



ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Thursday, 18 July 1963

Thirty-sixth session

at 3.30 p.m.

OFFICIAL RECORDS

OCT - 9 1963

PALAIS DES NATIONS, GENEVA

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 5:	
United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (concluded)	185

President: Mr. A. PATIÑO (Colombia)

Present:

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

Observers for the following Member States: Algeria, Brazil, Canada, China, Denmark, Greece, Hungary, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Romania.

Observers for the following non-member States: Federal Republic of Germany, Holy See, Switzerland.

Representatives of the following specialized agencies: International Labour Organisation, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, International Monetary Fund, World Health Organization, Universal Postal Union, Interim Commission for the International Trade Organization.

The representative of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

AGENDA ITEM 5

United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (E/3756, E/3799 and Corr.1, E/3817; E/L.1009, E/L.1011, E/L.1012, E/L.1013, E/L.1014, E/L.1015 (concluded))

1. The PRESIDENT explained that the Australian draft resolution (E/L.1009), the Argentine amendments thereto (E/L.1013) and the draft resolution submitted jointly by Colombia, Ethiopia, India, Jordan, Uruguay and Yugoslavia (E/L.1012) had been withdrawn and replaced by a new draft resolution submitted jointly by Argentina, Australia, Colombia, El Salvador, Ethiopia, India, Jordan, Uruguay and Yugoslavia (E/L.1015). The penultimate operative paragraph of the original Australian draft resolution, which was the subject of the amendment of

France and Italy-(E/L.1014), had become paragraph 8 of operative part I of the new joint draft resolution.

2. Mr. SIEGEL, Assistant Director-General, World Health Organization, speaking on behalf of the Director-General of WHO, thanked the Council for its understanding of the difficult problems entailed by the change in the opening date of the seventeenth World Health Assembly. The first International Sanitary Conference held in Paris in 1851 had stressed the close interrelationship between health and trade, and it was because of the recognition of the importance of that interrelationship that the Director-General had agreed to recommend to the Executive Board that it change its decision concerning the date of the seventeenth World Health Assembly. He was certain that the Council had taken into account the pertinent documentation from WHO relating to that matter, and particularly the document dated 14 June, containing a letter from the Director-General to the Director of the European Office of the United Nations, as well as document E/3793, containing the World Health Assembly resolution relating to the problem of co-ordination of conference arrangements. In the letter of 14 June, reference was made to the considerable difficulties which the organization would have to face and the additional expense involved if the Health Assembly were to be held in July. After study, it had been found that the additional expenses would be less if it were held in March, and the Director-General had therefore agreed to recommend to the Executive Board that the seventeenth World Health Assembly should be held at Geneva during the first three weeks of March 1964, instead of the traditional date of May, even though such a drastic change of over two months would create a number of problems for governments of member states, particularly with regard to delays in documentation and the extra procedural arrangements for the establishment of the agenda.

3. Mr. PREBISCH, Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, said that at the time originally selected for the third session of the Preparatory Committee there would be only two conference rooms available at Headquarters, owing to the reconstruction work which would then be in progress. Those conference rooms had already been allotted to the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and the Committee on Housing, Building and Planning; and Headquarters had therefore requested that the opening of the Committee's third session should be postponed until 3 February 1964.

4. Sir Ronald WALKER (Australia), introducing the new text of the joint draft resolution (E/L.1015), said that the preamble now contained a paragraph thanking the

ILO and WHO for their co-operation. Part I of the operative part dealt with the administrative decisions which the Council had to take. Part II was concerned with the practical problems facing the Conference and much of its wording was taken from the joint statement by representatives of developing countries contained in paragraph 186 of the report of the Preparatory Committee on its second session (E/3799). Unfortunately, there had not been sufficient time for the sponsors to consider the amendment submitted by France and Italy (E/L.1014), but he saw no difficulty in accepting it.

5. Mr. JEVTIC (Yugoslavia) expressed satisfaction at being able to co-sponsor the new joint text. The proposals mentioned in part II, paragraph 1, of the joint draft resolution actually referred to the proposals put forward in the Preparatory Committee, but the sponsors had been reluctant to specify that fact in order to allow for the consideration of other proposals which might be submitted by countries not represented in the Committee. He hoped that the USSR representative could accept part II, paragraph 2, in the light of the Indian representative's explanations at the 1287th meeting.

6. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan) said he would be able to accept the French and Italian amendment (E/L.1014) provided the words "economic" and "following" in the second paragraph were deleted.

7. Mr. DUCCI (Italy) said that the above changes were quite acceptable to the French and Italian delegations, although the term "economic organizations" had been taken from the original text submitted by Australia and still appeared in operative paragraph 8 of the revised text. He pointed out to the USSR representative that paragraph 208 of the preparatory committee's report stated that "some suggestions were made as to regional economic organizations which might be invited, but it was agreed to leave the matter for consideration by the Economic and Social Council". The purpose of the joint amendment was precisely to fulfil that request.

8. Mr. ARKADIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the preparation of a joint text by nine sponsors was quite an achievement, but there were still certain paragraphs in it that were unsatisfactory. Nor could his delegation accept the two-Power amendment, particularly if, as the representative of Jordan had suggested, the word "economic" was deleted. The deletion might have serious consequences. He realized that the object of the Jordanian sub-amendment was to secure the representation of the Arab League, but did he want an intergovernmental organization like NATO to be invited as well? Moreover, paragraph 208 of the preparatory committee's report twice mentioned "regional economic organizations". To open the Conference to all intergovernmental organizations would run counter to the decisions of the Preparatory Committee.

9. He proposed that in part I, operative paragraph 8 of the joint text, the words "to the third session of the preparatory committee and" should be inserted after the word "observers". With regard to part II, paragraph 1, he saw no reason why the invitation should not be

extended to all States, for there was nothing in General Assembly resolution 1785 (XVII) which prevented all States from being consulted regarding the proposals for practical action. In any case, however, it would be interesting to know how decisions which the Conference had not yet reached could be implemented.

10. Finally, paragraph 2 of part II should be clarified, particularly such terms as "political will" and "security in the world at large". It might be better to delete the word "political" and also to speak of "economic development" rather than "economic stability".

11. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan) said it was no secret that he wished the League of Arab States to be invited to the Conference as he had said in the Preparatory Committee. He had asked for the deletion of the word "economic" because its inclusion might be confusing for the Secretary-General whose main criterion in inviting organizations to the Conference was that they were "chiefly interested" in it. At the same time, the Conference must be given the widest possible publicity and as many interested organizations as possible should give it their moral support. In any case, the Council would have the opportunity at its resumed thirty-sixth session of considering the list of organizations which the Secretary-General was asked to prepare.

12. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that the purpose of the amendment submitted by France and Italy was not to call in question the principle adopted by the Preparatory Committee, but to suggest how the principle should be applied in detail and to enable the Council to take practical measures to that end. In the Preparatory Committee's report there appeared to be some discrepancy between paragraph 208 and those of rule 59 of the Conference's draft rules of procedure, and the French and Italian delegations accordingly hoped that the Council would take the necessary additional measures at its resumed thirty-sixth session.

13. The word "economic" already appeared in the Australian draft resolution and, in order to alter the original text as little as possible, the French and Italian delegations had retained the word "economic" in their amendment; but they would have no objection to its deletion, as proposed by the representative of Jordan. At the 1287th meeting he himself had pointed out that the status of the League of Arab States and OAS vis-à-vis the Council was already such as to entitle them to take part in the work of the Conference, and it was certain that at the resumed thirty-sixth session the Council would decide to admit them as observers. In drafting the amendment, he had at no time intended that NATO should participate in the Conference; and, if the Soviet representative would be satisfied with that assurance, the Council would not need to give the matter any further attention. In accordance with the French and Italian amendment, the Secretary-General would as a matter of course be requested to select organizations which were genuinely interested in following the work of the Conference.

14. The Soviet representative had referred to the possibility of intergovernmental organizations participating

in the work of the Preparatory Committee's third session. The French and Italian amendment contained no reference to that possibility, and the Soviet representative's suggestion should rather be considered by the sponsors of the joint draft resolution. On the other hand, as the Committee's third session was to be a short one, and as the main topic for consideration would be the draft agenda for the Conference, he wondered if it was really necessary for representatives of intergovernmental organizations to attend the session. It was much more important that they should attend the Conference itself.

15. The idea of inviting all States to the Conference had not been accepted by the Preparatory Committee; and the Council itself would have to discuss the matter if the Soviet representative were to submit a formal proposal to that effect.

