



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 6: Question of a declaration on international economic co-operation (<i>continued</i>)	33
Agenda item 14: Non-governmental organizations (<i>concluded</i>) Proposal for a review of the list of non-governmental organizations in consultative status	35

President: Mr. Foss SHANAHAN (New Zealand).

Présent:

Representatives of the following States: Afghanistan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Denmark, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Italy, Japan, Jordan, New Zealand, Poland, Spain, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Observers for the following Member States: Argentina, Dominican Republic, Hungary, Israel, Netherlands, Peru, Romania, Thailand, Tunisia, Yugoslavia.

Representatives of the following specialized agencies: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; International Civil Aviation Organization.

The representative of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

AGENDA ITEM 6

Question of a declaration
on international economic co-operation
(E/3467, E/L.899, E/L.900) (*continued*)

1. Mr. SILVA SUCRE (Venezuela) supported the proposal made by the representative of El Salvador at the previous meeting that consideration of the USSR draft declaration on international economic co-operation (E/3467) should be postponed, not so much because of the time factor but because the new text differed considerably from that originally introduced in the Second Committee (A/4648, para. 48). Being an under-developed country itself, Venezuela welcomed any efforts—and particularly those made by highly industrialized countries—to help the under-developed countries, but it doubted whether a declaration on international economic co-operation could be a real substitute for collective action to initiate basic programmes of assistance.

2. Mr. DUDLEY (United Kingdom) recalled the spirit of friendly co-operation in which the original draft of General Assembly resolution 1515 (XV) had been discussed in the Second Committee. In its final form that text represented as high a degree of agreement as one could hope to achieve in the United Nations. By contrast, in introducing the draft declaration (1142nd meeting), the USSR representative had couched his remarks in a form that was wounding to many delega-

tions, including that of the United Kingdom. It was hardly surprising that the United States representative had reacted as he had. Clearly, the USSR representative had been engaging in propaganda against other States, an approach which was not acceptable to the Council. He would commend to the USSR representative the kind of amicable agreement reached between the USSR and United Kingdom delegations in sponsoring Council resolution 727 A (XXVIII) rather than the harsh and critical method of presentation he had adopted.

3. While ready to reply to the misrepresentations of the USSR representative when the occasion arose, he would confine himself for the moment to the question of international trade. The USSR representative had spoken as though the under-developed countries had only to look to the Soviet Union and its friends for support, while the Polish representative had mentioned with evident satisfaction the growing industrial production and international trade of the socialist countries. It was quite true that the total imports of the Sino-Soviet bloc had been growing, but practically all the increase in their trade was with each other. Seventy-five per cent of the imports of the Soviet group were from the other countries in that group. Most of the remainder were from the highly industrialized countries of the West. The socialist countries imported very little indeed from the under-developed countries and much of what they did import was strategic raw materials. They offered very small markets for what the Uruguayan representative had called traditional exports. The United Kingdom alone imported four times as much from the under-developed countries as did the whole of the Sino-Soviet bloc; it imported ten times as much tea, cocoa and coffee as the whole of that bloc, although its population was 50 million as compared with the 1,000 million claimed by the USSR representative for the Sino-Soviet bloc. The United Kingdom offered a more stable market and the Soviet bloc paid not a penny more than it did.

4. In the Soviet bloc countries there was no free market. State trading concerns decided the volume, structure and source of imports. Imports were deliberately kept down and foreign exchange was husbanded for the purchase of strategic raw materials and certain other industrial products. The individual consumers of tropical foods and raw materials were discouraged from consuming more by the maintenance of high retail prices. If those countries wished to devote all their resources to developing heavy industry they were free to do so. But they should not claim that they were providing a large or stable market for the products of the developing countries. It was the Western States which provided the best market for such countries and would continue to do so. At the same time they recognized their responsibility of trying to improve the earnings of the primary-producing countries. They would like to see an increase in the imports of the Soviet group from the under-developed countries, as that would help everyone. But they would not tolerate criticism from those whose performance was so very much worse than their own.

