



CONTENTS

|  | Page |
|--|------|
| <i>Agenda item 36:</i>   |      |
| <i>Question of holding an international conference on trade problems (continued)</i> |      |
| <i>Consideration of draft resolutions (continued) . . . . .</i>                      | 245  |

**Chairman:** Mr. Bohdan LEWANDOWSKI  
(Poland).

AGENDA ITEM 36

**Question of holding an international conference on trade problems (A/5221, A/C.2/214, A/C.2/L.645, A/C.2/L.648/Rev.2 and Corr.1, E/3631 and Add.1-4) (continued)**

**CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.2/L.645, A/C.2/L.648/REV.2 AND CORR.1) (continued)**

1. Mr. STANOVNIK (Yugoslavia) said he was glad to note that the Committee appreciated the unceasing efforts made by the sponsors of the joint draft resolution in their consistent desire to reach unanimous agreement. Since several suggestions or amendments had been put forward in the course of the last few meetings, the sponsors had felt that they should make their collective position known and he accordingly was submitting to the Committee, on behalf of its thirty-five sponsors, a further revised version of the draft (A/C.2/L.648/Rev.2 and Corr.1). Although they had deeply desired to meet the various requests which had been made to them, the sponsors had unfortunately found it impossible to do so in every case, because satisfying one side often entailed forfeiting the support of the other. They had therefore been able to accept only two suggestions which did not significantly modify the carefully balanced text of the first revised version. At the suggestion of the Soviet Union, they had added the words "in particular" in the ninth preambular paragraph before the words "adversely affect the necessary expansion", because that addition did not change what they intended that paragraph to convey; they had likewise agreed to insert the words "equitable and" in operative paragraph 5 (b), for consistency with paragraph 5 (b) (i), as proposed by the representative of the United Kingdom.

2. In the last preambular paragraph, however, the sponsors had been unable to accept the addition desired by the United States because they knew that the Soviet Union had wanted an amendment to the opposite effect. They had therefore decided not to take sides but to keep their text as it stood. Similarly, they had retained the words "and not later than September 1963" in operative paragraph 3 on the grounds that it would be unreasonable to postpone beyond that date

the consideration of the pressing problems of the developing countries. Since the work of the Preparatory Committee would depend upon the nature of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and thus on its date, that Committee must at least be given some indication of the time-limit for the meeting. Failure to be specific would undermine the very foundation of the Conference; moreover, the discussion had shown that the Second Committee would have to take a decision on the time-limit in any case, whether on the sponsors' initiative or on that of other delegations.

3. In paragraph 2 (a), the sponsors had been unable to add the words "and of the main trading countries", as desired by the United States, because they considered that their position had been made sufficiently clear in the statement made on their behalf by the representative of Yugoslavia at the 835th meeting. The existing form of words had been used before on similar occasions, for example, in Economic and Social Council resolution 751 (XXIV) establishing the Committee for Industrial Development. With regard to the Bulgarian and Byelorussian amendment (A/C.2/L.672) to operative paragraph 2, the sponsors had decided to express their views individually in accordance with their Government's instructions.

4. Again, they had not thought it necessary to insert the word "progressive" before the word "measures" in paragraph 5 (c), as the representative of Greece had suggested, because the draft resolution presupposed that the measures envisaged would take effect over a long period as the outcome of a continuous policy. Nor had the sponsors inserted the words "as a consequence" after the words "developing countries and" in paragraph 5 (c), because those words would have upset the delicate balance they had achieved. In the same paragraph, the sponsors had been unable to make the deletion requested by the French representative because it would have totally changed the meaning of the provision. For the same reason, they had retained the words which the United Kingdom representative had wished to delete from sub-paragraph (d); moreover, the insertion of that sub-paragraph in toto had been the condition on which the sponsors of the six-Power amendment (A/C.2/L.651/Rev.1) had joined in sponsoring the draft resolution. Lastly, having rejected the United Kingdom representative's suggestions, they had been unable to agree to make the word "initiatives" more specific, as the Soviet Union representative desired.

5. He urged all members of the Committee to decide their position on the draft resolution with the same desire for unanimity as animated the sponsors. A unanimous decision would show that the entire Committee understood that trade-co-operation, like trade itself, was an exchange and could not be reduced to unilateral concessions.