16. His delegation was inclined to agree with the Soviet representative concerning the wording of part II, paragraph 2, of the joint draft resolution.

17. Part II, paragraph 1, was not sufficiently specific; it might be better to speak of "proposals which have already been made and which may be made before the beginning of the Conference".

18. Mr. ARKADIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the position of the delegation of Jordan regarding the principle of universality was not consistent. In the Preparatory Committee the delegations of Jordan and Lebanon had invoked General Assembly resolution 1785 (XVII) in order to oppose suggestions for making participation in the Conference universal. In the current discussion, the delegation of Jordan was invoking the concept of universality in connexion with its suggestion that the invitation to intergovernmental organizations should not be confined to those of an economic character.

19. In reply to the French representative, he pointed out that he had made no formal proposal to amend the opening words of part II, paragraph 1, of the joint draft resolution. He had simply remarked that there was no valid reason, and no legal justification, for not inviting all countries without distinction to give consideration to the matters mentioned therein.

20. The French representative had suggested that the decision of the Preparatory Committee that representatives of the appropriate intergovernmental organizations should be invited not only to the Conference, but also to the third session of the Preparatory Committee, should be set aside. If the delegations of Italy and France wanted to change their position, that was no reason for disregarding that decision. He recalled that those delegations had not made any objection in the Preparatory Committee to the adoption of the report containing that recommendation (E/3799, para. 208). The French representative had pointed out that the third session of the Committee would last only two weeks. The USSR delegation did not believe that a long time was necessary in order to make a useful contribution. In fact, if the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, EEC and the League of Arab States were to send observers to the

third session, the outcome could not but be constructive. The whole subject should be approached in a practical manner.

21. Mr. BINGHAM (United States of America) suggested that the words "Invites the States Members of the United Nations, of the specialized agencies and of the International Atomic Energy Agency..." in part II, paragraph 1, of the joint draft resolution should be replaced by the words "Invites the States which will participate in the Conference..."

22. In the same paragraph, he found it difficult to accept the reference to "a new international trade and development policy". That language had been drawn from the joint statement by the representatives of developing countries, but the text of the statement made it perfectly clear that what was visualized was a whole series of measures to deal with an enormously complex matter, and not the somewhat naïve idea of a single new policy. If those works were taken out of context and embodied in a resolution of the Council they could prove misleading. Again, some of the measures that would be needed might not be "new"; they could be a modification of old policies or even a return to former policies. He therefore suggested that the concluding phrase should be amended to read: "... basic agreement on desirable and practical policies with respect to international trade and development."

23. He agreed with the Soviet Union representative that the language of part II, paragraph 2, was somewhat poetic. His main objection, however, was to the use of the expression "to guarantee the acceleration of the economic development". Such language was too ambitious and he suggested that it should be replaced by an expression, used in the joint statement of representatives of developing countries, "to contribute to the acceleration...", or some such expression.

24. He supported the joint amendment. His delegation took the view that the Council was competent to make minor changes in the preparatory committee's recommendations.

25. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan), replying to the Soviet Union representative, said that there had been no inconsistency on the part of the delegation of Jordan. When it had been suggested in the Preparatory Committee that invitations to the Conference should be sent to all countries, his delegation and that of Lebanon had rightly pointed out that the Committee could not go beyond its mandate as laid down in General Assembly resolution 1785 (XVII), paragraph 4 (a), which specifically requested the Secretary-General to invite all States Members of the United Nations, of the specialized agencies and of the IAEA. His delegation took the position that the Council was competent to decide in the matter of observers from intergovernmental organizations.

26. Mr. UNWIN (United Kingdom) suggested replacement, in the fifth preambular paragraph of the joint draft resolution, of the words "a greater readiness to act and

to adopt practical measures . . .” by the words “a universal readiness to act and generally to adopt practical measures . . .”; in the seventh preambular paragraph, of the word “*Considering*” by the word “*Confident*” and of the word “should” by “will”; and, in the eighth preambular paragraph, of the term “self sustained growth” by “self-sustaining growth”.

27. He preferred the formulation contained in the amendment by France and Italy. With regard to the Jordanian representative’s suggestion to delete the adjective “economic” before “organizations”, he recalled that it had been the clear intention of his delegation — and, he believed, of other delegations — in the Preparatory Committee to cover such international organizations as the League of Arab States which were not necessarily economic, but which had an established relation with the Council.

