draft was modified in a number of points and finally adopted by the Committee in the formulation appearing at the end of the report [A/6594, para. 34].

6. The main objective of the draft resolution is to reaffirm the General Assembly's conviction that divergencies arising from the laws of different States in matters relating to international trade constitutes one of the obstacles to the development of world trade. While noting with appreciation the efforts made by inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations towards the progressive harmonization of international trade law, the draft resolution notes that progress in this area at a world-wide level has not been commensurate with the importance and urgency of the problem.

7. On the basis of the conviction that world-wide work in this field should be substantially co-ordinated, systematized and accelerated, and that broader participation should be secured, especially on the part of developing countries, section I of the operative part of the draft resolution establishes a commission, to be called the "United Nations Commission on International Trade Law". The commission would consist of twenty-nine States, to be elected at the twenty-second session of the General Assembly, according to the distribution of seats provided for in paragraph 1 of section II of the operative part of the draft resolution.

8. It is also provided in the draft resolution that Member States should, in so far as possible, appoint as their representatives on the commission persons of eminence in the field of international trade law. Thus, the commission would combine a high degree of scholarship and expertise with government participation, which would be essential to ensure the most active support of Governments in this endeavour.

9. In view of the experience, interest and responsibilities of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development in the field of international trade, the commission would establish particularly close collaboration with UNCTAD. Indeed, many delegations drew attention, in the course of the debate, to the very high importance of such close collaboration in view of the necessity that in the harmonization and development of trade law full account be taken of the actual requirements of world trade. This point is covered by sub-paragraph (f) of paragraph 8 and by paragraph 10 of section II of the draft resolution. Recognizing the important contribution made by existing inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations in this field, the Commission would also provide for appropriate working relationships with them.

10. As the draft resolution was adopted by the Sixth Committee without any negative vote or abstentions, it may be hoped that this plenary meeting will adopt it unanimously. The importance of the subject matter, and of the new subsidiary organ of the General Assembly to be established, would make a unanimous adoption most auspicious.

*Pursuant to rule 68 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the report of the Sixth Committee.*

11. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the Sixth Committee [A/6594, para. 34]. I would draw the attention of the Assembly to the report of the Fifth Committee [A/6609] on the financial implications of the draft resolution. Since the draft resolution was adopted unanimously in the Sixth Committee, may I take it that the General Assembly also adopts it unanimously?

*The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.*

#### AGENDA ITEM 12

Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapters II to IX, X (section II), XII, XIII (sections II to VII), XIV and XV) (continued)\*

#### REPORT OF THE SECOND COMMITTEE (A/6613)

#### AGENDA ITEM 37

United Nations Conference on Trade and Development: report of the Trade and Development Board (concluded)\*\*

#### REPORT OF THE SECOND COMMITTEE (PART II) (A/6567/ADD.1)

#### AGENDA ITEM 46

Population growth and economic development

#### REPORT OF THE SECOND COMMITTEE (A/6604 AND CORR.1)

#### AGENDA ITEM 41

Activities in the field of industrial development (concluded)\*\*\*

(b) Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the United Nations Organization for Industrial Development

#### REPORT OF THE SECOND COMMITTEE (PART II) (A/6508/ADD.1)

*Mr. Reisch (Austria), Rapporteur of the Second Committee, presented the reports of that Committee and then spoke as follows:*

12. Mr. REISCH (Austria), Rapporteur of the Second Committee: The first report [A/6613] deals with agenda item 12.

13. The Second Committee, to which certain parts of the report of the Economic and Social Council had been allocated, considered these sections of the report throughout the course of its meetings in conjunction with other agenda items dealing with the subject matter contained therein. Further, in dealing with those matters and taking note of the remaining part of the report, the Committee had before it two draft resolutions which were introduced by the delegation of Chile [A/6613, paras. 4-5] and which—after a brief discussion, during which several delegations, while agreeing with the substance of the draft resolutions,

\*Resumed from the 1494th meeting.

\*\*Resumed from the 1488th meeting.

\*\*\*Resumed from the 1488th meeting.

referred to the limited time available for their consideration—were subsequently withdrawn in order to expedite the work of the Committee. The Second Committee therefore recommends no specific action to the General Assembly.

14. The second report of the Second Committee [A/6567/Add.1] relates to agenda item 37. The Committee has already reported previously [A/6567] and separately on one aspect of the consideration of this item, namely, the holding of a special session of the Trade and Development Board in New York on 21 December 1966. In considering this item, the Second Committee had before it, as the main basis for discussion, the report of the Trade and Development Board [A/6315]. The Committee also heard a statement by the Secretary-General of that organization, Mr. Raúl Prebisch, which was issued as an official document [A/C.2/L.908].

15. The Committee had a series of recommendations before it on this item, and adopted five draft resolutions for submission to the Assembly [A/6567/Add.1, para. 29]. Draft resolution I deals specifically with the second session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. This draft resolution, after amendment [A/6567/Add.1, paras. 12-13], was adopted unanimously by the Committee. In this connexion, I wish to draw attention to paragraph 14 of the report in which the understanding of the Committee with regard to the interpretation of the word "negotiation", which is used in the text of the draft resolution, is reproduced.

16. Draft resolution II deals with technical assistance in trade and related fields. It was adopted unanimously by the Committee.

17. Draft resolution III deals with "International monetary reform". That draft resolution, after several amendments had been proposed and a revision of the original draft resolution had been issued, was adopted without objection.

18. Draft resolution IV deals with the "Implementation of the recommendations of the first United Nations Conference on Trade and Development". The draft resolution was also adopted by the Committee without objection.

19. Draft resolution V is entitled "International agreement on cocoa". This draft resolution was adopted unanimously by the Committee, after revision by its sponsors. However, with regard to this draft resolution, several amendments [A/L.510] have been presented to the General Assembly by a number of delegations.

20. Also under this aspect of the item, the Committee heard a statement on the subject of cocoa by the Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. Owing to the importance of this statement, the Committee decided that its full text not only should be issued as an official document of the Committee but should also be annexed to the report [A/6567/Add.1, annex].

21. The third report [A/6604 and Corr.1] is on agenda item 46. The Committee had before it a draft resolution which, after oral revision, was adopted unanimously [A/6604, para. 9]. An understanding pre-

valled among interested delegations, both sponsors of the draft resolution and others, with regard to the interpretation of certain terms in the draft resolution [*ibid.*, para. 8]. This has been indicated as having been the understanding of the Committee, although, owing to certain circumstances, the text of this interpretative paragraph was never officially introduced in the Committee.

22. In that connexion, I wish also to draw the attention of the Assembly to the corrigendum [A/6604/Corr.1], which refers to paragraph 8 and adds in the penultimate line of the paragraph after the words "while bearing in mind" the words "the sovereignty of nations in formulating and promoting their own policy and".

23. The last of the reports relates to item 41 (b) [A/6508/Add.1]. I have already had the honour of introducing a first report on this subject to the General Assembly [A/6505] in which the Committee informed the Assembly that a supplementary report concerning the site of the future headquarters of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization was to follow. To this end the Committee requested the Secretary-General to submit a report on the details of the facilities required for the effective functioning of the organization [A/C.2/232].

24. In dealing with this matter, the Committee decided that a decision on the site should be taken during the twenty-first session of the Assembly and that this decision should be taken by secret ballot. The Committee then determined the procedure to be followed in the balloting [A/6508/Add.1, para. 19].

25. The Committee had to select the site from among seven offers. Four ballots were held and the result of the decisive fourth ballot was the selection of Vienna as the future headquarters of the organization [*ibid.*, para. 12].

26. After selecting a site, the Committee also considered a draft resolution, submitted by a number of sponsors [*ibid.*, para. 13]. However, after a brief discussion, the Committee decided that only operative paragraph 1 of this draft should be retained in the form of a draft resolution, while the remaining part of the draft resolution should be incorporated in the report [*ibid.*, para. 15].

27. The recommendation of the Second Committee to decide to locate the headquarters of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization at Vienna, Austria, is contained in paragraph 16 of the report. It gives me great pleasure to introduce this recommendation of the Second Committee to locate the headquarters of the organization in the capital of my own country. I sincerely hope that this recommendation, along with many others of the Second Committee, will be adopted unanimously.

*Pursuant to rule 68 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the reports of the Second Committee.*

28. The PRESIDENT: The first report of the Second Committee, [A/6613] relates to parts of the report of the Economic and Social Council allocated to the Committee. If there is no objection, I shall take it

that the General Assembly takes note of the report of the Second Committee.

*The General Assembly took note of the report of the Second Committee.*

29. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to agenda item 37. The Assembly has before it five draft resolutions submitted by the Second Committee [A/6567/Add.1, para. 29]. A number of amendments [A/L.510] have been submitted to draft resolution V.

30. I now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

31. Mr. TADJO (Ivory Coast) (translated from French): My delegation is a co-sponsor of draft resolution V [A/6567/Add.1, para. 29], and of the amendments to that draft [A/L.510].

32. My delegation wholeheartedly supports the amendments; they serve to give some meaning to draft resolution V which became pointless as a result of the failure of the recent talks on cocoa. In doing so we are not without feelings of great distress and some bitterness, for the failure of the recent cocoa talks has once again shown up the difficulties encountered by the world Organization in attempting to implement the resolutions so patiently prepared and adopted by successive sessions of the General Assembly.

33. My delegation could not but be distressed when it considered that an agreement on cocoa is generally felt to be very easy to achieve in view of the present situation of this basic commodity. Are the great hopes aroused in the developing countries by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development to be forever disappointed?

34. The Ivory Coast also felt embittered on hearing of the failure of the cocoa talks. How could we feel otherwise, when the Ivory Coast delegation, knowing that cocoa represents one third of our country's export earnings, cherished great hopes of the successful outcome of these talks?

35. Since the talks have ended in failure, it is only natural to try to lay the responsibility on someone. The United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany must bear the heavy burden of responsibility before the whole world for the failure of the recent cocoa talks, because they refused to agree to the price range proposed by the producing countries and adopted by the majority of the consuming countries; and the United Kingdom must share the responsibility for having joined with those two Powers in obstinately refusing to admit that buffer stocks could play an important role.

36. I shall not speak at great length; I merely wish to say that this failure was not due to economic considerations, for if the slightest attempt had been made to determine the comparative cost, it would have been evident that 19 cents, the price on which the United States insists, is not at all a fair price for the producers, especially since various intermediate costs must be deducted from those 19 cents. At a price of 22 cents a pound for cocoa, the Ivory Coast can pay its producers seventy francs CFA<sup>2/</sup> per kilo, that is,

the lowest rate since the recent exceptionally low cocoa prices.

37. We feel that all this is due to a lack of the political will to contribute effectively to the development of these countries. Cocoa production, as everyone knows, could enable more than a dozen countries to attain the minimum objectives set by the United Nations Development Decade.

38. I shall conclude by saying that the Ivory Coast delegation has not lost all hope, although there seems no cause for optimism, since the consultations have come to an end without any assurance that they can be reopened with a view to preparing the next cocoa conference.

39. In voting for these amendments, I believe we are demonstrating our faith in this great world Organization, in the hope that a softening of the attitudes of the countries responsible for the failure of the talks will allow a preparatory conference on cocoa to be convened.

40. Mr. BELEOKEN (Cameroon) (translated from French): The delegation of the Federal Republic of Cameroon is a co-sponsor of the amendments (A/L.510) to the Second Committee's resolution V on the United Nations Conference on Cocoa [A/6567/Add.1, para. 29]. I should like here to explain the reasons which led us to propose these amendments. At the same time, I should also like to recall my Government's position with regard to the implementation of the various recommendations of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.

41. When the Second Committee was considering the draft resolution [ibid., para. 24] on the United Nations Cocoa Conference, the delegation of Cameroon, which collaborated in the drafting of the text, thought it unnecessary to intervene in the Committee itself. Indeed, we knew that multilateral talks were taking place in one of the United Nations conference rooms and we did not wish in any way to prejudge the results of those talks, whether successful or not.

42. The Committee therefore proceeded with the normal discussion of the question and finally adopted unanimously the draft resolution now before the General Assembly. Unfortunately, only a few hours after the draft resolution had been adopted by the Second Committee, the multilateral talks met with an unprecedented setback. The Secretary-General of UNCTAD, aware of the seriousness of the problem, thought it his duty to inform the members of the Second Committee of the outcome of the negotiations between the producing and consuming countries. The text of his statement is annexed to the Second Committee's report. It deserves serious consideration by all Members of the United Nations and especially by those responsible for the new situation which we bitterly deplore. In his entirely objective statement, the Secretary-General of UNCTAD recognized the very substantial concessions made by the producing countries and explained the true reasons for the failure of the negotiations. At a meeting last October in Douala in my own country, the producing countries harmonized their positions and, in a spirit of conciliation, presented the consumer countries with compromise solutions which, we must admit, were appreciated

<sup>2/</sup> Communauté Financière Africaine.

by the majority of the consumer countries. Unfortunately, we are obliged to note that certain major consumer countries, systematically refusing any compromise and seeking at all costs to impose their views on the producing countries, have once again destroyed any chance of agreement between the two sides, to such an extent that the Secretary-General of UNCTAD no longer feels that he can convene another United Nations Cocoa Conference, or even a preliminary negotiating group. We understand Mr. Prebisch's disillusionment and we fully share it. How can we conceive of negotiations in which one of the parties makes concessions while the other party remains inflexible and determined not to take the slightest step forward?