6. Mr. PATIÑO (Colombia) thanked the representative of Yugoslavia and all the sponsors of the draft resolution for their renewed efforts to reconcile the different opinions expressed in the Committee. As now worded, the draft resolution had the full support of his delegation, with the exception of the last six words in operative paragraph 3. Colombia, as a developing country, was keenly interested in the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and had voted in favour of Economic and Social Council resolution 917 (XXXIV). It regretted that it had been impossible to alter operative paragraph 3, which made matters very difficult for members of the Economic and Social Council. Colombia had always warmly defended the interests of the under-developed countries and could not be suspected of wanting to delay the Conference. Its only reason for maintaining that the existing text was incompatible with the discharge of its obligations as a member of the Economic and Social Council was that it did not want to be obliged later on to repudiate the undertaking it would give by voting now in favour of convening the Conference by September 1963.

7. In the Preparatory Committee and in the Economic and Social Council, his delegation would make every effort to see that the Conference was held on or even before that date. If, despite its efforts, however, all the preparations needed to make the Conference a success had not been completed by the thirty-sixth session of the Council, the Colombian delegation would not want, solely because it had already committed itself by voting for paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, to take the responsibility of convening a conference which would not have every prospect of success. All countries wanted the Conference to be a success and to be held as soon as possible, but nobody had made it clear why September 1963 was the only possible date. It had been his understanding that the sole determining factor was the need to convene the Conference before the conclusion of the negotiations for the United Kingdom's admission to the European Common Market. However, the Conference would be much wider in scope. If that had been the only reason for holding it, there was no reason why it should not have been convened at the beginning of 1963 or even in December 1962.

8. In order not to place any undue restriction on the freedom of action of the Economic and Social Council at its thirty-sixth session, he wondered whether, if the sponsors insisted on specifying a time-limit in the draft resolution, the words "September 1963" in paragraph 3 of the draft might not be replaced by the words "January 1964". His delegation formally requested that, if that amendment was unacceptable, a separate vote should be taken on the words "and not later than September 1963". In conclusion, he said that his delegation would vote against the amendment submitted by Bulgaria and the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

9. Mr. KLUTZNICK (United States of America) observed, with regard to the sponsors' refusal to mention the main trading nations in paragraph 2 (a), that it seemed strange that they should be able to acknowledge orally the merits of that proposal but unable to include it in the written text. Moreover, no valid comparison could be drawn between the enlargement of the Preparatory Committee and the composition of the Committee for Industrial Development. The sponsors of the second revised text said that

they were trying to achieve unanimity, but in that case they would have done better to adopt a positive attitude and not to reject the few minor changes suggested by his delegation. Furthermore, it was impossible to weigh every suggestion in order to determine its exact ideological content; that would involve the Committee in savouring the essence of the whole draft resolution word by word, and he did not think that even the Soviet Union would adopt such a negative attitude.

10. With regard to the date of the proposed Conference, some delegations had apparently found it difficult to understand why the United States delegation laid such stress on the impossibility of convening the Conference in 1963. His delegation had already said, and the Colombian representative had just explained again, that if the Conference was to be held in 1963, neither the Preparatory Committee nor the participating Governments would have enough time for careful preparation. His delegation regretted that its appeal had not been heeded, for the present text faced it with an insuperable obstacle. It might, in the last analysis, have been able to overlook some parts of the revised text to which it took exception, if agreement could have been reached on that point, which it considered to be of vital importance. The United States delegation had received strict instructions not to accept 1963 as the time-limit, and it had reaffirmed its position on that point on many occasions.

11. The outright rejection of the United States appeal augured ill for any future co-operation. All those who had participated in the work of the Economic and Social Council knew how the United States had striven to bring the discussions on convening an international conference on trade and development to a generally satisfactory outcome, but the present deadlock compelled it to reconsider its decision to take part in the Conference. In so doing, it was certainly not trying to exercise a veto of any kind, but it had to take a decision in the light of the contribution it thought it could make to the success of the Conference. If, therefore, the text of operative paragraph 3 was retained as it stood, the United States would vote against the draft resolution. His delegation associated itself with the Colombian representative's request for a separate vote on the last phrase in paragraph 3.