28. He agreed to a large extent with the remarks of the Soviet Union representative regarding part II of the draft resolution. Paragraph 1 was unexceptionable as part of the joint statement by representatives of developing countries. The same formulation, if presented as an invitation to action, would not be practical. It should be remembered that the proposals submitted to the Preparatory Committee were very numerous indeed; it would be unrealistic to expect all the States concerned to explore the means of implementing those various proposals. In fact, it would be for the Conference itself to make a choice among them so that States could focus their attention on them. He accordingly proposed that the latter part of paragraph 1 be re-worded along the following lines: “. . . to give earnest consideration, before the beginning of the Conference, to the proposals made for international action, so as to make it possible to reach at the Conference basic agreement on desirable and practicable policies with respect to international trade and development.”

29. He agreed with the Soviet Union representative that the adjective “political” in part II, operative paragraph 2, was unnecessary. He supported the United States proposal to replace the words “to guarantee” by “to contribute to”. He further proposed the deletion of the concluding words “and the promotion of economic stability and security in the world at large”, which had been rightly criticized by the Soviet Union representative.

30. Mr. CHAKRAVARTY (India) said that he could not agree with the suggestion by the United Kingdom representative that the concluding words of paragraph 2 were unnecessary. There was no contradiction between the desire for stability and the objective of development. Operative paragraph 1 of that same part made it perfectly clear that the whole aim pursued was that of development; however, an increase in international trade might well be accompanied by instability of prices, which invariably disturbed the economy of primary producing countries. Stability was therefore a legitimate aim of those countries.

31. He had no objection to the suggestion to replace the words “to guarantee” by “to contribute to”.

32. He had no objection to the words “before the beginning of the Conference” being placed after the word “consideration” in part II, paragraph 1, but he could not support the textual changes suggested by the United Kingdom representative.

33. It was the hope of the sponsors of the joint draft resolution that the eighty States which were not members of the Preparatory Committee would come forward with definite proposals in response to the invitation in part II, paragraph 1. It should be remembered that sovereign States were not bound by the decisions of the Preparatory Committee and it was always open to them to put forward their own views.

34. Lastly, his delegation did not favour the amendment submitted by France and Italy.

35. Mr. ZAPOTOCKY (Czechoslovakia) pointed out that the Preparatory Committee had already recommended to the Council that an invitation to attend the Committee’s third session should be addressed to those inter-governmental economic organizations which were interested in the Conference. He urged that the Council should abide by that recommendation, particularly since the duration of the Conference would be shortened by one week. The participation of those intergovernmental organizations in the third session of the Preparatory Committee would enable that Committee to take their views into account in its report to the Conference.

36. His delegation accordingly proposed that the concluding words of operative paragraph 8 should be amended to read: “. . . to send observers to the third session of the Preparatory Committee and to the Conference.”

37. Mr. ARKADIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to the Indian representative’s comment, pointed out that the number of countries that had not participated in the decisions of the Preparatory Committee amounted to some 120 and stressed the need to take into account the views of those countries on international trade. The Secretary-General of the Conference should give due consideration to the matter so that a formula might be found before the third session of the Preparatory Committee whereby the views of all those States could be taken into consideration.

38. Earlier he had criticized the inappropriate terms “stability” and “security” in part II, paragraph 2, but he did not support the proposal by the United Kingdom representative to delete the whole of the passage which contained those words. The passage should refer simply to the promotion of economic development, without any reference to stability or security.

39. The representative of Czechoslovakia had already proposed the amendment of paragraph 8, but he suggested the even simpler course of redrafting that paragraph so as to indicate the adoption by the Council of the recommendations contained in paragraph 208 of the Preparatory Committee’s report.

40. He urged the Council to adhere to the recommendations of the Preparatory Committee and to retain the

qualification "economic" in paragraph 8. The Committee had arrived at its conclusions after long deliberation and it would be unwise for the Council to set them aside without any valid reason. In that connexion, he suggested that the Council's proposals should be referred to the Committee for consideration at its third session.

41. Mr. RESTREPO (Colombia) pointed out that the wording of part II, paragraph 1, was the same as that used in the joint statement in the report of the Preparatory Committee. The meaning was quite clear and he would strongly oppose any amendment of the phrase "a new international trade and development policy". That was exactly what the Conference would have to achieve.