43. When analysing in the Second Committee the causes of the failure of the United Nations Cocoa Conference in 1966, the Permanent Representative of Ghana, Mr. Arkhurst, stated frankly that the Conference's lack of success was mainly due to the attitude adopted by the United States delegation.<sup>37</sup>

44. My delegation can confirm today that the failure of the multilateral talks of 29 November 1966 was also due to the intransigence of the United States delegation. While the producing countries have considerably modified their position since the failure in June, the United States on the contrary has not altered its rigid attitude by one inch, as the representative of Ghana has stated.

45. After the statements made by the United States delegations to the Forty-First session of the Economic and Social Council and to the Fourth Session of the Trade and Development Board, we were tempted to believe that the possibility of an international agreement on cocoa was close at hand. Now we must shed all our illusions. There is a great difference between the declarations of intention which we hear in political forums and the attitudes adopted by some delegations at technical meetings. For our part, we should like to see deeds correspond to words so that the mutual confidence which should prevail among members of the international community may be strengthened.

46. I will not go into all the different points on which the delegations of the producing countries have made vast concessions. Mr. Prebisch has summarized them excellently in his statement of 9 December which is attached to the Second Committee's report. Let it suffice for me to mention only one—the problem of prices.

47. Despite certain rumours put about by the local press—I shall return to them in a moment—the failure of the recent multilateral talks on cocoa was due, as in June last year, to the question of a floor price. We shall speak very forthrightly on this matter because we believe that a frank expression of our opinions will create a better understanding of our respective attitudes. As we see from the statement of the Secretary-General of UNCTAD, the producing countries made a very constructive proposal to the consumers. While previously they had requested a floor price of 26, 25 or 24 cents per pound, last June and more recently at the beginning of this month, they agreed to a com-

promise floor price of between 20 and 22 cents. This proposal on the part of the producing countries was so reasonable that one of the consumer countries decided, as early as last June, to adopt it. I should like to extend the sincere congratulations of the delegation of Cameroon to the French Government for taking that decision and for its constant policy in favour of the stabilization of commodity prices in developing countries. We are sure the French Government, in taking that decision, took into account not only the interests of France, but also the equally legitimate interests of the producing countries.

48. In all fairness we should also congratulate the other consumer countries which agreed to negotiate on the basis of a floor price of between 19 and 21 cents, and we consider that all the countries which did so, in June as well as in December, made an effort to come closer to our views. We believe that it is still possible for us to reach agreement on a single floor price, acceptable to all parties, of between 19 and 22 cents.

49. However, we deeply deplore the fact that the United States delegation was not in a position to accept a floor price of more than 19 cents. We are unable to understand the basic reasons which led the United States authorities to adopt such a position which, in our opinion, is unjustifiable.

50. The Secretary-General of UNCTAD, whose competence and moral integrity is well-known and appreciated by every one here, stated that the attitude of those who would not accept a floor price of more than 19 cents could not be justified on any technical ground. With your permission, Mr. President, I should like to quote his words:

"I have taken risks which may seem greater than those which an international civil servant should have taken. I went to see the producers in Cameroon and recommended compromises. I also saw the consumers. But there is something I cannot do and that is to recommend the producers to accept the floor price of 19 cents because, in all good conscience, I cannot. All the other compromises which I advocated, I advocated in good conscience, convinced as I was that a good settlement was possible. But I shall not do so in the case of prices, because I am sure that to accept the floor price of 19 cents would be to destroy the agreement. How can the floor price of 19 cents be accepted, knowing that in the last twenty years, prices fell only once below 20 cents? How can a sound agreement be built up on such a basis? How can the producers accept a price lower than the normal level of prices over the last twenty years? I do not wish to enter into an argument. That is not for me to do. But I must urgently appeal for a more flexible approach to this problem of prices, for a study of the past, and for recognition of the fact that this agreement involves no risk at all."  
[A/6567/Add.1, annex, para. 13]

51. As the Secretary-General of UNCTAD has done, we also make an urgent appeal to the Government of the United States and to all those who might be tempted to support it on this question of a floor price. We urgently appeal to them to show more understanding and more co-operation.

<sup>37</sup> This statement was made at the 1084th meeting of the Second Committee, the official records of which are published in summary form.

52. There is no doubt in our mind that the majority of Members of the United Nations seek the adoption of an international agreement on cocoa. On numerous occasions, both developing and developed countries, hoping for the success of UNCTAD and concerned by the anachronism of the present structures of international trade in general and of the cocoa trade in particular, have clearly expressed their desire to see an international agreement on cocoa concluded as soon as possible. It would be regrettable if the United States Government, conscious of its role in the world cocoa trade, should systematically oppose the wishes of the majority of members of this Assembly.

53. The position of the Cameroon Government should be clearly understood. We do not need a scapegoat to blame for all our misfortunes but I sincerely believe everyone will understand that, for a country like Cameroon in which cocoa is the chief export product and where a million people live exclusively on the cocoa trade, the catastrophic decline in the price of cocoa during the last few years represents a grave and constant concern.

54. For example, it will be remembered that after the decline in prices last year, Cameroon had a deficit of 4,00 million francs CFA, i.e., more than 16 million dollars. For a budget such as ours, these figures speak for themselves.

55. At the beginning of the present session, an eminent public figure of a major developed country declared that the greater the power, the greater were the responsibilities. Of course, he was referring chiefly to political responsibilities; but we believe this idea also applies to the economic and commercial field.

56. We ask those who hold the destiny of certain poor countries virtually in their hands to shoulder all their responsibilities. We ask them to deal justly with us by paying a fair price for our products. We call upon them, as our friends, to make our task easier by refraining from adopting positions which public opinion in our countries simply cannot understand, indeed how are we to explain to the cocoa planters that certain friendly Governments devote millions of dollars to the arms race and the conquest of space, while at the same time declare that they are opposed to a rise of a single cent in the price of the cocoa produced in our country?

57. I should also like to say a word on the price preferences mentioned by Mr. Prebisch in his statement of 9 December. The local Press, and particularly the Journal of Commerce of 12 December 1966 stated that the problem of preferences formed the chief subject of the cocoa talks of 29 November. In an article written in Washington, Mr. Richard Lawrence stated—and I should like to quote his exact words, even if my English pronunciation is faulty:

*[The speaker continued in English.]*

"To the surprise of most countries, the question of preference dominated the discussions in New York last week..."<sup>4/</sup>

58. The PRESIDENT: May I respectfully draw the attention of the speaker to the fact that he asked for the floor to make an explanation of vote and I gave him the floor. The statement that he is now making obviously is not an explanation of vote; it is a general statement. I would request him, in accordance with the decision of the General Assembly, to confine himself strictly to an explanation of vote. If the representative of Cameroon desires to make a general statement, I shall accommodate him; he may have his statement included in the verbatim record. But at this stage of our proceedings, his statement is not in order, and it is my duty to see to it that there is order in our proceedings. The representative of Cameroon may proceed.

59. Mr. BELEOKEN (Cameroon) (translated from French): I thank you, Mr. President, but as I said at the beginning of my statement, I wanted to explain the reasons why the Cameroon delegation joined with other delegations in submitting the amendments now before the Assembly. These amendments have not yet been formally introduced by my colleague, the representative of Ghana. I wanted to explain the reasons which prompted my delegation to submit these amendments and I thought that . . .

60. The PRESIDENT: May I explain the situation to the representative of Cameroon. He is right in saying that the amendments were to be introduced by the representative of Ghana. However, when we came to the stage of the consideration of this item it was not convenient for the representative of Ghana to introduce the amendments. Therefore, I decided that we would proceed with the explanations of vote and that at the end of the explanations of vote I would call on the representative of Ghana to introduce the amendments before we proceeded to a vote. That arrangement has been made, and the representative of Ghana will speak after the representatives have explained their votes. If the representative of the Cameroon has been authorized by the sponsors to introduce the amendments, I shall permit him, even at this stage, to finish his statement.

61. Mr. BELEOKEN (Cameroon) (translated from French): I apologize. I do not wish to abuse the patience of the members of the Assembly. I said earlier that the sponsors of the amendments had not been able to consult one another, since the Ghanaian representative, for reasons beyond his control, was unable to be present here in time to introduce our amendments. I thought that in my capacity as co-sponsor, it would have been possible for me to explain my delegation's position and the reasons why we will vote in favour of the amendments and of the amended draft resolution as a whole.

62. I shall not insist on continuing my speech if the President feels that the position which I have just explained is not in accordance with the rules of procedure. May I ask the President to tell me whether I should leave the rostrum?

63. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Cameroon has a full knowledge of the rules of procedure. I would request him to adhere to the rules of procedure and confine his statement to an explanation of vote on proposals other than his own amendments, on which,

<sup>4/</sup> Quoted in English by the speaker.

under the rules of procedure, he is not entitled to explain his vote.

64. Mr. BELEOKEN (Cameroon) (translated from French): I shall wait until the representative of Ghana has introduced our amendments, after which I shall probably ask to speak in order to explain my delegation's vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

65. The PRESIDENT: I would suggest that I have the duty to put order in the proceedings. If there is no objection I shall call on the representatives who wish to explain their votes. After those explanations of vote have been made, I shall give the floor to the representative of Ghana to introduce the amendments. If the other sponsors of the amendments wish to speak after him, at that stage I shall be very happy to call on them to make their statements before we proceed to a vote. Is there any objection to that?

66. I call on the representative of the United Kingdom on a point of order.

67. Sir Edward WARNER (United Kingdom): I find myself in some difficulty on this because some amendments are about to be submitted and I wish to speak in explanation of vote on both the draft resolution and the amendments. I do not see how I can speak on the amendments before they have been submitted. I therefore request that I be allowed to speak after the amendments have been submitted by the representative of Ghana.

68. The PRESIDENT: I should like to explain to the representative of the United Kingdom that, so far as the work of the Assembly is concerned, the amendments have been before the Assembly from the beginning of the meeting—and I so declared. Only the presentation of the amendments by sponsors does not make the amendments formal. The amendments have been and are before the Assembly.

69. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote.

70. Mr. FORSHELL (Sweden): The Swedish delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution V, entitled "International agreement on cocoa". We will do so gladly because we consider the question of concluding such an agreement to be particularly urgent. This view we have expressed on many occasions and we have tried within the limit of our possibilities to facilitate the reaching of such an agreement.

71. In those circumstances we shall find it natural also to support the amendments [A/L.510], with one exception. We shall not be in a position to support the amendment to operative paragraph 4. After all, the final aim of these efforts is to reach an agreement between all parts concerned, and whatever our views of what has happened hitherto, we feel that the consultations will be successful only if all parties show a maximum of goodwill and a will to co-operate.

72. I am authorized to state that the delegations of Denmark, Finland, Iceland and Norway associate themselves with the explanation of vote that I have just made.

73. Sir Edward WARNER (United Kingdom): My delegation shares the great disappointment which has been expressed that the recent informal talks

failed to make progress. The producers certainly put forward constructive proposals, but it was perhaps unfortunate that Governments of consumer countries did not have the opportunity to consider them in advance of the meetings.

74. In many respects, the proposals were acceptable to the United Kingdom. In particular, we were able to accept, for the first time, that the Cocoa Council might, in exceptional circumstances, be able to authorize the buffer stock to intervene directly on the market. Also, we were prepared to drop our insistence that the purchase price for the buffer stock should be on a degressive scale.

75. Despite the failure to reach agreement at the recent meeting, the consultations did point the way to possible compromises on the outstanding issues concerning the mechanism of the agreement.

76. As far as price is concerned, the United Kingdom stood by the suggested negotiating bracket of 19-21 cents, and the producers stood by theirs. Some important consumers have not felt able to move beyond 19 cents. Nevertheless my delegation remains convinced that progress can still be made during the further consultations we clearly need.

77. We hope that Mr. Prebisch will pursue these consultations with both producers and consumers, so that a basis for negotiation can be speedily reached. We are ready to play our part in attaining an acceptable and workable compromise and can support draft resolution V before the Assembly. We can also accept the amendments which have been circulated [A/L.510], with the exception of the amendment to paragraph 4 to exclude the word "producers", which my delegation will oppose. As regards the new preambular paragraph, I would say that it is more a question of gastronomical than political will, and I hope that all will eat more chocolate this Christmas.

78. Mr. ROOSEVELT (United States of America): My delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolutions relating to implementation, the second session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, technical assistance in the field of trade promotion, and international monetary problems. Our comments and reservations have been fully set forth in the Committee, and there is no need to repeat them here. Therefore I shall confine my remarks to an explanation of vote on draft resolution V, relating to the cocoa agreement.

79. My delegation voted in favour of the cocoa draft resolution in Committee and would have similarly voted here if we had had an opportunity to vote on it in the form in which it was recommended by the Committee. However, the draft resolution has been somewhat overtaken by events since the cocoa consultations there referred to have been adjourned. Accordingly we are faced with a series of amendments which seek to take account of the new circumstances with which the General Assembly is now faced. Six of the seven amendments represent well-balanced attempts to bring the draft resolution up to date. My delegation has no difficulty with them and will vote in favour of them.

80. The amendment to operative paragraph 4 is, however, a very different matter. By addressing its

call to Governments, particularly those of the major consuming countries, to exert maximum efforts, it in effect places the burden of reaching agreement on one party to the future negotiations. In doing so, it differs from the draft resolution recommended by the Committee, which addresses its call both to the major consuming and to the major producing countries. The change tends to destroy the basis for future negotiations by implicitly placing the blame—I might say, directly placing it, in view of the comments which have been made—for past failures on the United States and other consuming countries. The United States has negotiated in the past in good faith and intends to continue so to negotiate in the future in the hope of attaining the objective on which we all agree: the speedy conclusion of an international cocoa agreement. Our ability to do so will be impaired—and, I would stress, very seriously impaired—by an amendment which destroys the balanced situation so necessary to successful negotiations on any subject by insisting that one party to the negotiations must exert greater efforts than the other.