5. If the Western countries accorded most-favoured-nation privileges to the countries of the Soviet bloc, the latter would have the right to enter the Western market and sell their goods without restriction in free competition with traders from the Western countries. If they chose to set their prices artificially low, they might expect to capture a large share of the market. In return for such a privilege, they would be offering the Western countries nothing of any value, for their purchasing organizations were run by government monopolies and bought only as much as government policy required. They would still have the power to decide where and how much to buy and that was the supreme form of discrimination in trade. The Western countries were not prepared to give something for nothing. If they did do so, only the Soviet bloc and not the under-developed countries would benefit.

6. Recalling the discussion of the original USSR draft declaration in the Second Committee,¹ he assumed that the Afghan representative, both at the 674th meeting of the Second Committee and at the 1142nd meeting of the Council, had intended the Council to consider in principle whether a declaration on economic co-operation was desirable. Certainly the Council had not been asked by the Second Committee to undertake to discuss whatever text the USSR delegation might choose to submit.

7. His delegation, like the French delegation, was quite willing to examine the question of principle, but its present opinion was that it was unnecessary for the Council or the Assembly to proceed to further action. The reaffirmation of the principles laid down in the Charter with regard to international economic and social co-operation, contained in the first preambular paragraph of General Assembly resolution 1515 (XV), had been hammered out at length in the Second Committee while the concluding paragraph of that resolution contained all that could be required of a declaration on international economic co-operation. Indeed, the text to which the Second Committee had devoted so much labour was much better than the adaptation of it which the USSR delegation had now produced. Moreover, it was wholly concerned with those aspects of international economic relations which had a bearing on the development of the under-developed countries and did not contain extraneous matter designed to benefit the advanced countries, whatever their ideology might be.

8. Finally, the United Kingdom delegation was quite prepared to accept the suggestion made at the previous meeting by the representative of El Salvador that the Council should refer the matter to Governments for their opinion.

9. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) said that while a number of different views had been expressed by delegations concerning the question of a declaration on international economic co-operation and the revised draft submitted by the USSR delegation (E/3467), it appeared that there was considerable support for the procedural suggestion he had made at the previous meeting. His delegation had therefore submitted a formal proposal in the shape of a draft resolution (E/L.900) which provided for consideration of the matter at the thirty-third session of the Council, after the views of Governments had been obtained.

10. Mr. KLUTZNICK (United States of America) said that his delegation wished to comment briefly on

the substance of the USSR draft declaration, its observations at the 1142nd meeting having related only to the presentation of that draft.

11. As the Ethiopian representative had rightly pointed out at the previous meeting, most of the articles of the revised draft declaration were a repetition of principles already enunciated in other United Nations resolutions, in particular General Assembly resolution 1515 (XV). In fact, the only new feature to be found in the draft declaration was the recommendation in the first paragraph of article 3 that countries should adhere to the principle of the most-favoured-nation treatment in their trade relations. His delegation shared the doubts expressed by others concerning the desirability of approving such a recommendation. For those countries which allowed free trade, it would be an extremely one-sided arrangement to accord most-favoured-nation treatment to countries whose foreign trade was under state control.

12. General Assembly resolution 1515 (XV) had been adopted after many days of discussion and his delegation therefore doubted that much benefit could be derived from further prolonged discussion of a draft declaration resulting only in the adoption of a text similar to that resolution. The Council could more usefully devote its time and energy to taking positive action which would benefit the less developed countries. The draft declaration reflected the increasing tendency to seek to limit the Charter. It gave an illusion of progress but was, in fact, more restrictive than expansive in comparison with Article 55 of the Charter, which was clear, broad, and adequate.

13. However, his delegation felt that serious attention should be paid to any effort to improve international economic co-operation and recognized the need to ascertain the views of all Member States on the matter. It would be willing to take part in further discussion of the proposed declaration if there was enough interest shown by the Members—in particular, the less developed countries. It therefore supported the Salvadorian draft resolution (E/L.900).

14. Mr. PAZHAWAK (Afghanistan) said that his delegation had submitted an amendment (E/L.899) to the draft declaration and that, he believed, would remedy a deficiency in the text. However, he would not comment immediately on the amendment in view of the procedural nature of the present discussion but requested only that it should be considered in due course in conjunction with the draft declaration.