12. Mr. FRANZI (Italy) thanked the sponsors of the revised draft resolution for rewording the ninth pre-ambular paragraph to take account of the proposals of his delegation and of several other countries, but said that some points of fundamental importance still had to be settled if agreement were to be reached on the text.

13. In operative paragraph 2 (a), specific mention should be made of the major trading nations, since they were the nations which played the principal role in the bulk of international trade and with whom trade problems would be discussed. They too, therefore, should be given adequate representation in the Preparatory Committee, where the discussions would begin. In addition, his delegation could not agree to a recommendation that the Conference should be convened not later than September 1963, since the need for adequate preparation should be taken into account; above all, the success of the Conference should be ensured, since failure would be worse than postponement or even cancellation.

14. With regard to paragraph 5 (c), he pointed out that the task of the Conference would be to remove all trade barriers and not only those arising from industrialized countries; indeed, the revised text mentioned measures to intensify trade relations among the developing countries; there were therefore other barriers which deserved just as much consideration as those arising from industrialized countries. In its present form, the text of paragraph 5 (c) was not objective, and he did not see why the sponsors should not display the same spirit of impartiality as they had shown in speaking of "all" countries in the revised version of the preamble; failure to do so would mean a return to a limited conception of "some" countries which were erecting barriers to international trade. His delegation therefore formally requested the deletion of the phrase "arising from industrialized countries, whether individually or from economic groupings". In conclusion, he said that Italy, together with Colombia, had submitted a sub-amendment (A/C.2/L.674) to the amendment in document A/C.2/L.672, in order to ensure compliance with United Nations practice in regard to international conferences; it requested the insertion, after the words "United Nations", of the words "and members of the specialized agencies and of the International Atomic Energy Agency", and the deletion of the words "and any other States which so desire".

15. Mr. TODOROV (Bulgaria), supporting the amendment in document A/C.2/L.672, said that the universal character of the United Nations was clear from the preamble to the Charter, in which the peoples of the United Nations declared that they were determined to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples. Similarly, Article 55 referred to peoples and nations without any limitation or restriction. The amendment was consequently fully in accord with the Charter; the people who were going against the Charter, from purely political motives, were those who wanted to impose a restrictive formula. Moreover the Conference would study problems affecting all States, not only those which were Members of the United Nations. Many countries had commercial though not necessarily diplomatic relations with countries that were not Members of the United Nations. Since world trade was by definition universal, it was proper that all countries participating in it should be invited.

16. The General Assembly and other United Nations bodies, including the Economic and Social Council, even after adopting and putting into effect the restrictive formula, had often appealed in their resolutions to all the States of the world. Resolution 1474 (ES-IV), for example, adopted by the General Assembly at its Fourth Emergency Special Session on the situation in the Congo, was addressed in its operative part alternately to "all Member States" and "all States". If the principle of universality was applicable to so important a question as the maintenance of order in the Congo, there was no reason why it should not be applied to an international conference on trade, which was also important. Moreover, resolution 670 (XXV) of the Economic and Social Council was addressed to "countries all over the world", calling on them to consider ways of increasing their support to the United Nations Children's Fund. That resolution on an important social question had been proposed by numerous delegations. The same applied to General Assembly resolution 1257

(XIII). In those resolutions, United Nations bodies appealed on political and social matters to all States in the world. There was no reason to make an exception of the economic field. The objections might be motivated by the notion that the amendment would introduce political motives; but the sole purpose of proposing the general formula in it was the success of the Conference. The Bulgarian delegation hoped that the Secretary-General would invite all Member States to attend the Conference, as well as all non-Member States which wished to do so. The proposed form of words expressed a spirit of conciliation and compromise.