81. I wish to emphasize our continued belief that an international cocoa agreement is both desirable and attainable. To attain it, however, requires that both sides recognize the differences that still stand in the way of an agreement—disagreeable perhaps as some of the differences may be. The United States wishes to co-operate in achieving an agreement which will have the capability of ensuring that the revenues cocoa producers receive from this important crop will be protected from any serious price declines in the future. That objective cannot be attained, however, unless the producing countries make a greater effort to recognize and understand the very real difficulties faced by the consuming countries and the technical—I repeat, technical—problems that have to be met to arrive at a workable agreement. I would stress that is is equally right and proper for consuming countries, such as mine, to make greater efforts to recognize and understand the very difficult technical problems faced by the producing countries. It is a two-way street, not a one-way street.

82. Therefore my delegation will vote against the amendment to operative paragraph 4, which we cannot accept in principle and which, I believe, in the long light of history, no Government would be willing to accept. We trust that we shall be joined in this by the overwhelming majority of our colleagues who have consistently demonstrated, throughout the Second Committee's consideration of these problems, a fair-minded and even-handed approach to our common difficulties.

83. Should, however, the amendment to eliminate the words "and producers" be adopted by this Assembly, I trust my colleagues will understand that the United States will not be able to concur in a resolution which fails to place equal responsibility for future progress on both producers and consumers—a responsibility which we are ready to assume.

84. Mr. VIAUD (France) (translated from French): I should like to explain briefly my delegation's position regarding draft resolution III (International Monetary Reform) [A/6567/Add.1, para. 29], which we are in the process of discussing.

85. I believe that this resolution was adopted unanimously, but with a certain number of interpretations necessitated by some ambiguity in the wording of operative paragraph 1. I should like to state here, as we have already stated in the Second Committee [1100th meeting], that we accept paragraph 1 as it stands, including its obscurities. This means that, while we recognize the need to associate both developed and developing countries in the discussions and decisions relating to future monetary reform, on the other hand, we do not consider ourselves bound by the present draft resolution as regards the place or the forum in which such discussions might be held.

86. As regards draft resolution V, concerning negotiations for the conclusion of an international agreement on cocoa, I in turn would like to express the French delegation's deep disappointment at the failure of the informal talks which took place here in New York a few days ago.

87. Our disappointment is due, in the first place, to the fact that we had here an opportunity to put into practice for the first time the theory to which we attach such importance, that of organizing primary commodity markets through direct action on prices. For this reason we are directly involved in and affected by this setback. But we are also affected by it in the sense that it represents a loss for the developing countries which are exporters of cocoa. Now we should be able to make a rapid calculation of the difference which one cent or one and a half cents per pound makes in the total volume exported throughout the world. Let us say that it represents perhaps a sum of \$2 million. When my country advocated direct action on prices, we knew very well that the burden would fall on the French consumer. We acted in full awareness of that fact. We were prepared to make the sacrifice and we are still prepared to do so, by accepting the price range proposed by the developing countries as a basis for negotiations, and by agreeing to participate in the financing of buffer stock. We should like to express the hope that the other developed countries will be prepared to make the same sacrifice.

88. Our disappointment means, therefore, that we can no longer accept the text of the draft resolution approved by the Second Committee and that, on the contrary, we support most of the amendments (A/1.510) which, although they have not yet been introduced by the delegation of Ghana, are sufficiently well known to everyone because we have the document before us. My delegation will be able to vote in favour of most of these amendments. As regards the ones which contain an appeal to the consumer countries, I should like to point out that the paragraph is worded in such a way that it is addressed first and foremost to all countries, but more especially to the consumer countries. This is a rather unusual procedure, but I think we are entitled to require some discipline on the part of the consumer countries in the operation of markets and trade. But I think that they are prepared to accept this discipline. It is fairly natural to ask a little more of the consumer countries because it represents less for them, and also because they are richer. Moreover, an agreement on a commodity like cocoa is something much more valuable for the producing countries than for the consumer countries.

89. Consequently, my delegation will not vote against this amendment since we think that we have understood the spirit of it. However, if the delegations which speak after me can clarify certain points, we would like to be sure that the text of the draft as it will emerge after our vote when the amendments have been adopted will still contain an appeal to all countries, i.e., to all those countries which must co-operate in the conclusion of an international agreement.

90. This will be the position of the French delegation when we come to vote on the various draft resolutions.

91. Mr. Donald MACDONALD (Canada): The delegation of Canada will give its support to the draft resolutions recommended by the Second Committee [A/6567/Add.1, para. 29]—including draft resolution V. We have already lent our support to these draft resolutions in the Committee.

92. As concerns the draft resolution on the Cocoa Conference, we are also prepared to support the amendments [A/L.510] if and when they are formally introduced, with the exception of the amendment to paragraph 4.

93. The delegation of Canada cannot support the amendments to paragraph 4 of the draft for reasons which have already been expressed from this rostrum; that is to say, because it does not seem to us that we should single out the consumer countries as bearing the entire responsibility for the continued absence of an agreement on cocoa. Such an amendment not only implies an undue degree of responsibility on the part of the consumer country, but also implies a degree of understanding on the part of producer countries which at the moment does not in fact exist. For that reason, we shall not be able to support that amendment.

94. Mr. ISSAKA (Togo) (translated from French): I have asked to speak in order to explain very briefly our vote on the amendments [A/L.510] to draft resolution V [A/6567/Add.1, para. 29] and on the draft resolution as a whole.

95. I am amazed at the attitude taken earlier by certain delegations, such as those of Denmark, the United Kingdom and the United States, in stating that they could not support our fifth amendment. What are they blaming the producing countries for? For having followed the advice of the Secretary-General of UNCTAD, Mr. Prebisch? For having offered every possible inducement for reaching an agreement on cocoa?

96. I should like to ask those delegations whether they agree with Mr. Prebisch's statements. If not, why do they not challenge those statements?

97. The PRESIDENT: I am sorry to interrupt the speaker, but I should be glad if he would indicate to me on what point he wishes to speak so that I may know whether I can allow him to continue or if, on the contrary, I should call upon him at a more opportune time.

98. Mr. ISSAKA (Togo) (translated from French): I thought that the Assembly was already discussing the amendments submitted by my delegation and others.

It is on the fifth of these amendments particularly that I wish to speak.

99. The PRESIDENT: We are at the stage of explanations of vote. The speaker tells us that he wishes to speak about the amendments. But since he is one of the sponsors of these amendments, he cannot, by virtue of the rules of procedure, speak on them at this stage.

100. Mr. ISSAKA (Togo) (translated from French): In that case, I should like the President to tell me when the debate on this question will take place, since my delegation wishes to express its opinion on this matter.

101. The PRESIDENT: The speaker asked for the floor. I was going to clarify the situation, but he insisted upon having the floor. He will have the opportunity, if he wishes, to come back to the rostrum and speak at the appropriate time, since I have other speakers on the list.

102. I shall now clarify the situation. In the absence of any objection on the part of the Assembly, we proceeded with explanations of vote. There are no more speakers on my list for explanations of vote. As I said before, I shall now call on the three representatives who are sponsors of a proposal and who wish to make a statement. The first is the representative of Ghana; after that I shall call on the representative of Brazil; and after that I shall give the floor to the representative of Togo, if he wishes to speak. Those representatives may make a statement about their own proposal, if it is in the form of introducing or elaborating on the proposal. At the same time they may explain their votes on proposals other than their own.

103. Mr. WILMOT (Ghana): Draft resolution V, which is contained in the report [A/6567/Add.1, para. 29] under consideration, was adopted unanimously by the Second Committee. At the time the Second Committee was considering this draft resolution, multilateral consultations on cocoa were in progress next door between the producer and consumer countries. With these consultations in view, the draft resolution urged the parties concerned, particularly the major consumer and producer countries, to exert every effort to reach agreement on all outstanding matters so as to enable the Cocoa Conference to be reconvened as soon as possible, and in any case not later than the commencement of the 1967-1968 cocoa season.

104. Unfortunately, between the unanimous adoption of this draft resolution by the Second Committee and its consideration by this Assembly, events have occurred which necessitate major modifications to the draft resolution. It is for this reason that I have the honour, on behalf of the co-sponsors, to introduce the amendments contained in document A/L.510.

105. It is with a feeling of regret that I state that the urgent appeal made in the recommendation of the Second Committee—namely, that the parties concerned in the consultations should exert maximum effort to resolve all outstanding issues—went unheeded. Despite this appeal, the consultations broke down.

106. The main objective of the amendments is to reflect in the Second Committee's recommendation before the Assembly this regrettable development, which is yet another serious but avoidable setback to the

negotiation of a cocoa agreement. These amendments also seek to indicate the steps to be taken to create conditions conducive to the speedy reconvening of the Cocoa Conference to conclude an agreement within the deadline stipulated in the draft resolution of the Second Committee. Accordingly, we propose that operative paragraph 3 be reworded to request the Secretary-General of UNCTAD to approach Governments concerned with a view to resuming the multilateral consultations which unfortunately broke down. It is obvious that resumed consultations would not achieve any meaningful results unless the parties concerned, particularly the major consumer countries, reconsidered their position now. We would therefore expect that during the Secretary-General's approaches to Member Governments, particularly Member Governments of the consumer countries, they would be able to give him some indications of a change of position which would make it possible for him to resume these multilateral consultations.

107. The Secretary-General of UNCTAD gave in the Second Committee [see A/6567/Add.1, annex] the reason for the breakdown of the multilateral consultations. That statement has made necessary the amendment proposed to the sixth paragraph of the preamble to the recommendation before us. From his analysis, it is quite clear that what is at stake now is not the solution of an intricate economic or technical problem, but the absence of a genuine willingness on the part of some consumer countries to achieve an agreement. In my delegation's statement on cocoa before the Second Committee, we pointed out that the producer countries had made all the concessions possible.

108. This view as confirmed by the Secretary-General of UNCTAD in his statement to the Second Committee the other day. As a result of these concessions, agreement has been reached on almost all the major technical issues, in particular those relating to size of the buffer stock; the means of pre-financing the buffer stock and the procedure for allocating quotas to the producer countries. The producers continued to show a spirit of compromise and understanding during the recent consultations, and I believe that some of the consumers showed a willingness to co-operate with them. But the major consumer countries on which the conclusion of a satisfactory agreement so largely depends maintained their rigid positions, especially on the crucial matter of price. In these circumstances it would be invidious to address an appeal for maximum effort in such a manner as to ignore the sustained reconciliatory spirit exhibited by the major producer countries. That is why we propose the deletion of the words "and producer" from the second line of operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution V before us.

109. It must be emphasized that the main obstacle to the conclusion of a cocoa agreement is the issue of the minimum price. On this, the producers have made every possible concession.

110. The producer countries had originally hoped for a higher price level. They started from a floor price of 26 cents per pound of cocoa, then finally proposed a price range of 20-22 cents per pound, within which the floor price could be negotiated. Some of the consumers suggested a floor price range of 19-21 cents as a basis for determining one definite price within

the range. But the major consumers, which include some of the wealthiest nations in the world, were ironically unable to consider any floor price above 19 cents. If there should be any new initiatives on this score, it should come from the major consumer countries and not from the producers.

111. It is the firm conviction of my delegation that the issue of price is no longer an economic question. It is a political issue requiring a political decision. It is evident that if the price range is to be determined by economic considerations, the producers cannot reasonably be expected to accept a floor price of 19 cents per pound of cocoa. As my delegation stated in its intervention in the Second Committee [1084th meeting]—and this was confirmed by the Secretary-General of UNCTAD in his statement in the Second Committee [1096th meeting]—although the price of cocoa has fluctuated erratically during the past twenty years, only once has it fallen below 20 cents per pound. How then can the producers be expected to accept a floor price of 19 cents in an agreement whose essential objective is to ensure "remunerative, equitable and stable prices"? How can the producers accept a floor price which is less than the average minimum market price of cocoa over a period of twenty years? To propose only 19 cents for a pound of cocoa in an agreement whose objective is to protect not only the consumers but also the producers cannot be said to demonstrate a serious desire to reach a meaningful agreement. Nor can it be regarded as being consistent with the declarations that have so often been made by the major consumer countries of their willingness to reach a meaningful agreement.

112. Surely, if the obstacle to the conclusion of a cocoa agreement is the inability of the wealth nations to accept a price range involving a difference of only two or three cents, then what is at stake is not the economic soundness or feasibility of the proposed agreement, but the lack of the political will to conclude such an agreement. The present stage of negotiations, therefore, calls for greater demonstration of political will, particularly by the major consumer countries. That is why we have proposed the addition of a preambular paragraph making reference to this fact. But mere recognition of this fact is not enough. It is necessary to reflect this political element in the mandate given to the representatives to future consultations and negotiations. As long as the consultations are regarded as technical and are handled by representatives with a restricted mandate, no significant progress can be expected since, as I have argued above, the factors preventing agreement at this time are political. It is on account of this that the sponsors have proposed the inclusion of a new operative paragraph urging Governments to ensure that their representatives to future consultations have sufficient political mandate to facilitate agreement on the various matters at issue.