42. On the other hand, he could see no objection to the deletion of the word "political" in section II, paragraph 2, of the draft resolution, or to the replacement of the word "guarantee" in the same paragraph.

43. Mr. SIEGEL, Assistant Director-General, World Health Organization, while expressing appreciation for the inclusion of the tenth paragraph of the preamble, said that the wording of that paragraph was not accurate as it failed to take account of his earlier statement. It was not correct to state that WHO had already agreed to adjust the dates of the Seventeenth World Health Assembly: that was a prerogative of the WHO Executive Board, which according to the Constitution, was the only organ which could establish the date, or alter the date, of the annual sessions of the World Health Assembly. At that stage, it would be correct to say that the Director-General had agreed to seek an adjustment in the date.

44. Mr. JEVTIC (Yugoslavia) said he was prepared to accept the wording of paragraph 8 as it stood, but in order to meet the objections raised, he proposed the following text:

"Requests the Secretary-General to invite those regional intergovernmental economic organizations which have a substantial interest in the subject matter of the Conference to send observers to the third session of the Preparatory Committee and to the Conference, and further requests the Secretary-General to submit to the Council, at its resumed thirty-sixth session, proposals regarding the practical rules to be observed for the participation of those organizations in the work of the Preparatory Committee and the Conference as observers."

He supported the remarks made by the Colombian and Indian representatives concerning part II and would be very reluctant to see any changes made in that part.

45. Mr. PALTHEY, Deputy Director, European Office of the United Nations, pointed out, with reference to part I, paragraph 3, that in order to allow for preparations for the session of the International Labour Conference, the closing date of the Conference on Trade and Development should be put forward to 14 June 1964.

46. Mr. VIAUD (France) and Mr. RESTREPO (Colombia) supported the recommendation.

47. Mr. ARKADIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) expressed the view that the Yugoslav proposal brought a solution nearer, since it took account of all the texts before the Council.

48. The official records could state that the Council was of the opinion that the League of Arab States should be invited to attend the Preparatory Committee's third session and the Conference.

49. He urged representatives to avoid giving the impression in the joint draft resolution that the Council was approving proposals the Preparatory Committee had never made and rejecting proposals it had actually made.

50. Mr. DUCCI (Italy) said his delegation had never favoured the paragraphs now included in part II of the joint draft resolution. The wording was not clear and the arguments put forward by the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union representatives had convinced his delegation that they should be redrafted.

51. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan) observed that he would accept any wording that would make it clear that the League of Arab States could be invited to the Conference.

The meeting was suspended at 6.20 p.m. and resumed at 7.5 p.m.

52. Sir Ronald WALKER (Australia) said that the co-sponsors of the draft resolution had agreed to replace the word "greater" by the word "universal" and to add the word "generally" before the words "to adopt practical measures" in the fifth preambular paragraph; to replace the word "Considering" by the word "Confident" and the word "should" by the word "will" in the seventh preambular paragraph; to replace the word "sustained" by the word "sustaining" before the word "growth" in the eighth preambular paragraph; to insert the words "Directors-General of" before the words "the ILO and WHO" and to replace the word "adjusting" by the words "seeking to adjust" in the tenth preambular paragraph.

53. With regard to part I, they had agreed to substitute the words "15 June 1964" for the words "16 June 1964" in paragraph 3, but had been unable to reach any compromise on paragraph 8. They had felt that the best solution was for the amendment of France and Italy to that paragraph to be voted on later.

54. They had also agreed to the following wording of part II, paragraph 1:

"1. Invites the States which will participate in the Conference to give earnest consideration, before the beginning of the Conference, to proposals for concrete and practical international action and to explore all practical means for their implementation, so as to make it possible to reach at the Conference basic agreement on measures constituting a new international trade and development policy;"

In paragraph 2, they had agreed to replace the words "Expresses its expectations" by the words "Expresses the hope", to delete the word "political" before the word "will" and to replace the word "guarantee" by the words "contribute to". They had not altered the wording

of the final part of the sentence, believing that it was sufficiently clear that the word "economic" qualified both the words "stability" and "security".

