

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

SEVENTEENTH SESSION

Official Records

**SECOND COMMITTEE, 839th
MEETING**

Thursday, 15 November 1962,
at 10.45 a.m.



NEW YORK

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>	253

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, A/C.2/L.648/Rev.2/Add.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. Mrs. WRIGHT (Denmark) regretted that at the preceding meeting the representative of Tanganyika had divided the Committee into two groups: those who wanted the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development to take place and those who did not. That classification was not justified, for all delegations were working towards the same goal, namely, the holding of a conference at which to settle the existing problems. At the preceding meeting, the Danish delegation had made a suggestion calculated to satisfy the sponsors of the joint draft resolution (A/C.2/L.648/Rev.2 and Corr.1); it consisted of replacing the closing words of operative paragraph 3 by some such phrase as "not later than the thirty-seventh session of the Economic and Social Council". Her delegation was now wondering whether the United States representative's proposal—that both years should be mentioned—might not be the best solution. If necessary, she would submit a formal amendment to replace the final words of the paragraph under discussion by a phrase on the following lines:

"taking into account the views expressed by many delegations that the Conference should be convened not later than September 1963, as well as the view of other delegations that the Conference would be more productive if held in early 1964".

The Conference should deal primarily with the trade problems of the developing countries, which could be resolved by concluding agreements to the mutual advantage of the developed and developing countries.

2. Mr. BLOIS (Canada) endorsed the Danish representative's comments; the form of words she had suggested should resolve the Committee's main difficulty. He joined the previous speakers in appealing to all delegations to examine the matter very seriously

because, in the opinion of the Canadian delegation, it was perhaps the most important item before the General Assembly. The Conference would play a major role for all countries, whether developed or developing, and it was important that all the participants should be as well prepared as possible to discuss their problems. The Conference was bound to have very favourable effects on all countries' trade. Many representatives, and the Yugoslav representative in particular, had made commendable and sincere efforts in a spirit of compromise. Although the trend of the discussion had not been very encouraging, his delegation was convinced that an agreement was still possible. In view of the importance of such an agreement, the sponsors of the draft resolution should make further concessions. They could do so by making more flexible that part of the proposal which related to the setting of a date for the Conference. Although it found the present text of the draft resolution far from ideal, the Canadian delegation was prepared to support it and urged all delegations to consider very carefully what position to take.

3. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) associated his delegation with the observations of the Danish and Canadian representatives as representing a generally acceptable compromise solution.

4. Mr. BOLT (New Zealand) recalled that his delegation's support for the stated objectives of the draft resolution reflected New Zealand's keen concern with most of the questions proposed for inclusion in the Conference agenda. His delegation hoped that the sponsors would spare no effort to attain those objectives and that foundations would be laid for a conference capable of achieving results. His delegation had never envisaged a conference which would be a mere political gesture, and for that reason it had expressed serious doubts regarding the feasibility of convening one in September 1963; those doubts should not be interpreted as a desire that no conference should be held.

5. The Soviet representative had made light of the need for careful preparations for the Conference. In that connexion, it should be noted that, at the tenth session of the Commission on International Commodity Trade, at Rome, the USSR representative had done nothing to help in finding a solution to the problem of compensatory financing, which was of great importance to the developing countries. The attitude of the USSR delegation was thus easy to understand. It was regrettable that the preparations for the Conference should be subordinated to an arbitrary choice of date. The New Zealand delegation would have preferred the date to be fixed in the light of progress made in the preparatory work. It was true that the Yugoslav representative, in explaining at the 835th meeting the position of the sponsors of the draft resolution, had stated that operative paragraph 3 should be interpreted as leaving it to the Economic and Social Council to take a final decision on the basis of the Preparatory Com-

mittee's report. However, the text of the draft resolution as it stood might place the Council in a difficult position and give rise to controversy. Moreover, the co-operation of the great trading countries was essential to assure the success of the Conference and the future participation of the United Nations in matters of trade. He was sorry that the goodwill of those countries had been taxed to the limit, so that they could no longer commit themselves without reservations.

6. His delegation joined in appealing to the sponsors of the draft resolution to reconsider their position and to examine the Danish amendment, which offered a compromise solution that should enable all the major trading countries to support the draft resolution.

7. Mr. ANJARIA (India) found it encouraging that almost complete agreement had been reached on the essential points of the draft resolution, the only exception being the date of the Conference. As had been pointed out again at the current meeting, the aim was to hold a conference that would achieve results and lead to the expansion of trade and an increase in the earnings of the developing countries. It was evident that, if that purpose was to be achieved, the Conference required careful preparation. The sponsors of the draft resolution, of which the Indian delegation was one, had considered the question of the date very carefully; as was well known, they had begun with the recommendation made in the Cairo Declaration of Developing Countries (A/5162) that the Conference should be convened at an early date in 1963, and had then postponed the date to June and later to September 1963. Like the representatives of Denmark and Canada, he was conscious of the need to find some means of reconciling all the different points of view. As one of the sponsors, his delegation could not, of course, support any amendment incompatible with the spirit and substance of the draft resolution; but it viewed with sympathy the proposals which had been made during the meeting and would not oppose their adoption if it was felt that they would achieve unanimity and create the atmosphere that everyone desired.