113. The question of the minimum price range is not an insuperable one. Given the basis congruence of views of both producers and consumers on the need for a permanent solution to the problem of the instability of the cocoa market, and given the necessary political will to give concrete expression to this conviction, there should be no insurmountable

obstacle to the conclusion of an international cocoa agreement. My delegation is still hopeful that a cocoa agreement can be concluded in the very near future and in any case should be concluded not later than the commencement of the 1967/68 cocoa season. We hope that our amendments will be accepted unanimously by this assembly so as to encourage the resumption of the consultations under appropriate conditions.

114. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Ghana spoke on behalf of all the sponsors of the amendments. If the co-sponsors still wish to make statements, I shall be happy to call on them.

115. Mr. GUEIROS (Brazil): The Brazilian delegation wishes to add its voice to those of the delegations from the main cocoa-producing countries in expressing its deepest disappointment at the failure of the technical consultations held in New York a fortnight ago.

116. When the draft resolution now before the Assembly was adopted in the Second Committee, we could not refrain from being optimistic about the results of the technical negotiations that were going on. The main issues had been reasonably cleared up, satisfactory progress had been achieved in the question of removal of barriers, which the Brazilian delegation had considered an outstanding one, and everyone naturally expected that this new opportunity would not be a mere repetition of the discouraging breakdowns that had unfortunately been constant in the preceding negotiations.

117. We all know that our optimistic hopes were once again in vain, and the major issue of the price of cocoa once again became the stumbling block to the successful conclusion of the negotiations.

118. The Brazilian delegation does not now have an irrevocable feeling of failure because we cannot believe that the repetition of failures should be expected in cocoa negotiations. We think that by reinforcing the political authority of the delegations at work, and by a wider analysis of the implications of this important issue, the day will soon come when the cocoa agreement finally becomes a reality.

119. We are convinced that this result could be best attained if the remaining problems were thoroughly discussed as soon as possible. With respect to the question of barriers to trade and consumption, we think that a constructive exchange of views could take place within the framework of UNCTAD or in Brussels, thereby clearing the way for a reconvened negotiating conference. We feel that such consultations can be fruitful and can throw new light on this problem.

120. Let me conclude on a hopeful note, despite the reasons we have for being bitter at this stage. We heard an assurance from the representative of the United States in the Second Committee [1096th meeting] to the effect that this question now deserves most serious consideration from this Government. That renewed effort is welcome to us, for it will certainly create a new trend in future negotiations, and we are convinced that the difficulties so far have been caused by an insufficient appraisal of the problems involved. By resuming the consultations in a short time, we

will be acting consistently with the serious manner in which we regard this question, and we will finally reach the point at which the Cocoa Conference may be reconvened with the assurance of a successful outcome.

121. The PRESIDENT: I should have been happy at this time to call on the representative of Togo, but he has informed me that he does not wish to speak.

122. The Second Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of five draft resolutions [A/6567/Add.1, para. 29].

123. Draft resolution I is entitled "Second session of the United Nations Conference on Trade Development". This draft resolution was adopted unanimously by the Second Committee. If there is no objection I shall take it that the General Assembly also adopts it unanimously.

*Draft resolution I was adopted unanimously.*

124. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II is entitled "Technical assistance in trade and related fields". This draft resolution was adopted unanimously by the Second Committee. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the General Assembly also adopts it unanimously.

*Draft resolution II was adopted unanimously.*

125. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution III is entitled "International monetary reform". If there is no objection, I shall take it that the General Assembly adopts this draft resolution.

*Draft resolution III was adopted without objection.*

126. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution IV is entitled "Implementation of the recommendations made by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development at its first session". In the absence of any objection, I shall take it that the General Assembly adopts this draft resolution.

*Draft resolution IV was adopted without objection.*

127. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution V is entitled "International agreement on cocoa". Amendments to this draft resolution have been submitted in document A/L.510. In accordance with rule 92 of the rules of procedure, I shall first put to the vote the amendments.

128. The first amendment proposes to add the following words at the end of the sixth preambular paragraph:

"and the statement he made in the Second Committee on 9 December 1966 on the results of the multilateral consultations on cocoa which took place in New York from 29 November to 7 December 1966".

*The first amendment was adopted by 111 votes to none.*

129. The PRESIDENT: The second amendment proposes to add the following paragraph at the end of the preamble:

"Recognizing that the present stage of negotiations calls for a greater demonstration of political will by all concerned,".

*The second amendment was adopted by 111 votes to none.*

130. The PRESIDENT: The third amendment proposes to insert the following paragraph between the present operative paragraphs 1 and 2:

"Deplores the breakdown of multilateral consultations on cocoa held in New York from 29 November to 7 December 1966;".

*The third amendment was adopted by 112 votes to none.*

131. The PRESIDENT: The fourth amendment proposes to reformulate the present operative paragraph 3 as follows:

"Requests the Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development to approach the Governments concerned with a view to resuming the multilateral consultations on cocoa at an early date;".

*The fourth amendment was adopted by 111 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

132. The PRESIDENT: The fifth amendment proposes to delete in the second line of the present operative paragraph 4 the words "and producer".

*The fifth amendment was adopted by 90 to 3, with 19 abstentions.*

133. The PRESIDENT: The sixth amendment proposes to insert the following paragraph between the present operative paragraphs 4 and 5:

"Urges Governments to ensure that representatives to these consultations have sufficient political mandate to facilitate agreement on the various matters at issue;".

*The sixth amendment was adopted by 113 votes to none.*

134. The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to vote the seventh amendment, which proposes to insert in the first line of the present operative paragraph 5 of the word "further" between the words "Urges" and "that".

*The seventh amendment was adopted by 111 votes to none.*

135. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote draft resolution V as a whole, as amended.

*Draft resolution V, as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 110 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

136. The PRESIDENT: The next item on the agenda is item 46. The Second Committee recommends to the Assembly a draft resolution for adoption [A/6604, para. 9].

The representative of Jamaica has asked for the floor, and I call on him.

137. Mr. AITKEN (Jamaica): My delegation accepts that there is a positive interrelationship between growth of population and economic and social well-being. This positive interrelationship, however, does not mean, in my delegation's view, that the one determines the other. Rather, population growth is but one of the several important factors that determine the scale and rate of economic development.

138. The population factor has attracted very wide attention in the search for ways and means to sustain accelerated rates of economic development. From this point of view you will appreciate the references in the preambular paragraphs of the resolution to the work that has been done, on the initiative of the United Nations, to see the population problem in its proper perspective. In this connexion I would mention only the series of population studies, and particularly No. 41 of that series, World Population Prospects as Assessed in 1963,<sup>5/</sup> and World Population: Challenge to Development,<sup>6/</sup> as well as the summary report on the World Population Conference<sup>7/</sup> that was held in Belgrade last year.

139. It seems to my delegation that the great attention being paid to problems of population is predicated on the assumption that world population is tending to increase at a more rapid rate than increases in world food supply. The presumption is a valid one, as the reports show, and as it is known that the incidence of food shortage is most frequent and most severe in those areas that have a high population density. My delegation can easily understand the concern that if high population densities were to emerge in all habitable areas of the world, there might well be a critical and world-wide incidence of food shortage.

140. An equally important assumption for enquiring into demographic problems is the recognition that social well-being is intimately bound up with rates of increase and with the absolute volume of population. For in the high-density areas, food shortages are not the only disabilities. The social fabric is impaired by shortages in housing facilities, shortages in educational facilities, and shortages in other amenities which, in their turn, lead to over-crowding and illiteracy and all their ill effects. When to these is added the fact that opportunities for gainful employment are not always created at a sufficiently fast rate, we have the picture of a society ripe for change. The only question is where should change begin, and we are convinced that the population studies being undertaken will, in conjunction with other economic and social studies, provide the answers for desirable changes in an orderly manner.

141. There is a third reason for studying this problem that deserves prominence and arises directly from the two just enumerated. The reason is that a very rapid rise in population, even in a population structure of the late-expanding type, tends to be an additional factor to political instability, especially where the increases in population are not matched by the creation of necessary social amenities and the creation of opportunities for gainful employment.

142. If we were to revert to the discredited Malthusian triumvirate of war, disease, and famine, and accept them as instruments for adjusting the population explosion to available resources, we would not only be pessimists, but ignorant for not having studied the realities of our day and age. Wars are not now inevitable—at least we hope so; disease has

<sup>5/</sup> United Nations publication, Sales No.: 66.XIII.2.

<sup>6/</sup> Ibid., Sales No.: 66.XIII.4.

<sup>7/</sup> World Population Conference, 1965, vol. I: Summary Report, United Nations publication, Sales No.: 66.XIII.5.

been decisively arrested; and unrelieved famine is hard to contemplate in a world with a developed social conscience.

143. My delegation sees two possibilities for the intermediate and long-term solution of this problem. First, we believe that the world is far from nearing its maximum of food production, as there still exist large but untapped resources for food production. That is why my delegation, in the earlier part of the session, supported fully the resolution requiring a survey of marine resources. We believe there is yet much food to be had from the sea once the extent of the resources is more precisely known and the means of harvesting are more easily attainable. But the sea is not our only hope. There are vast areas of land that are not producing their full potential because of a certain "primitiveness" of technique. There are also vast areas that are not producing because of the lack of essential water. For these areas there is hope yet, as we believe that the search for cheap methods of desalination has just begun. Then too, there are vast areas where there is too much water, leaving millions of acres in virgin forests. We do not believe it will continue for long to be beyond the ingenuity of man to find ways and means to convert areas of rain forests into areas of food and industrial production. Granted, all, this is an expensive proposition; but so is war, and the war against the poverty effects of the population explosion may yet inherit resources released by disarmament for this very task of making life meaningful for the 200,000 or more persons that join us each day.

144. The second possibility has less of the elements of the ideal and turns upon the more practical problem of national population policies. May I say that it is realized that a nation will consciously adopt an enlightened population policy if, and only if, it is genuinely concerned about the population explosion and economic development. It should be realized too that, with the extension of the areas of food production as outlined in the first possibility, in combination with realistic population policies, the world should be in no real danger of widespread food shortages. I have deliberately said "realistic population policies", for population policies do not restrict themselves to various means of birth control. They also involve the practical but equally sensitive policies of emigration and immigration. Admittedly, this problem brings into focus the hard reality of national boundaries. But I think we can be all agreed that emigration and corresponding immigration have contributed a very great deal to the economic and social well-being of many countries and that the problem today is not that emigration and immigration have lost their efficacy to make worthwhile impacts upon the life of a country, but it is in large part a measure of the implicit unconcern felt for the population problem in its totality.

145. My delegation considers that there is scope for realistic and enlightened population policies which in the past have contributed so much to economic development of many countries and above all to the dignity of man.

146. On the basis of these two considerations my delegation will vote for the draft resolution because

it remains convinced that there should be alarm indeed about the population explosion, if the international community only takes note of it, but if there is resolution to tackle the problem there need be no alarm.

147. The PRESIDENT: Since the draft resolution recommended by the Second Committee [A/6604, para. 9] was adopted unanimously in the Committee, may I take it that the General Assembly also adopts it unanimously?

*The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.*

148. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to the second part of the report of the Second Committee on agenda item 41 (b), concerning the site of the future headquarters of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization [A/6508/Add.1]. I would draw the attention of the Assembly to the report of the Fifth Committee on the financial and administrative implications of the recommendation of the Second Committee [A/6610.]

149. I call on the representative of France in explanation of vote.

150. Mr. SEYDOUX (France) (translated from French): The Second Committee considered several possible sites for the headquarters of UNIDO, all of which had much to commend them. In order to be able to make a recommendation to the General Assembly, the Second Committee followed a special procedure which I am happy to confirm was both practical and objective.

151. The Committee chose Vienna by a large majority. I should like here to repeat my delegation's congratulations to the Austrian delegation for the magnificent success it obtained for its beautiful capital. Now that the moment has come for the General Assembly to take a final decision on the UNIDO headquarters, may I be permitted to suggest, Mr. President, that the draft resolution confirming the choice of Vienna [A/6508/Add.1, paragraph 16] should be adopted unanimously or even, if you think it possible, by acclamation. In this way, we shall demonstrate our common interest in seeing the new organization established in its headquarters by unanimous consent.

152. The PRESIDENT: May I take it that the General Assembly adopts the draft resolution recommended by the Second Committee [A/6508/Add.1, para. 16].

*The draft resolution was adopted without objection.*

153. Mr. WALDHEIM (Austria): It is a great honour for my country that Vienna has been chosen by a unanimous decision of this Assembly as the permanent seat of the Industrial Development Organization. I should like to express my sincere thanks to the representative of France, Mr. Seydoux, for his kind words and the suggestion he just made to this Assembly. It is very gratifying that the competition among the various delegations and countries offering their cities for the seat of UNIDO was carried out in such a friendly and fair way and was motivated only by the desire to serve the interests of the Organization.

154. The Austrian Government and the Austrian delegation very much appreciate the expression of confidence and trust which the decision of the General

Assembly implies. As a neutral country in the heart of Europe and easily accessible to all countries, Austria believes that it can provide a background which will enable UNIDO to pursue its important work under the most favourable conditions.

155. Having had the task of rebuilding its economy during the last generation, Austria is familiar with many of the problems and obstacles which stand in the way of industrial development. The experience gained by the Austrians in this field will, I trust, be of value to this Organization.

156. As is stated in the report which the Assembly has approved, the installation as soon as possible of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization in its permanent headquarters will expedite the work and purposes of the Organization. The Austrian authorities will be glad to start at an early date the negotiations and consultations with the Secretary-General in order to make the appropriate arrangements for the establishment of the secretariat in Vienna.