55. Mr. CRESPO (International Labour Organisation), recalling that the Deputy Director of the European Office had requested that 14 June should be indicated as the closing date for the Conference, pointed out that the text read out by the Australian representative gave the date as 15 June and asked the Council to reconsider the date specified in the revised draft resolution.

56. Mr. VIAUD (France) pointed out that draft amendment E/L.1014 had originally referred to the Australian draft resolution (E/L.1009), and that the French and Italian delegations had been unable to reach a compromise with the co-sponsors of the joint draft resolution. They had, however, suggested to the latter the retention of their paragraph 8 with the following wording: "Approves the Preparatory Committee's recommendation to invite...", the paragraph in question to be followed by the joint draft amendment, which therefore, instead of replacing paragraph 8, would have preserved the principle of a recommendation by the Preparatory Committee. The sole aim of the amendment would then have been to provide procedures for applying the Committee's recommendation.

57. As the suggestion had not been accepted, the French and Italian delegations were obliged to maintain their text, as amended by the Jordanian representative.

58. Mr. DUCCI (Italy) expressed the hope that the Council would consider the proposal the French representative and he had made to the co-sponsors of the draft resolution during the adjournment. His delegation had no objection to invitations being sent to intergovernmental economic organizations to send observers to the third session of the Preparatory Committee as well as to the Conference; the only reason reference to the third session of the Committee had been omitted from the French and Italian amendment was because no reference had been made to it in the joint draft resolution.

59. Replying to a request for clarification from Mr. ARKADIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. VIAUD (France) said that, in their proposal to the sponsors of draft resolution E/L.1015, the French and Italian delegations had not mentioned the attendance of observers at the Preparatory Committee's third session. That was a point to be decided by the co-sponsors themselves.

60. Mr. ARKADIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked if the French and Italian representatives would be prepared to accept the replacement of the words "Requests the Secretary-General" in paragraph 8 by the words "Approves the recommendations of the Preparatory Committee contained in paragraph 208 of its report (E/3799)".

61. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that, if the USSR representative proposed that paragraph 8 should be amended to ensure that the invitation to the intergovernmental organizations also covered the Preparatory Committee's third session, and if the co-sponsors of the draft resolution

were willing to accept that proposal, the French delegation would have no objection to it. He had also understood that the USSR representative would then also accept the French and Italian amendment.

62. Mr. ARKADIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had no objection to requesting the Secretary-General to submit to the Council at its resumed thirty-sixth session a list of organizations which would be chiefly interested in the work of the Conference, and he was prepared to accept the inclusion in the draft resolution of a paragraph to that effect.

63. Sir Ronald WALKER (Australia) remarked that he could not consult the sponsors about the new proposal. However, his delegation was prepared to accept the replacement in paragraph 8 of the words "Requests the Secretary-General" by the words "Approves the recommendations of the Preparatory Committee in paragraph 208 of this report", and the addition of the two paragraphs contained in the French and Italian amendment.

64. Mr. TETTAMANTI (Argentina), Mr. RESTREPO (Colombia), Mr. INDASHAW (Ethiopia), Mr. CHAKRAVARTY (India), Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan), Mr. PASTORI (Uruguay), and Mr. JEVVIC (Yugoslavia) also accepted the proposal.

65. Mr. MALINOWSKI, Secretary of the Council, said that it was his understanding that operative paragraph 8 would, in fact, be replaced by two paragraphs, which would read:

"8. Approves the recommendations of the Preparatory Committee contained in paragraph 208 of its report (E/3799) as regards invitations to intergovernmental economic organizations;

"9. Further requests the Secretary-General to submit to the Council at its resumed thirty-sixth session proposals regarding intergovernmental organizations which would be chiefly interested in the work of the Conference, and regarding the practical rules to be observed for the participation of those organizations in the Conference as observers."

66. Mr. VIAUD (France) pointed out that the joint draft amendment covered two separate points. The first point, which concerned the specialized agencies, was not essential because, under the arrangements linking them to the United Nations, they had the right to send representatives to the Conference on Trade and Development. If the Council preferred to omit the first paragraph of the amendment, the French delegation would have no objection, it being understood, of course, that information on practical arrangements for the Conference would be communicated to the specialized agencies.