15. The United Kingdom representative's interpretation of the purpose which the Afghan delegation had had in mind at the 674th meeting of the Second Committee was not correct. As was clearly indicated in paragraph 23 of the summary record of that meeting, and also in paragraph 53 of document A/4648, his delegation's intention had been that the USSR draft declaration should, in view of its importance, be discussed by the Council. The Council, in which the under-developed countries in particular placed such hope, was the obvious forum for the discussion of any proposal such as the USSR draft. It would be unfortunate, in view of the frequently expressed need to strengthen the organs of the United Nations, if the Council were to become a graveyard for resolutions. The best way to strengthen it would be to allow it every opportunity to consider constructive measures.

16. The Salvadorian proposal to postpone consideration of the item in view of the short time available at the

¹ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifteenth Session, Second Committee, 672nd to 674th meetings.*

present session was a reasonable one, but he felt that the Council should consider the item at the thirty-second session and not at the thirty-third. Furthermore, he did not think it was necessary to consult Governments, since they were all represented in the General Assembly, which had referred the matter to the Council and which would ultimately receive the Council's report on it.

17. He therefore proposed that the Council should adopt the following resolution:

"The Economic and Social Council

"Decides, owing to the lack of time at its current session and the importance of the draft declaration on international economic co-operation, to postpone the consideration of the draft declaration on international economic co-operation contained in document E/3467, and the amendment to the draft contained in document E/L.899, to its thirty-second session, with a view to its adoption as soon as possible."

18. He made the proposal in the hope that it would prove acceptable to the Council as a whole, and he stressed the undesirability of a divided vote in the Council on the matter.

19. The PRESIDENT suggested that the Afghan representative's proposal might be presented in the form of an amendment to the draft resolution submitted by El Salvador (E/L.900).

20. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan) said that a statement of general principles such as the USSR draft declaration might well reflect a sincere desire for peace, progress and international co-operation among peace-loving nations. However, such a declaration could hardly be applicable in the case of an authority which had committed open aggression in the area and his delegation would be unable to support any suggestion of co-operation with that authority so long as the results of that aggression were allowed to stand. Its attitude towards the final text of the draft declaration would be guided by that consideration.

21. Mr. WODAJO (Ethiopia) supported the constructive suggestion made by the Afghan representative. The question of a declaration on international economic co-operation must be regarded as having been referred to the Council by the General Assembly, rather than raised by the USSR alone. He was prepared to accept deferment of the item to a session at which the Council would have ample time to discuss it, but he felt that such consideration should not be delayed unduly. All Governments should, of course, have an opportunity to

make known their views on the draft declaration; they would, however, be able to do so when the draft declaration was submitted to the General Assembly.

AGENDA ITEM 14

Non-governmental organizations (concluded)

**PROPOSAL FOR A REVIEW OF THE LIST
OF NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS
IN CONSULTATIVE STATUS**

22. Mrs. MIRONOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that her delegation had already expressed its views (1141st meeting) on the need for a revision of the list of non-governmental organizations in consultative status but had made no formal proposal on the subject. She now suggested that, in order to save time and simplify its work, the Council should decide to entrust the task of reviewing the list to the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations.

23. Mr. DUDLEY (United Kingdom) said that, while he did not wish to express any view on the substance of the question, he felt that the Council could take no decision on it at the current session as the item had not been included in the Council's agenda and could not be regarded as falling within the provisions for revision of the agenda laid down in rule 17 of the Council's rules of procedure.

24. Mrs. MIRONOVA (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) replied that she had not proposed that the question should be discussed in the Council but had merely suggested that it should be taken up in the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations. The Committee was formally authorized to do so under paragraph 35, sub-paragraph (b) of Council resolution 288 B (X) and the fact that the question had been raised in the Council showed that the time was ripe for such a review.

25. The PRESIDENT agreed that it might be regarded as contrary to the Council's rules of procedure, strictly interpreted, to discuss the question although, since the matter had been referred to in connexion with the report of the Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations (E/3449), he had thought that it could appropriately be discussed. However, since an objection had now been raised and since there was formal provision for the initiation of the review in question by the Council Committee itself, he suggested that the matter should be left for action by that Committee, where it could be raised by any one of the Committee's members.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 12.40 p.m.