157. I should like to reiterate that the Austrian Government will do everything in its power to facilitate the establishment and the smooth functioning of the Organization.

158. May I express once again my Government's gratitude and appreciation for the decision to locate the headquarters of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization in Vienna and thank all delegations for the decision they have taken this afternoon.

159. The PRESIDENT: I now invite the Assembly to take note of the decision of the Second Committee in paragraph 15 of its report.

*The Assembly took note of the decision of the Second Committee.*

160. The PRESIDENT: If there is no objection, I shall take it that the draft resolution recommended by the Second Committee [A/6508/Add.1, para. 16] is adopted.

*The draft resolution was adopted without objection.*

161. The PRESIDENT: There is another matter under agenda item 41 (b) which requires action by the General Assembly—the election of the members of the Industrial Development Board. In accordance with resolution 2152 (XXI), of 17 November 1966, the Board "shall consist of forty-five members elected by the General Assembly from amongst States Members of the United Nations and members of the specialized agencies and of the International Atomic Energy Agency for a term of three years, provided, however, that of the members elected at the first election the terms of fifteen members shall expire at the end of one year and the terms of fifteen other members at the end of two years".

162. It also provides that

"In electing the members of the Board, the General Assembly shall have due regard to the principle of equitable geographical representa-

tion and shall accordingly observe the following distribution of seats:

"(a) Eighteen from the States listed in part A of the annex to the ... resolution;

"(b) fifteen from the States listed in part B of the annex;

"(c) seven from the States listed in part C of the annex;

"(d) five from the States listed in part D of the annex."

163. I should like to read a letter dated 15 December 1966 addressed to me by the Permanent Representative of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic to the United Nations:

"On behalf of the States listed in part D of the annex to General Assembly resolution 2152 (XXI) and with reference to the elections to the Industrial Development Board at the current session of the General Assembly, I have the honour to request that Cuba be included on this particular occasion and in this particular case among the States listed in part D of the annex to the said resolution."

164. By reading that letter, I have put this matter before the Assembly. In the absence of any objection, I shall take it that the Assembly approves this request.

*It was so decided.*

165. The PRESIDENT: Therefore, the list of the States in part D of the document which will be distributed for this election will reflect the decision just made by the General Assembly. The list of States in part C has been revised in the light of the enlargement of the membership of the United Nations, and the names of all the States indicated in the annex to resolution 2152 (XXI) are contained in the four separate ballot papers which will be used for this election, each one corresponding to one of the four categories of States specified in the resolution.

166. I should like to outline the procedure that I intend to follow this afternoon, if there is no objection. We shall proceed in three stages. We shall first elect the forty-five members of the Board. After that, I shall consult the Assembly on the procedure to be followed in choosing from among the members elected in each category those which will serve for three years, two years and one year respectively. We shall then apply the procedure decided upon by the Assembly.

*It was so decided.*

167. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now proceed to elect the forty-five members of the Industrial Development Board. Pursuant to rule 94 of the rules of procedure, the elections shall be held by secret ballot.

168. Ballot papers will now be distributed. Will representatives be kind enough to place a cross opposite the names of the countries for which they wish to vote on each list. If, on any ballot paper, the number of crosses indicated is greater than the number assigned, that ballot paper will be declared invalid. After completing the four ballot papers, representatives will be

requested to fold each one separately and deposit it in the ballot box marked with the letter corresponding to the letter on the back of each ballot paper. Those members receiving a majority of the votes cast will be declared elected. As names are called will representatives please proceed to deposit the four ballot papers in the corresponding ballot boxes marked "A", "B", "C" and "D".

169. Since the counting of the ballots will take some time, I propose that we suspend the meeting while the tellers count the votes in the office behind the podium.

*The meeting was suspended at 6 p.m. and resumed at 7.25 p.m.*

170. The PRESIDENT: Before I give the result of the voting, I should like to remind Members of the Assembly that, as they know, there is always a possibility, in cases where there are more candidates than seats to be filled, that more candidates than can be elected may get the required majority. With that possibility in mind, I have taken the liberty of consulting with the parties concerned, and if such a situation does occur, it is our understanding that, of the candidates obtaining the required majority, those with the smallest number of votes will be considered as having withdrawn.

171. The result of the voting is as follows:

#### GROUP A

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Svab (Czechoslovakia) acted as teller.*

*A vote was taken by secret ballot.*

Number of ballot papers:	112
Invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	112
Required majority:	57

#### Number of votes obtained:

Zambia . . . . .	108
Cameroon . . . . .	107
Ghana . . . . .	107
Rwanda . . . . .	107
Somalia . . . . .	107
Sudan . . . . .	106
Guinea . . . . .	105
Ivory Coast . . . . .	105
Pakistan . . . . .	104
Iran . . . . .	102
Nigeria . . . . .	101
India . . . . .	100
Philippines . . . . .	100
United Arab Republic . . . . .	100
Indonesia . . . . .	97
Thailand . . . . .	95
Kuwait . . . . .	87
Jordan . . . . .	69
Iraq . . . . .	64
Niger . . . . .	5
Morocco . . . . .	4
Ceylon . . . . .	3
Algeria . . . . .	2
Dahomey . . . . .	2
Israel . . . . .	2
Liberia . . . . .	2
Malaysia . . . . .	2

Republie of Korea, . . . . .	2
Syria . . . . .	2
United Republic of Tanzania . . . . .	2
Botswana . . . . .	1
Chad . . . . .	1
China . . . . .	1
Ethiopia . . . . .	1
Gabon . . . . .	1
Gambia . . . . .	1
Lebanon . . . . .	1
Lesotho . . . . .	1
Madagascar . . . . .	1
Maldivie Islands . . . . .	1
Nepal . . . . .	1
Republie of Viet-Nam . . . . .	1
Sierra Leone . . . . .	1
Togo . . . . .	1
Tunisia . . . . .	1
Uganda . . . . .	1
Upper Volta . . . . .	1
Western Samoa . . . . .	1
Yugoslavia . . . . .	1

#### GROUP B

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Tan (Singapore) acted as teller.*

*A vote was taken by secret ballot.*

Number of ballot papers:	112
Invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	112
Required majority:	57

#### Number of votes obtained:

Canada . . . . .	108
France . . . . .	106
Finland . . . . .	106
Italy . . . . .	106
Japan . . . . .	106
Sweden . . . . .	106
Belgium . . . . .	105
Spain . . . . .	104
Switzerland . . . . .	104
United Kingdom . . . . .	104
United States . . . . .	104
Netherlands . . . . .	102
Austria . . . . .	100
Turkey . . . . .	100
Federal Republic of Germany . . . . .	95
Australia . . . . .	12
Denmark . . . . .	5
Norway . . . . .	3
Holy See . . . . .	2
Greece . . . . .	2
Cyprus . . . . .	1
Ireland . . . . .	1
Luxembourg . . . . .	1
Malta . . . . .	1
New Zealand . . . . .	1
San Marino . . . . .	1

#### GROUP C

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Diallo (Upper Volta) acted as teller.*

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

Number of ballot papers:	112
Invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	112
Number of members voting:	112
Required majority:	57
Number of votes obtained:	
Chile . . . . .	108
Brazil . . . . .	107
Trinidad and Tobago . . . . .	107
Argentina . . . . .	106
Colombia . . . . .	105
Peru . . . . .	105
Uruguay . . . . .	105
Venezuela . . . . .	2
Costa Rica . . . . .	1
Mexico . . . . .	1
Panama . . . . .	1

#### GROUP D

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Kumlin (Sweden) acted as teller.

A vote was taken by secret ballot:

Number of ballot papers:	112
Invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	112
Abstentions:	4
Number of members voting:	108
Required majority:	55
Number of votes obtained:	
Czechoslovakia . . . . .	103
Romania . . . . .	103
Bulgaria . . . . .	102
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics . . .	102
Cuba . . . . .	86
Poland . . . . .	13
Albania . . . . .	2
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic . .	2
Hungary . . . . .	2
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic . . .	1

The following countries, having obtained the required majority, were elected members of the United Nations Industrial Development Board: Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Federal Republic of Germany, Finland, France, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Rwanda, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom, United States of America, Uruguay and Zambia.

172. The PRESIDENT: On the basis of the understanding I referred to earlier, before I declared the result of the voting, although Iraq obtained the required majority it will be deemed to have withdrawn.

173. We are now at the second stage of our proceedings, regarding the procedure which the Assembly will follow in choosing the fifteen Members that will serve for three years and the fifteen members that will serve for two years.

174. One procedure has been used of which I merely wish to remind the Assembly. The procedure by drawing of lots has been used in respect of other organs of the United Nations, the most recent one being for the election to the Economic and Social Council last year, when a similar choice had to be made as regards one-, two- and three-year terms. Since, in the election of the members of the Industrial Development Board, retiring members will be eligible for immediate re-election, the Assembly may wish to draw lots in selecting the members to serve for terms of three years, two years and one year respectively. It is not a suggestion that I am making; it is not a proposal that I am making. I just wanted as I said, to remind the Assembly that this procedure has been used in the Assembly before.

175. If there is no objection I shall take it that the Assembly so agrees and we shall proceed accordingly.

*It was so decided.*

176. The PRESIDENT: I shall now draw lots to choose the three categories of members.

*The President proceeded to draw lots.*

177. The PRESIDENT: The result of the drawing is as follows: From the countries elected in group A, the following will serve for three years: Iran, Pakistan, Ivory Coast, Ghana, Philippines and Cameroon; the following will serve for two years: Jordan, India, Sudan, Kuwait, United Arab Republic and Thailand; the rest of the members are elected to serve for one year. From the countries elected in group B, the following will serve for three years: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Canada, Turkey, Federal Republic of Germany and Spain; the following will serve for two years: United States of America, France, Netherlands, Finland and Japan; the rest of the members will serve for one year. From the countries elected in group C, the following will serve for three years: Argentina, Uruguay and Colombia; the following will serve for two years: Brazil and Chile; the rest of the members will serve for one year. From the countries elected in group D, the following will serve for three years: Bulgaria; the following will serve for two years: Romania and Cuba; the rest of the members will serve for one year.

178. I should like to thank the tellers for their assistance in this election and I wish to congratulate the countries which have been elected members of the Board.

#### AGENDA ITEM 33

Comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all other aspects: report of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations

#### REPORT OF THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE (A/6603)

179. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on representatives who wish to explain their votes on the draft resolutions recommended by the Special Political Committee [A/6603, para. 25] under agenda item 33.

180. Mr. AIKEN (Ireland): As Members of the Assembly are aware, draft resolution A/SPC 1.129, Rev.1 was adopted by the Special Political Committee

on 14 December and it appears as draft resolution A in document A 6603, which is now before us. On behalf of the co-sponsors of that draft resolution, I wish to say that we are highly appreciative of the support it received in Committee and we trust and believe that many more delegations will join us in supporting it at the next session should the Committee of Thirty-three again fail to agree upon a reliable system for financing future peace-keeping operations.

181. Last year, when submitting our proposals to restore mandatory assessments for peace-keeping under Article 17 of the Charter, we recognized that it might well take some years to reach our objective. We felt, however, that it would be a fatal blow to the United Nations, and disastrous for the smaller countries, if the defence of the financial powers of the General Assembly under Article 17 were not embarked on at once and if those powers were not restored as quickly as possible to full effectiveness.

182. The Charter does not place sole responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security on the five permanent members of the Security Council. That grave responsibility is, by Article 1 of the Charter, placed upon every individual Member of the United Nations, and all Members are equally and inescapably bound by that Article:

"... to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace...".

183. The Charter, as we all know and acknowledge, gives certain important powers to the Security Council to take action by air, sea or land forces to restore international peace and security, but it does not give the Council all power; and nowhere does it give to any of the five permanent members, or to the whole five of them, the right to interpret the Charter or to control every thought, word and deed of all Members of the United Nations.

184. The original sponsors of draft resolution A recognize that it would be unreasonable to expect the Assembly, which has so many resolutions to deal with in the closing few days of this session, to embark at this stage on a prolonged debate of the subject. Therefore they have decided to rest content with the progress that this draft resolution has made this year in the Special Political Committee and not to press for discussion and a vote upon it by the Assembly at the present session. Therefore I request, Mr. President, that, with your permission, draft resolution A in document A 6603 be not put to the vote.

185. The sponsors have also decided that, if the Committee of Thirty-three does not in its report to the twenty-second session uphold the right which Article 17 of the Charter gives to the General Assembly to make mandatory assessments for peace-keeping, they will introduce a similar draft resolution at that session.

186. I should like to add that the Irish delegation will abstain on certain paragraphs of draft resolution draft B, if they are voted upon separately. However, because we believe in the right of the Assembly to debate and pronounce upon all questions relating to peace-keeping and reject all contentions to the con-

trary, we will vote in favour of that draft resolution as a whole.

187. Mr. IGNATIEFF (Canada): In view of the important statement just made by the Foreign Minister of Ireland on draft resolution A recommended in the report of the Special Political Committee [A. 6603, para. 25] of 15 December, I believe I should make it clear why draft resolution B, submitted in the same report, will stand to be voted upon in the Assembly. I recognize that, since the vote was taken in the Committee, suggestions have been made by delegations, both in private and in public, that the adoption of draft resolution B should not be proceeded with, as it might be in some way harmful to the United Nations. Indeed it has been suggested that certain proposals adopted by the Special Political Committee would in some degree be contrary to the Charter or that they might prejudice the co-operation of certain delegations which do not agree with those recommendations.