17. Mr. CHRISTIANSEN (Norway) said that his delegation found the revised draft acceptable as a whole, but not the last part of operative paragraph 3, which required that the Conference be convened not later than September 1963. The Norwegian Government's general approach to the Conference made the date highly important to it. The success of the Conference, which aimed at laying the foundations for a new trade structure, depended on careful preparation with due regard to the intricacy and delicacy of the problems it would discuss. The Norwegian delegation honestly did not think the proposed date was compatible with that need. If paragraph 3 were adopted in its present form, the Norwegian delegation would feel obliged to abstain from voting on the draft resolution as a whole, for its Government could not undertake to attend a conference in circumstances in which it could not make a useful contribution. The Norwegian Government recognized the importance of the developing countries' trade problems and was prepared to play a willing part in discussing ways of solving them. The revised text of the draft was in many respects excellent, and the Norwegian delegation appreciated the spirit of co-operation and conciliation shown by the sponsors. It believed that a compromise could be reached by further discussion and consultation, hoped that before the vote was taken, a more elastic formula would be found in regard to the date, and associated itself with the Colombian representative's appeal to the sponsors of the draft to reconsider the matter.

18. Mr. USHIBA (Japan) stated that his delegation believed that the aim of the Conference should be a realistic search for ways and means of assuring a steady and effective expansion of the trade of the developing countries; since trade problems, particularly those of the developing countries, were complex, there should be thorough and careful preparation, and solutions should be sought making the best use of the activities and functions of the existing international machinery. That was why his delegation had found in the original draft resolution (A/C.2/L.648 and Add.1-4) and in the six-Power amendments (A/C.2/L.651/Rev.1) several points which it could not readily accept. However, as the debate had proceeded, his delegation had been heartened to find that the sponsors of the draft were animated by the same realistic desire. The revised draft under consideration was the fruit of the constructive efforts of the sponsors, and his delegation wished to join the others in offering warm congratulations on the initiative, wisdom and spirit of conciliation that had been shown.

19. The present text, coupled with the lucid explanation of the representative of Yugoslavia, did not present much difficulty for acceptance, except the last part of operative paragraph 3. His delegation fully

appreciated the strong urge felt by many delegations for the earliest possible convening of the Conference and was not opposed, in principle, to an early date. But a realistic appraisal of the work required of the Governments, the organizations concerned and the Secretariat led his delegation to favour the wisdom of flexibility. His Government, for one, could not foresee with confidence at the present time that it would be able to make adequate preparations before September 1963 and would very much regret being deprived of the opportunity of making as much of a contribution as it would wish to make to the work of the Conference. His Government thought furthermore that no undue restrictions should be placed on the initiative and discretion of the Economic and Social Council with regard to that important question. Since all the members of the Committee would agree that the success of the Conference depended above all on the willing participation of all the States Members of the United Nations, including the major trading nations ready to co-operate, his delegation could not see any point in insisting on a date which appeared to be so unrealistic at the present time. Accordingly, in spite of the late stage of the proceedings, his delegation would like to appeal to the sponsors to accept the proposal of the United States and several other countries to delete the last six words of operative paragraph 3, so as to facilitate unanimous approval of the draft resolution. If that appeal was not heeded, his delegation would not be able to vote for that paragraph.

20. Lastly, it was his delegation's view that the existing international trade bodies, particularly GATT, had been, and were presently at Geneva,

doing very useful work. Although there were inevitable shortcomings in the functions of GATT, his delegation felt that the purpose of the Conference would be defeated if the participating Governments were to try in haste to create a revolutionary or an entirely new organizational structure, or to graft such an organization on existing ones, for that would abruptly curtail the work currently being performed. His country would rather place its hopes and expectations on the gradual evolution of the existing international machinery.

21. Mr. ALLANA (Pakistan), speaking on a point of order, informed the Committee that during the preceding speech, the sponsors of the draft resolution had received an appeal asking them to reconsider their decision and not to insist on a definite date. Several of them had had informal consultations during the meeting. On their behalf, he wanted to assure the Committee that the sponsors of the draft resolution had been guided throughout their deliberations by the wish to make all possible concessions to achieve unanimity. In the same spirit, they would take into account the comments made during the meeting, and try to take into consideration, as far as possible, the different views expressed. To facilitate the Committee's proceedings, he formally proposed that the meeting be adjourned so that the sponsors of the draft could determine their attitude towards operative paragraph 3.

*The proposal was adopted by 70 votes to 1, with 8 abstentions.*

The meeting rose at 12.10 p.m.