67. The PRESIDENT said he assumed that the amendment as read out by the Secretary was acceptable.

68. Mr. BLAU (United States of America), referring to the statement of financial implications submitted by the Secretary-General (E/3818), stated that his delegation wanted sufficient funds to be provided to ensure that the Conference was a success, but after preliminary examina-

tion it felt that the estimates submitted by the Secretary-General were too high in some respects. He wondered, for example, if, in arriving at the sum of \$799,000 for temporary staff to service the Conference and the sum of \$293,000 for translation and reproduction of pre-conference documents, sufficient account had been taken of the fact that other meetings would be cancelled and staff would therefore be available. He also agreed with the observations made at the 1287th meeting by the Australian representative concerning the provision of \$151,000 for public information services. He hoped the matter would be kept under review, and reserved the position of his delegation until it was considered in the Fifth Committee.

69. He thanked the sponsors of the draft resolution for having taken his suggested amendments into account and assured the Colombian and Yugoslav representatives that, in proposing an amendment to part II, paragraph 1, he had in no way meant to suggest that his delegation was in favour of the *status quo*; his delegation believed that a change was both inevitable and necessary and that what would emerge would be a combination of old and new measures. The introduction of the reference to "measures" before the reference to a new trade and development policy was helpful.

70. Mr. UNWIN (United Kingdom) said that he reserved his delegation's position on financial implications until they were discussed later by the appropriate body.

71. In reply to a request for clarification from Mr. MALINOWSKI, Secretary of the Council, Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan) said that his understanding was that the new paragraph 8 would refer to "intergovernmental economic organizations", whereas the proposed paragraph 9 would refer simply to "intergovernmental organizations" since his delegation's proposal to delete the word "economic" had been accepted by the representatives of France and Italy as sponsors of the original text.

72. Mr. ARKADIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) suggested that it might meet the point of the representative of Jordan if it was made clear in the summary record that the League of Arab States would be invited to participate in the Conference as an observer; there would then be no need to exclude the word "economic"

73. Mr. VIAUD (France) said his delegation was prepared to propose the inclusion in the summary record of a passage in which the Council would acknowledge the long-established ties between the Council and the League of Arab States.

74. He agreed with the USSR representative that it would be preferable to restore the word "economic" in operative paragraph 9 in the joint draft amendment, provided that the Jordanian representative agreed to that course.

75. Mr. DUCCI (Italy) suggested that it might be stated in the summary record that nothing in paragraph 9 should be construed as excluding intergovernmental organizations which, although mainly political, also had economic interests, such as the League of Arab States.

76. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan) asked whether the expression "intergovernmental economic organizations" would cover organizations, such as the League of Arab States, which were at the same time economic, social and political.

77. Mr. MALINOWSKI, Secretary of the Council, replied that the Secretary-General of the Conference and the Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs would no doubt agree, in the light of the Council's discussion of the subject and of the previous discussion in the Preparatory Committee, that it was intended to invite, along with others, at least two intergovernmental organizations of that type: the League of Arab States and OAS. He could give no answer in regard to other similar organizations, since he did not believe that any other organization had been specifically mentioned either in the Council or in the preparatory committee.

78. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan) said that he would have no objection to the inclusion of the word "economic" in the proposed paragraph 9, on the understanding that the summary record contained the necessary clarification of the draft resolution.

79. The PRESIDENT put to the vote the joint draft resolution on the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (E/L.1015), as amended.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

80. Mr. VIAUD (France) said his delegation had voted for the draft resolution, and especially for part II in the light of the amendment to the end of paragraph 1. It did not regard it as impossible that the Conference would lead to the adoption of measures constituting a new international trade and development policy. The proposals his delegation had made in the Preparatory Committee had also visualized the adoption of a new policy in the field of primary products or at least an adaptation of existing trade policies. But the task was not easy. While hoping for the success of the Conference, the French delegation wished to stress the point that the effects on national intents and public opinion of any considerable change in trade policies might in some degree hamper the freedom of action of governments. A practical sense to the provisions of part II of the resolution adopted could be ensured only by a realistic appreciation of the possibilities offered to States Members to give flexibility to their trade policies and of the difficulties of such a task.

81. Mr. TREU (Austria) said that his delegation welcomed the unanimous vote and trusted that the Conference would justify the hopes expressed in the draft resolution.

82. Mr. ARKADIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he hoped that the Conference would be truly universal and would take into account the interests of all countries which desired it to be successful.

The meeting rose at 8.10 p.m.