188. The Canadian Government and many other Governments have, of course, long been aware of the fact that, within this Organization, there are different views about the meaning of the Charter provisions concerning peace and security. The Foreign Minister of Ireland made references to that, and I may say I entirely agree with these references. Over the years, since San Francisco, our discussion of the constitutional issue has continued unabated. This discussion no doubt will continue into the future, until some day, we earnestly hope, an understanding will be reached. Meanwhile efforts have been made, as the Foreign Minister of Ireland reminded us, in the Committee of Thirty-three nations to make some progress, even of a modest kind; but these efforts, despite the untiring endeavours of the Chairman of that Committee, the Ambassador of Mexico, have failed to produce results. In the circumstances, it is difficult to understand suggestions that the only suitable course of action in regard to the reports and recommendations of the Special Political Committee would be to remit them to the same Committee of Thirty-three which was unable to produce a substantive report to the twenty-first session of the General Assembly.

189. It is equally difficult to understand why the General Assembly should not be able to provide for some practical steps forward in this area while the desired dialogue on the constitutional differences continues. That dialogue, of course, should continue, and draft resolution B provides precisely for that. However, we cannot believe it is the wish of the majority of Member States that, in the present troubled state of the world, nothing should be done in the interval to improve the capacity of the United Nations to keep the peace.

190. Draft resolution B was adopted by the Special Political Committee on 14 December after full discussion of a number of proposals and a number of principles. There were a number of delays to allow time for consultation, but finally the Special Political Committee reached the stage of voting on the proposals before it, and this draft resolution obtained the best vote of the various proposals put to the Committee.

191. It is a draft resolution which, we maintain, does not prejudice the position of any delegation—and I cannot stress that too much. The draft resolution in fact, deliberately avoids imposing any unacceptable obligations on any Member State which does not share the view of the majority about the nature or the value of the contribution that the United Nations has made or could continue to make in the peace-keeping field.

192. What the draft resolution tries to do is: first, to provide some guide-lines in the field of financing, subject to further elaboration; second, to invite Member States to make information available about forces and services which they might provide on request; and, third, to make some recommendations to the Security Council, including the consideration of what measures the Council itself could take to improve the capacity of the United Nations for peace-keeping purposes. All those elements, it seems to us, are in accordance with the Charter and could hardly be regarded otherwise if the draft resolution is examined on its merits.

193. Surely through the years nothing has been more clearly demonstrated by experience than the need for peace-keeping. The draft resolution now submitted is designed simply to carry this movement forward without prejudice to the position of any delegation, and the effort of this Organization to maintain international peace and security, in support of the United Nations Charter, is generally recognized as being as essential as ever it was.

194. We all recognize with great regret that no consensus has been reached with regard to draft resolution B on the peace-keeping provisions of the Charter. However, provision is made in this draft resolution that efforts should continue in the Committee of Thirty-three nations to seek such a consensus. In the meantime, the General Assembly, under the draft resolution, is not required to take any final decision; nor can this draft resolution affect the rightful powers and responsibilities of the Security Council and in particular of its permanent members—as the Foreign Minister of Ireland stressed a moment ago. We merely ask all Member States to judge this draft resolution on its merits and particularly in the light of the comments I have made.

195. In conclusion, I believe it would be a sorry day indeed for this Organization and its Members if we were deflected from expressing our considered views on a recommendation of a Committee by the only means available to the vast majority of us: that is, by voting on a draft resolution in the General Assembly.

196. Mr. SEYDOUX (France) (translated from French): On two occasions I have had the opportunity to state before the Special Political Committee [522nd and 545th meetings] the reasons why the French delegation was compelled to vote against the draft resolution sponsored by seven countries [A/6603, para. 6].

197. The importance of what is usually called the question of peace-keeping operations, and the inevitable consequences which will not fail to arise from the adoption of this text, make it my duty to speak before the General Assembly in order to explain the vote which we may have to cast.

198. When several friendly delegations informed us of their intention of submitting a draft resolution, we believed that the purpose of their initiative was to bring out a number of ideas which might help to reconcile conflicting views. It was in this belief that we had repeated contacts with several of the sponsors of the draft resolution to be submitted to the vote of the Assembly. We made some suggestions which were chiefly designed to reaffirm the relevant provisions of the Charter, especially those which confirm the basic problem of the respective powers of the Security Council and the General Assembly in the field of peace-keeping.

199. We thought that a reference to Articles 10, 11 and 12 in particular—to all of which, I should like to remind the Assembly, the members of the Committee of Thirty-Three devoted special attention—would meet with the approval of everyone.

200. We were surprised to note that these suggestions were considered unacceptable and that, gradually, a draft resolution was being prepared which, without formally contradicting the Charter, adhered to ambiguous formulae in referring to constitutional principles and only reverted to precise terms when proposing measures said to be of an entirely practical nature. How was it that the sponsors of the draft resolution did not realize that those measures were based on premises which had been challenged and that it was, to say the least, difficult to remain ambiguous about fundamental questions while proposing concrete solutions in the light of an interpretation of the Charter that has been described as dynamic? Now it is well known that this is precisely where the essential disagreement arose between the different schools of thought, and particularly between the permanent members of the Security Council.

201. In making these remarks, I do not intend to engage in polemics with the sponsors of the draft resolution, whose countries still maintain very friendly relations with my own. But it must be understood that in voting against the so-called "Canadian" draft resolution, we wish above all to avoid ambiguity. We continue to think that, in a matter as serious as this, there is nothing to be gained by trying to evade the problems now before us.

202. My delegation wishes to say that the provisions of the draft resolution about which I have been speaking should not, if this text is adopted by the Assembly, be considered binding on delegations which have expressed their disagreement. By creating a situation which might open the way for indirect amendments to the Charter, we believe that the sponsors of the seven-Power draft resolution cannot assume the right of recommendation which, according to the Charter, belongs to the General Assembly. Still less can they do so in this case, since the authority of the Assembly to interpret the provisions which concern it has its limits when that interpretation may alter the powers conferred by the Charter on another United Nations body. Indeed, it is not for the General Assembly to determine the conditions under which the Security Council should exercise its peace-keeping powers.

203. All that Article 11 of the Charter states is that the Assembly may consider general principles and

may make recommendations to the Members of the Organization or the Security Council. Consequently, operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution under consideration exceeds the competence of the General Assembly when it invites—I stress the word "invites"—Member States to communicate to the United Nations information concerning the kinds of forces or services they might be in a position to provide in response of a request to participate in a peace-keeping operation.

204. If the Charter of the United Nations expresses an ideal common to all Member States, it must also be the exact reflection of the international situation.

205. No one denies that changes have taken place since 1945; but we are bound to recognize that these changes have not affected the essential basis of world equilibrium. Consequently, we can derive nothing constructive or realistic from peace-keeping unless we base ourselves on these considerations. To state this fact does not mean that we congratulate ourselves on it, but experience of the recent past has shown us the danger of any system which, in the name of a majority, would lead to the utilization of United Nations machinery for the sole benefit of one Power or one group of Powers.

206. Reverting to this conception of the United Nations which, I must admit, we thought had been abandoned, the sponsors of the draft resolution are assuming a responsibility the extent of which they have yet to measure. In seeking to impose their views on peace-keeping through the indirect method of a resolution, they may revive differences of opinion which were becoming less sharp and may make it impossible for a long time to reconcile conflicting points of view, particularly between Powers with special responsibilities, whose agreement is essential under the very terms of the Charter. Therefore, my delegation does not see what benefit the Organization and its Member States would derive from the new situation which will certainly arise if the seven-Power draft resolution is adopted.

207. Under these circumstances, the Assembly will understand that this situation—which, we still hope, will not arise—might induce us to reflect along the lines suggested and might force us to draw the conclusions which we fear.

208. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): The General Assembly has before it a report of the Special Political Committee describing the results of the discussions in that Committee on the item entitled "Comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all their aspects" [A/6603]. Thus, we have now arrived at the stage in the discussion of this question at the current session of the General Assembly when we are about to take a decision.

209. Many years' experience of discussing this item in the United Nations has, as is well known, confirmed beyond question that there is no sense in imposing, by means of a formal vote, any decisions which run counter to the Charter of the United Nations, and that attempts to adopt one-sided and tendentious decisions contrary to the United Nations Charter—far from contributing to the successful solution of problems relating to the conduct of peace-keeping operations—will

in fact only lead to a further accumulation of difficulties in the work of our Organization.

210. Unfortunately, however, this important and concluding stage in the consideration of the question of peace-keeping operations at the current session of the General Assembly is being marked by attempts on the part of a certain group of States, headed by the United States of America and the United Kingdom, to ignore this most important requirement, which is in keeping with the interests of the successful work of the United Nations, and to secure the adoption by the General Assembly of a decision which is at variance with the most important provisions of the United Nations Charter and impairs the prospects of reaching agreed decisions.

211. We are referring to the attempt made in the Special Political Committee at its 545th meeting on 14 December 1966 to secure the adoption, on the basis of the well-known Canadian draft resolution [A/6603, paras. 6-10 and 25 (draft resolution B)], of a decision which runs counter to the United Nations Charter; this attempt was made in the face of strong objections from many countries, including the Soviet Union and France—major Powers which are permanent members of the Security Council and have a special responsibility for maintaining international peace and security—and despite the objections voiced by many other Members of this Organization representing different political groups and geographical regions.

212. The Soviet Union, guided by the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations Charter, is constantly making every possible effort to bring about mutual understanding between States Members of the United Nations on questions relating to measures for the maintenance of peace and security. This is clear in particular from the position which the Soviet Union has consistently taken on the question of peace-keeping operations, both in the work of the Special Committee of Thirty-three and in the discussions in the Special Political Committee of the Assembly.

213. The Soviet delegation considers it necessary to affirm once again its profound conviction that the only correct course for the General Assembly to take in considering the question of peace-keeping operations is to engage in further patient efforts to find solutions which would increase the effectiveness of our Organization within the framework prescribed in its Charter, solutions which would be acceptable to all States Members of the United Nations.

214. We therefore appeal once again to the delegations of countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, which have apparently been deluded into thinking that circumventions and violations of the Charter are likely to open the way to a more effective maintenance and strengthening of international peace, to ponder at this important moment the possible serious consequences for our Organization of any attempt to undermine its foundation and impose on the General Assembly a tendentious and illegal decision.

215. We venture to stress most strongly here that the attempt to give the impression that violations and circumventions of the Charter are likely to contribute to the maintenance of international peace is most misleading. The very fact that the group of States which

supports the proposal for treating the United Nations Charter in this arbitrary manner is headed by the NATO Powers, whose ruling circles are supporting decaying and anti-popular regimes in every part of the world, and are carrying out acts of armed intervention and sending their navies, armies and air forces to destroy peaceful inhabited localities in countries where the people have risen up to fight for their national liberation—this fact speaks for itself.

216. It is not difficult to imagine the system for maintaining peace by armed force which these Powers would establish if they were not faced with the insurmountable barrier of the United Nations Charter, which provides that the principal responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security rests with the United Nations Security Council, in which the possibility of adopting measures directed against the interests of small countries and prejudicial to their national freedom and independence is completely ruled out.

217. The delegations of States Members of the United Nations representing the young and independent peoples of Asia and Africa must realize the serious consequences of any action to circumvent the Security Council and to use the United Nations flag as a cover for armed intervention in the domestic affairs of other countries, and for the suppression of national liberation movements. The tragedy experienced by the Congolese people is still fresh in all our minds.

218. The Powers sponsoring the resolution which violates the Charter of the United Nations are now appealing to the General Assembly to take a formal vote in this representative organ of the United Nations. However, no one should be misled by this manœuvre. These Powers are, of course, reckoning that, if they succeeded in overcoming the main obstacle to their selfish designs and circumventing the Security Council, they could then make an attempt in the General Assembly, by means of various political schemes, pressures and manipulation of differences of opinion between and within different groups of delegations, to secure—once again by a formal vote—the adoption of decisions and the creation of a majority which, however fleeting and unstable it might be, would take one-sided decisions, exclusively in the interests of those Powers, on this most important question of the use of armed force by the United Nations. We have unceasingly warned all peace-loving peoples and countries of this danger.

219. The Soviet Union has always advocated and will continue to advocate, measures to increase the effectiveness of the United Nations in maintaining peace and the security of peoples.

220. In this connexion, it should be recalled that the Soviet Union, in its memorandum of 1964, proposed a constructive programme based on the use of those extensive possibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security which are contained in the United Nations Charter itself, but have hitherto rarely been used and put into effect.

221. We confirm that the Soviet Union is prepared, together with other countries which are genuinely interested in strengthening the United Nations, to make persistent efforts to find possibilities of increasing the effectiveness of this Organization on the basis of negotiations and agreements within the framework of the United Nations Charter.

222. We believe that the proposal submitted by the delegation of Jamaica in Special Political Committee document A/SPC/1.133, to the effect that the Security Council should be recommended to proceed as quickly as possible with preparations which would enable it to discharge its responsibilities under Article 42 and 45 of the Charter, reflects the completely legitimate desire of the Members of our Organization to see the Security Council intensify its activities in the field long since assigned to it by the provisions of our Charter [A/6603, para. 11].

223. During the discussions in the Special Political Committee on the question of peace-keeping operations, the Soviet Union supported the approach reflected in the draft resolution submitted by the delegations of three States—India, the United Arab Republic and Yugoslavia [*ibid.*, para. 13]. In the opinion of the Soviet delegation, the approach proposed by these three countries offered definite prospects for continuing the fruitful efforts being made by Member States in the search for agreed solutions within the framework of the Committee of Thirty-three.