8. Mr. PATIÑO (Colombia) associated himself with the Canadian, Greek and New Zealand representatives' statements and supported the Danish amendment for his delegation regarded it as a reasonable compromise between the different positions, which was what the sponsors of the draft resolution were really aiming at. The Brazilian representative had pointed out that when the Economic and Social Council took a final decision on the date for the Conference, it would have to bear in mind not only the resolution which the General Assembly would adopt, but also the progress made in the preparatory work; he had added that the Yugoslav representative had made the same point at the 835th meeting in stating that the Council should make a final decision taking as guidance, in the first place, the desire of the overwhelming majority of the General Assembly that the Conference should be held at a time when other world events would not interfere with its work. That interpretation was reflected in the amendment proposed by the Danish delegation. As the Yugoslav representative had said, it might be necessary—although he hoped it would not—for the Preparatory Committee to hold a third session after the summer session of the Economic and Social Council, in August 1963. Consequently, the Assembly could not reasonably be asked to recommend the Economic and Social Council to convene the Conference not later than September 1963 because, if the Preparatory Commit-

tee had to hold a third session, not all the documents of that session would be available by that time.

9. In reality, the only consideration which was making the sponsors hesitate and was preventing them from adopting some such formula as that proposed by the Danish delegation seemed to be that the Cairo Declaration called for the Conference to be convened in 1963. The Committee had paid a well-deserved tribute to the Cairo Declaration in the draft resolution it had adopted a few days previously (832nd meeting). The Economic and Social Council should therefore bear in mind the urgency of the Conference and the fact that many countries wished it to be held in 1963; but it would be very unwise to fix a theoretical date such as September 1963. From the statement made by the Indian representative, it was to be hoped that the Danish amendment would prove acceptable to the sponsors of the draft resolution.

10. Mr. LUBBERS (Netherlands) said that his delegation too considered it more important that the Conference should be well prepared than that a date should be fixed a priori. The Netherlands, for its part, was ready to trust the Preparatory Committee and the Economic and Social Council to make adequate preparations for the Conference, and it therefore regretted that many delegations had so far taken a somewhat rigid attitude regarding the date. The success of the Conference would depend primarily on mutual confidence and on willingness to co-operate in a constructive spirit, and there was no need to adhere a priori to such a date as September 1963, for no one knew whether it would be possible to keep to it. His delegation considered that the difficulties could easily be overcome through a more flexible approach to the problem, such as that reflected in the amendment proposed by the Danish delegation, and it recommended the Committee to adopt that proposal unanimously.

11. Mr. EL BANNA (United Arab Republic) said that the detailed explanation given by the representative of Yugoslavia showed how far the sponsors of the draft resolution had gone in seeking unanimous approval. The Conference should be a demonstration of co-operation between developing and developed countries. The sponsors had done everything in their power to reconcile the different points of view. They held that the Conference date was of crucial importance, for significant trends in world trade would emerge in 1963 and the developing countries' interests must be considered before they were faced with rigid agreements. The sponsors had already bowed to the developed countries' wishes by postponing the date to September 1963. He therefore appealed to those representatives who had requested a further postponement to show a spirit of co-operation and endorse the revised draft resolution.

12. Mr. ALMEIDA (Brazil) added that the sponsors of the draft resolution were anxious for the Conference to be well prepared; it was merely that they felt it could be so prepared within the time-limit they proposed. In case that proved impossible, the Yugoslav representative had put forward a flexible formula in the statement he had made on behalf of the sponsors at the 835th meeting. It was essential that the Conference should be convened and should be a success. The United Nations, at least in economic matters, had to solve its problems by majority vote, and the time had come to find out what the majority wanted. The sponsors of the draft resolution were convinced that their position was reasonable, and they felt that it was time the Committee took a decision.

13. Mr. KARAKOYLU (Turkey) said that his delegation was prepared to support the idea of a conference on trade and development provided that it was devoted to the problems of trade between developing and developed countries and not with East-West trade, which was the concern of ECE. As to the date of the Conference, it seemed neither sensible nor timely to decide on either September 1963 or a later date; indeed, the success of the Conference would depend on a degree of flexibility in the matter, for nothing would be more disappointing than to convene an ill-prepared conference. As the Greek representative had pointed out, the question of an international conference on trade had been under discussion for over fifteen years. It would be unwise to risk spoiling everything in order to save three or four months; it should not be forgotten that, if too early a date was set, some trading countries whose participation was essential to the success of the Conference might decide not to attend. For those reasons, Turkey fully supported the Canadian and Danish proposal and would be unable to vote in favour of the draft resolution if operative paragraph 3 remained unchanged.