224. As is well-known, this Committee has done some substantial and useful work to clarify the various points of view—a task which is an essential prerequisite for the achievement of agreed solutions. However, the delegations of the United States of America, the United Kingdom and their allies prevented this positive and fruitful approach from prevailing, and preferred to counter it with a method involving the imposition of decisions unacceptable to many other countries, a method which will seriously complicate the situation and may block the path to fruitful negotiations. The Soviet delegation cannot support such a position which, in the last analysis, is based on indifference to the fate of the United Nations and on an adventurist attempt to place further difficulties in its way.

225. I should like to point out to the General Assembly that the Canadian draft resolution which was foisted upon the Special Political Committee is contrary to the Charter inasmuch as it is designed to confer on the General Assembly certain powers in regard to the preparation, conduct and financing of operations by United Nations armed forces which belong exclusively to the Security Council.

226. It is contrary to the Charter to propose that States should communicate to the United Nations information concerning the kinds of forces and equipment which they might be in a position to provide in response to a request to participate in a duly authorized United Nations peace-keeping operation. This is a matter which is clearly the prerogative of the Security Council.

227. Other provisions are so worded that they could later be used as a cover for, or to justify, any departures from the Charter; and this is something which the Soviet delegation has resolutely opposed and continues to oppose. The distinguished representative

of France also referred precisely to this point in the statement which he has just made.

228. The Soviet delegation would like to stress once again that the Canadian draft resolution is anti-constitutional and is designed to undermine the United Nations Charter. The statement just made by the Canadian representative, to the effect that the adoption of his draft resolution would not be contrary to the Charter, is an attempt to mislead the Assembly. In view of these circumstances, this draft resolution is unacceptable and we feel most strongly that it should not be put to the vote.

229. The Soviet delegation is convinced that the United Nations has a significant role to play in maintaining peace and safeguarding the independence and legitimate rights and interests of peoples. In recent years there has been a considerable increase in the number of States Members of the United Nations which adopt a peace-loving and anti-imperialist position. The mobilization of these forces does, in our view, offer genuine possibilities for increasing the effectiveness of our Organization as an instrument for preventing aggression and maintaining world peace.

230. However, we consider it our duty to issue a warning that all attempts to impose resolutions which are contrary to the Charter of the United Nations will tend only to weaken this Organization, and not to strengthen it. Those delegations which, for one reason or another, are now prepared to vote in favour of decisions which are directed against the very foundations of the Charter of this Organization must be clearly aware of the possible consequences of such a vote. The history of recent years shows convincingly what can happen as a result of the adoption of illegal decisions of this kind. At best, these decisions remain stillborn; but they are quite liable, also, to lead to critical situations of the kind which our Organization has recently experienced.

231. No one is entitled to amend the provisions of the United Nations Charter relating to the use of armed force for the maintenance of peace. Therefore, the decision adopted in the Special Political Committee on 14 December, and submitted for endorsement by the General Assembly in that Committee's report [*ibid.*, para. 25], does not and cannot have any force. The Soviet Union will never accept as legal any decisions of that nature, which run counter to the key provisions of the Charter of the United Nations.

232. In this connexion, the Soviet delegation considers it necessary to stress once again, as we did in our statement of 16 December, that if the sponsors of illegal draft resolutions succeeded in imposing them on the United Nations General Assembly, this will create a situation fraught with serious consequences for the United Nations itself. And when people attempt to force illegal decisions on the United Nations, what they are really doing is to undermine the foundations of our Organization and create serious complications in its work. Responsibility for the consequences of such action rests entirely with the instigators of these attempts, which are a threat to the authority and the fate of the United Nations.

233. Mr. VINCI (Italy): I should like to make clear the position of my delegation on the various draft resolutions contained in the report of the Special Political Committee [A/6603, para. 25].

234. In this connexion, my delegation has taken note of the very important statement made this evening by the Foreign Minister of Ireland.

235. It has been suggested by some delegations that we should refrain from voting in the plenary meeting on the texts that were already approved by the Special Political Committee. Criticism has quite evidently been directed at the report, which we support. This document has also been the subject of misinterpretation. It is indeed very difficult for me to understand how the recommendations contained in a draft resolution which has been so thoroughly debated in all its aspects and which has had the affirmative votes of such a significant majority, could be construed as something menacing the very existence of our Organization and undermining the Charter of the United Nations. I believe there is no example in history of the disruption of a democratic society and its structural principles by a majority. The reverse is the case, and the records show many examples of minorities having the upper hand over majorities and of putting an end to the free expression of whole communities. This simple comparison should make it sufficiently clear how inconsistent some of the allegations are.

236. Nevertheless, faced as we are by certain unfortunate circumstances, I believe that I owe it to my delegation as well as to the other original sponsors and, last but not least, to the large number of delegations that voted for the Canadian draft resolution, to explain once again why that draft is a well-balanced and non-controversial text, which is aimed solely at establishing some guidelines for the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations in particular, so as to ensure the possibility of achieving some real progress at its next sessions. I can best do this by very rapidly going through the provisions of draft resolution B, which is now before the Assembly for a final vote.

237. The general statements contained in the preambular part of the draft resolution recall either the very language of the Charter of the United Nations or previous resolutions on this subject already adopted by the General Assembly. I shall therefore, to be brief, deal with the provisions of the operative part, some of which raise reservations or even fears especially for some permanent members of the Security Council.

238. I am quite sure that operative paragraphs 1 and 2 of the draft resolution are not likely to raise any doubts. They note various financial systems on the basis of which peace-keeping operations might be supported, and outline a possible way of equitable apportionment which can be further studied by appropriate bodies. Along these lines, operative paragraph 3 goes on to suggest—and I repeat, to suggest—the preparation of a special scale which would take into account, among other things, the particular position of developing countries. It would be difficult, and indeed unjustified, to ask these countries to share the cost of a peace-keeping operation beyond well-

defined and very restrained limits. None of these paragraphs contains the word "decides" or any other expression which can be interpreted as binding. Even less can it be argued that these paragraphs violate or circumvent the Charter.

239. I come now to operative paragraph 4. At the root of this provision is the understandable, and we should add commendable, desire to ensure to our Organization all the necessary means, including some stand-by forces, in the event a peace-keeping operation is decided upon by the proper body of the United Nations. This would enable the United Nations to start peace-keeping action without losing time in any case where time could be a decisive factor in carrying out the duties of the "blue berets". Again, there is nothing in the Charter which would prevent any Member State from offering whatever it may wish to the Organization, and there is nothing in operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution B which imposes on the United Nations the deployment of those forces. The decision—I repeat, the final decision—to use or not to use stand-by forces by the United Nations is to be made by the proper bodies of the United Nations.

240. The same can be said of operative paragraph 5, both from the financial and from the organizational point of view. This paragraph recalls the relevant Articles of the Charter, and in no way encroaches on the constitutional functions of the Security Council inasmuch as it recommends the setting-up of those very arrangements to which the representative of the Soviet Union so often referred in past sessions of the Committee of Thirty-three. There is nothing in this paragraph which can be considered as an infringement of the Charter of the United Nations, unless we think that Article 10 of the Charter constitutes such an infringement.

241. I shall not speak of operative paragraphs 6 and 7, which reflect the virtually unanimous approval of the Special Political Committee. They ensure the existence of the Committee of Thirty-three, a body which is capable of achieving at least limited progress on the problem confronting us.

242. These are our aims. There are no decisions in our text which might constitute a direct threat to the Charter of the United Nations or to the prestige and future of the Organization. We have assembled, after lengthy discussions and consultations, a group of reasonable suggestions for future work in this field by the Security Council and the Committee of Thirty-three. We do not see any apocalyptic danger in these suggestions and guidelines, nor did the many delegations that voted in favour of them see in them any disastrous effects or a total disavowal of the sovereign rights of any country.

243. For our part, we are not seeking a victory for ourselves and a defeat for others, as a victory in this field would indeed be a Pyrrhic victory. As I said in the Special Political Committee, we are not in any case deploying elephants. But the will not to impose decisions through majorities, even if large, should not be confused with any lack of moral strength and serious conviction. We have been sincerely prompted by the earnest desire, after years of indecision and vacillation, to take some steps forward, and we can

do so only by providing the appropriate bodies of our Organization with a clear indication of the lines along which we at least would like to see them work.

244. If we want to emerge once and for all from an already too long period of frustration and unpreparedness, we must act cautiously, yes, but swiftly, otherwise the United Nations will hopelessly lag behind in the field where its action is most needed: peace.

245. For all the reasons that I have tried to explain, the Italian delegation is not in a position to change the vote that it cast in the Special Political Committee on the draft resolutions, and in particular I refer to draft resolution C, which is still before the General Assembly.

246. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary): The delegation of the Hungarian People's Republic wishes to place its views concerning the present item and the report of the Special Political Committee [A/6603] in a very clear-cut way in the records of the General Assembly.

247. My delegation has constantly given its careful attention to the question of the comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all their aspects, from the very inception of the Committee of Thirty-three, particularly during the last two sessions of the General Assembly. In joining the United Nations, the Hungarian People's Republic solemnly undertook to engage in the paramount task of this Organization, that is, the maintenance of international peace and security. In subscribing to these major goals, my country, like all other Members of this Organization, had to undertake obligations to discharge its duties according to the United Nations Charter and to observe the spirit and letter of that international treaty of utmost importance. My delegation is convinced that the General Assembly would be choosing a very dangerous path, in violation of the Charter, if it were to endorse the so-called Canadian draft resolution appearing as draft resolution B in the recommendation in the report before us. [A/6603, para. 25] The Hungarian delegation made clear its views on this draft at the 524th meeting of the Special Political Committee. We are opposed to it because it represents a definite departure from the provisions of the Charter. It is undeniable that all aspects of peace-keeping, including the financial ones, fall within the exclusive competence of the Security Council, as stipulated by Articles 43, 47 and 49 of the Charter. Draft resolution B recommended in the report involves methods for financing peace-keeping operations that are in violation of the Charter, methods which, even in disguised form, are aimed at circumventing the rule of the unanimity of the permanent members of the Security Council. They would seek to restore the spirit and practice of the ill-famed resolution 377 (V), the so-called Uniting for Peace resolution which, as the aftermath of its application, has brought only friction, confusion and crisis to the United Nations.

248. This proposal contradicts the functions and powers of the Security Council, as laid down in Article 24 and Chapters VI, VII, VIII and XII of the Charter. Such methods cannot be applied, not even on an interim basis. No interim violation of the Charter can be tolerated in our Organization. Con-

cern has been expressed by speakers before me on this rostrum; they have asked: what will happen in the event of war while the draft resolution proposed in the Special Committee remains unadopted, while the Committee of Thirty-three has still not concluded its work and activities, while the Committee still has not taken a definite stand on aspects of peace-keeping operations? The very simple answer is that during this interval—as afterwards too—we have to abide by the provisions of the Charter. That is the only solution and the only basis on which we can act.

249. My delegation had sincerely hoped for a consensus in the Special Committee that would have enabled the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations to continue its work, studying the flood of various, and sometimes divergent, proposals submitted during this session for its consideration. In spite of all pleading that priority be given to a draft which represented a fair amount of consensus [see A/6603, para. 12], the Committee pushed through the above-mentioned proposal.

250. This Organization has already witnessed a serious crisis that was also brought about by the ruthless efforts of a number of Member States to impose their will on the others, clearly disregarding the stipulations of the Charter. That political and constitutional crisis is still too fresh in our memories for us to forget it and go ahead with new attempts to create new controversies and difficulties. With due respect for the views of those delegations that strive—and I believe some of them do so bona fide—to interpret and alter the Charter of the United Nations in contradiction of its provisions, I warn them not to persist in this course. They should not make it more difficult to find new solutions to new situations which inevitably emerge. They should not produce new difficulties when we are still under the shadow of old ones.

251. With these considerations in mind, my delegation, upholding the principles and provisions of the United Nations Charter, is diametrically opposed to the adoption of draft resolution B, which could not enlist the support of even a majority of the Members of the United Nations. If it is put to the vote, we shall vote against it. If it is adopted, it will not have any binding force. It cannot be considered as even a recommendation, because it is illegal and completely alien to the Charter. It will have no effect on, and no obligation for, the position of my delegation.

252. In conclusion, my delegation will support draft resolution C, because its intention is to make recommendations to the Security Council for a better implementation of its obligations under the Charter. This recommendation shows flexibility and gives due consideration to reality. We shall therefore vote for it.

253. Mr. RICHARDSON (Jamaica): No one in this Assembly doubts the overwhelming importance of the item now before us. Neither does any delegation entertain any illusions about the necessity to bend all energies towards the reconciliation of fundamental differences of view, however wide such divergencies of view may be and however remote the prospects of a consensus may seem at any given moment.

254. Since the discussion ended in the Special Political Committee on this item, many delegations have been concerned—concerned to the point of agitation—about the possibility that the decision finally made in this Assembly on this item will, when the votes have been recorded, be a decision which divides, not unites, the Members of the United Nations; that it might be one which underscores and aggravates the divergencies of view within the international community rather than one which reconciles our separate attitudes.

255. In the past few days, on the initiative of delegations describing themselves as non-aligned, urgent negotiations have been conducted amongst delegations of all shades of opinion on this subject, to see whether agreement might be possible. I understand that those so engaged believe, even now, that if a little more time is allowed them, their efforts at achieving agreement might prove successful. My delegation believes that we have a duty to extend to those delegations engaged in such efforts the courtesy and support of our patience. I have taken the floor, therefore, to propose, in accordance with the provisions of rule 78 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, that the meeting be adjourned at this point, and that the Assembly should not proceed to the vote on draft resolutions B and C until Monday, 19 December.

256. Draft resolution C will be formally adopted by this principal organ of the United Nations if the vote is taken tonight. Of that, the Jamaican delegation is confident. It will be adopted with no smaller majority if the vote is taken on 19 December; of that, too, we are confident. The single recommendation in that draft resolution prejudices no one's position; it is fully consistent with the provisions of the Charter. It recognizes the primary responsibility imposed on the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security, and it simply invites the Council to prepare itself to discharge an important part of that responsibility.

257. The motion, therefore, has nothing to do with the fate of draft resolution C. The motion is precisely what it appears to be on the face of it, a motion to postpone the voting and perhaps the further discussion on these two draft resolutions until 19 December. It is not a first step in a move to defer to some indefinite time the voting on these two draft resolutions. It is prompted solely by the desire to see whether, even at this late stage, it might be possible to reach an agreement upon a draft which would command the overwhelming support of the majority of the Members of this Assembly. I believe that those delegations which have been most actively associated in the earlier discussion on draft resolution B will not oppose this motion.

258. I know, Mr. President, that you are concerned about the volume of business which still remains to be dealt with before the end of this session, and also about the short time remaining in which to conclude that business, but it is possible that with an adjournment at this stage we might achieve a net saving of time.

259. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly has heard the statement which has just been made by the representative of Jamaica. His proposal consists of

two parts: one, the adjournment of the consideration of the item before us, and the other, the postponement of the vote. Of course, every matter suggested by any representative will be dealt with strictly in accordance with the rules of procedure, but I should like to draw the attention of Members to the fact that for the two meetings we have scheduled for 19 December, there are thirty-three items to be dealt with by the General Assembly. Therefore, this suggested postponement of the consideration of an item is not an ordinary postponement. In such a situation, it is my duty to draw the attention of the Assembly to the fact that if a motion would delay the work of the Assembly, I, in my capacity as President, cannot take the responsibility of agreeing with such a motion. The Assembly has to take that responsibility. Of course, the President is only a servant of the Assembly and completely in the hands of the Assembly.

260. As I have said, I shall deal with the matter strictly in accordance with the rules of procedure, but I should like to reach the following understanding, if this would be the consensus of the Assembly: that we continue and hear the few more speakers that we have on the list, and when we come to the end of this list I shall do my best to give full consideration to the second part of the proposal. To do that, I shall need the time it will take to hear the few other speakers on the list.

261. If the representative of Jamaica will allow us to hear the few speakers remaining on our list, we shall deal with his proposal after we have done that.

262. I call on the representative of Jamaica to tell me what is his desire, so that instead of using time on this discussion we may hear the speakers.

263. Mr. RICHARDSON (Jamaica): Under the rule of procedure which I quoted, my motion should be put immediately to the vote, but the Jamaica delegation, now as always will co-operate as fully as possible with the President. If, in his view, it would advance our work to hear a few more speakers before we adjourn, we would not insist on the strict observance of the procedure required by the rules.

264. The PRESIDENT: I wish to thank the representative of Jamaica. It could not be clearer to me that it is in the interest of the work of the General Assembly to hear all the remaining speakers, and, as I have said, we will reach a decision on the other point he has raised, giving full consideration to his statement on that point.

265. I call on the representative of Mexico on a point of order.

266. Mr. CUEVAS CANCINO (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): If it is the President's intention to make the best possible use of the Assembly's time, my delegation would certainly be the last to oppose him. However, it would respectfully draw his attention to rule 67 of the rules of procedure, and suggest that if we are to go on hearing explanations of vote, we might, in accordance with what we believe is a well-established precedent, begin our consideration of agenda item 33 by hearing the Rapporteur of the Special Political Committee.

267. The PRESIDENT: In answer to the representative of Mexico I would say the following. So far as my understanding of the work of the Assembly is concerned, although it is quite clear that reports are presented, the presentation of reports by the Rapporteurs while such reports in his name are before the Assembly is not an essential element. I believe that that, too, is in everybody's memory.

268. I had planned to give the floor to the Rapporteur at the end for further elaboration in detail of the report which is already before the Assembly in his name. I do not want to discuss this matter further with the representative of Mexico; I want only to inform him that I had informed the Rapporteur of my intention and that I intended to give him the floor before proceeding to the vote.

269. I call on the representative of Guinea.

270. Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea) (translated from French): My delegation has the impression that the manner in which we are proceeding would seem to indicate that positions have crystallized, that nothing can change the situation we are now facing, and that, therefore, we should conclude the explanations of vote and perhaps proceed to the voting.

271. In requesting to speak, my delegation hoped that we could be given some time to see whether any developments might occur over the weekend which would enable us to explain our vote on a text which is different from that now before us.

272. At the present time, my delegation does not feel that an explanation of vote on draft resolutions B and C [A/6603, para. 25] is called for, because we hope to be able to explain our vote on Monday when we shall perhaps be faced with a new development. Since no such new development has so far taken place, I shall waive my right to speak.

273. Mr. MISHRA (India): In the same spirit as the representative of Guinea, I should like to facilitate the closure of the debate today and therefore not proceed with an explanation of vote.

274. Mr. ALARCON DE QUESADA (Cuba) (translated from Spanish): I shall be extremely brief. My delegation will vote against the draft resolutions which have been submitted to us [A/6603, para. 25] because we believe that they are totally illegal and violate the Charter of the United Nations. We also wish to draw the attention of this Assembly to the fact that so-called United Nations peace-keeping forces have been used by the United States Government as an instrument of aggression against the peoples, for example, in the Congo and Korea.

275. Resolutions such as these are designed to interfere with the normal functioning of this Organization and to give peoples the impression that, in the struggle for peace they can depend on supposedly impartial international forces or on the decisions of United Nations bodies.

276. My delegation wishes to reaffirm that true peace will be achieved not by these means, but by the anti-imperialist revolutionary struggle of the people.

277. Therefore, it must be clearly understood that, if the above-mentioned draft resolutions were to be

adopted by the General Assembly, Cuba would not recognize their legal validity and would not consider itself under any obligation with respect to them.

278. Mr. NGUZA (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (translated from French): Mr. President, in response to your appeal, I shall be extremely brief.

279. In asking to speak, my delegation intended to explain its vote on the texts before us, but we have listened with great interest to the representatives who have preceded me. In discussing a question of such paramount importance, we believe it our duty to recall our great debt of gratitude towards this Organization, which helped the Democratic Republic of the Congo to recover its territorial integrity. In this connexion, I wish to pay a tribute here, on behalf of my country, to the Secretary-General, U Thant.

280. My delegation deeply appreciates all the statements we have heard. Therefore, in the interests of peace and of the United Nations we waive our right to speak at this stage in explanation of our vote and support the proposal to give delegations time to think the matter over. We dare to hope that these last-minute efforts will produce a new situation which may benefit the Organization. Naturally, this does not in any way affect our fundamental position on this question.

281. Mr. ATTOUNGBRE (Ivory Coast) (translated from French): During the discussions in the Special Political Committee, my delegation stressed the importance which the Republic of the Ivory Coast attaches to peace-keeping [525th meeting]. It was in order to demonstrate that interest that my delegation joined with others in trying to find a satisfactory, albeit provisional, solution to the question of financing peace-keeping operations.

282. The proposal favoured by my delegation has been withdrawn because the time is not ripe for it. The Ivory Coast will vote in favour of draft resolution B [A/6603, para. 25], the so-called Canadian proposal, out of a desire to find a solution to a problem it considers to be of the greatest importance.

283. The PRESIDENT: First of all, with the consent of the Assembly, I would consult the Members of the Assembly. If there is no objection to the suggestion made by the representative of Jamaica to postpone the vote on this item until 19 December, I shall take it that that is the desire of the Assembly.

284. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (translated from French): I apologize for speaking at this very late hour, but I believe that the representative of Jamaica has requested that both the discussion and the voting on this question should be adjourned until Monday.

285. I think it would be proper to postpone not only the voting on the draft resolutions, but also the debate on this question. Many delegations which have already spoken in the debate have simply said that they could not speak now because they were not ready to do so owing to the circumstances. They are awaiting some clarification of the situation.

286. Therefore, Mr. President, I should like to ask you to consider the Jamaican representative's proposal, since the delegations which were to speak this

afternoon have done so. However, there are other delegations, which, in different circumstances, would have liked to explain their vote before the voting, especially since rule 78 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly must be applied immediately and may not be interpreted in any other manner. I would be grateful, therefore, Mr. President, if you would put this question to the Assembly—not only that we postpone the voting, but also that we adjourn the debate.

287. The PRESIDENT: I do not think there is any problem; the situation is very clear. I have no further speakers today, and as was very clearly stated by the representative of Guinea, and now also by the representative of Bulgaria, if there is a different circumstance or a different proposal when the item is taken up again, delegations will naturally be entitled to express their views on it. But if there is no new circumstance and the situation is the same, there are no further speakers on what we now have before us.

288. Mr. ZOLLNER (Dahomey) (translated from French): I apologize for having to intervene at this late hour, but I would like to draw your attention, Mr. President, to the following facts: a certain number of representatives who would normally have wished to explain their vote now have refrained from speaking because of the new situation which seems to be developing and because they do not wish to explain their vote on a text which will not necessarily be the one on which we shall be called to vote on Monday.

289. In order to save the General Assembly's time, we prefer to postpone our explanations until the moment when we actually vote, in order to know exactly on what we are voting.

290. For this reason in particular my delegation did not ask to speak this evening to explain our vote. I believe, moreover, that we are not the only ones. Some representatives who had requested to speak this evening in explanation of vote have said very clearly that they do not wish to do so at this stage. They would prefer to know exactly on what they will have to vote on Monday, so as to explain their vote correctly.

291. Therefore, Mr. President, despite your most praiseworthy desire to speed up the work of this session as much as possible, I would ask you to take these facts into consideration and to allow those delegations which wish to explain their votes in a reasonable manner on the texts which will actually be voted on, to have the opportunity to do so on Monday.

292. The PRESIDENT: I still think that there is no problem. Perhaps, I did not make myself clear. I said that if there is a change in the circumstances, delegations will be fully entitled to take the floor and express their views and it will be my duty to call on them. The vote will also be postponed to 19 December, if there is no objection to the suggestion made by the representative of Jamaica.

293. I am prepared to call on the representative of Dahomey, who wishes to speak. But I should like to remind him that the hour is very late and I think the situation is quite clear. If the representative of Dahomey wants to explain his vote at any stage on

Monday, before or after the vote is taken, he will be able to do so.

294. I call on the representative of Yugoslavia.

295. Mr. BOZOVIC (Yugoslavia): Mr. President, I agree with you that the hour is late and that we should not prolong the discussion. I would therefore request you either to have the Assembly take a decision or to consult it in the way you think most appropriate on the proposal which was made by the representative of Jamaica, namely, to adjourn the meeting until 19 December—which means to adjourn to 19 December the discussion, explanations of vote and the vote.

296. Mr. President, with the explanation you have given, we are under the impression that there might still be some matter left not completely clear—a new proposal, new circumstances, and so on.

297. If, at this stage of the debate, we decide to adjourn the meeting, then it is for you, in your wisdom, to permit every representative who asks to speak in explanation of vote on 19 December, to do so either before or after the vote.

298. But as I said, the representative of Jamaica made his motion quite clear in the beginning. At your request, he repeated and explained the motion. It was for the adjournment of the meeting until 19 December.

299. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Yugoslavia has not himself made a motion for adjournment. He has referred to the motion made by the representative of Jamaica. I interpreted the motion and I asked for a clarification. The representative of Jamaica said that he did not insist. That is why I was allowed by the Assembly to call on other speakers. If there is a motion for adjournment, I shall now take it up in accordance with the rules of procedure. But such a motion will have to be made before it can be taken up.

300. The other point that I should like to make is that I have not said that there will be proposals. References were made to changing circumstances, which could be understood to mean that some kind of new proposal would be forthcoming. I merely referred to references

that had been made by Members of the Assembly. I myself do not know of any such proposals.

301. But what is quite clear is that we shall continue the consideration of this item on 19 December, and we shall see whether the situation is the same or different. That is what I had thought. We shall not proceed to a vote on this item today; we shall vote on it on Monday. I hope the situation is quite clear now.

302. We have reached an agreement on that point.

### AGENDA ITEM 35

Effects of atomic radiation: report of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation

#### REPORT OF THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE (A/6601)

303. Mr. GOÑI DEMARCHI (Argentina), Rapporteur of the Special Political Committee (translated from Spanish): In response to the President's invitation, I should like to introduce the report [A/6601] on agenda item 35 entitled "Effects of atomic radiation: report of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation".

304. On this item, the Special Political Committee had before it a draft resolution submitted by sixteen Powers, which was adopted unanimously. I therefore recommend, on behalf of the Committee, that the Assembly should adopt the draft resolution contained in paragraph 7 of the report.

305. The PRESIDENT: The draft resolution recommended by the Special Political Committee appears in paragraph 7 of its report [A/6601].

306. Since the draft resolution was adopted unanimously in the Committee, may I take it that the General Assembly also adopted it unanimously?

*The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.*

*The meeting rose at 9.20 p.m.*