14. Mr. DAVIS (Australia) also appealed to all parties to accept a compromise solution. It should be realized that the convening of an international conference on trade and development was a prerequisite for the success of the United Nations Development Decade. For that reason, Australia wished the Conference to be held as soon as possible but also wanted it to be adequately prepared; perhaps it might be convened if not in September, then in November 1963. In any event, it should be borne in mind that the Preparatory Committee would be meeting at the beginning of 1963; since it was to be enlarged, the developing countries would be properly represented on it. Furthermore, the Preparatory Committee would be composed of experts who would consider not only the Conference agenda but also specific proposals, so that the Conference would, in a sense, begin in 1963 in any case. Australia still supported the thirty-five-Power draft resolution but expressed the hope that Denmark's compromise proposal would be accepted.

15. Mr. KANO (Nigeria) deplored the fact that the Committee had reached a deadlock. However, since the different parties felt unable to make any further concessions, he would have to support the proposal put forward by the United Arab Republic and Brazil. It would be better to vote on the draft resolution than to prolong a discussion which, instead of bringing the opposing sides closer together, was merely accentuating the differences between them. Whatever the outcome of the vote, he trusted that all parties would accept it with good grace, thus preserving the atmosphere of friendly co-operation which alone would guarantee the success of the Conference.

16. Mrs. WRIGHT (Denmark) expressed her delegation's gratitude to all the representatives, whether sponsors of the draft resolution or not, who had been kind enough to find some merit in her suggestion. That was an indication that the different views were not entirely irreconcilable. She pointed out that her wording provided for convening the Conference not in 1964 but as soon as possible after the thirty-sixth session of the Economic and Social Council; it would simply state the views of those who favoured either September 1963 or the beginning of 1964. It seemed that her compromise solution might be acceptable; she was therefore submitting a formal amendment (A/C.2/L.676).

17. Mr. STANOVNIK (Yugoslavia) said he was pleased that the debate was proceeding in a more relaxed atmosphere than on the previous day and agreed with the representative of Denmark that views were not so sharply divided as might have been supposed. Nevertheless, cases did arise in which a compromise solution could not be reached until the texts under consideration had been put to the vote; such was the present instance. The solution proposed by Denmark would involve the inclusion in the draft resolution of a description of the different views expressed in the Committee. However, the Economic and Social Council could acquaint itself with those views by reading the summary records. Moreover, some delegations had adopted no position during the debate, and only a vote would clearly show the Council the attitude of the General Assembly on the important point under consideration. The sponsors of the draft resolution were therefore asking for a vote on their text, but they wished to assure the Committee that, in so doing, they in no way intended to depart from the spirit of conciliation which had guided them throughout the debate.

18. Mr. WATNEBRYN (Norway) supported the Danish proposal.

19. Mr. FRANZI (Italy) thanked the delegations of Bulgaria and the Byelorussian SSR for incorporating the first part of the sub-amendment submitted by Colombia and Italy in their revised amendment (A/C.2/L.672/Rev.1). Nevertheless, his delegation regretted that it could not withdraw the rest of its sub-amendment and therefore requested that it should be put to the vote in its revised form (A/C.2/L.674/Rev.1).

20. Mr. BUTTI (Iraq), replying to the remarks made the previous day by the representative of Greece, stressed the urgency of convening a conference on trade and development. It was not by chance that so many developing countries had joined together in submitting the draft resolution for consideration; there was a close link between trade and development. If they had not shaken off the colonial yoke, many of the present advanced countries would still be among the developing ones; that was why the latter wished to develop as rapidly as possible and considered the convening of an international conference on trade an urgent matter. In that connexion, it might well be asked what had happened during the past year that the atmosphere of urgency prevailing at the time General Assembly resolution 1710 (XVI) on the United Nations Development Decade had been adopted was being forgotten. There could be no denying that a correlation existed between the goals of the Development Decade and the convening of a trade conference. Could it be that there was now a desire to shorten the Decade by two years which would benefit the developed countries?

21. Mr. SIDIKOU (Niger) supported the Danish proposal and said he was glad to see that it offered a compromise solution acceptable to all. The Niger considered the convening of an international trade conference to be an urgent matter, but above all the Conference should be successful. He therefore hoped that the Committee would not remain deadlocked over a question of dates but adopt the Danish formula which would ensure that the Conference had every chance of success.

22. Mr. KANYIKE (Uganda) was convinced that, if they really wished to, the developed countries could make the necessary preparations to take part in a conference in 1963. Uganda, like nearly all the coun-

tries of Africa, fervently hoped that the Conference would be convened at the earliest possible date and would vote for the draft resolution as it stood.

23. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted that some of the proposals contained in the Soviet Union draft resolution (A/C.2/L.645) had reappeared in the thirty-five-Power draft and some of the proposed amendments. Under those conditions, the Soviet delegation considered that a vote on its own draft resolution would be superfluous.

24. The CHAIRMAN requested the Committee to vote on the joint draft resolution (A/C.2/L.648/Rev.2 and Corr.1) and the related amendments and sub-amendments.

25. Before doing so, however, a decision was needed on the Lebanese proposal (835th meeting) that the Committee's report should include the statement (A/C.2/L.671) made by the representative of Yugoslavia on behalf of the sponsors of the draft.

It was so decided.

26. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) requested a roll-call vote on his oral amendment to operative paragraph 2 (a) of the draft resolution proposing the addition, at the end of the paragraph, of the words: "and major trading countries".

A vote was taken by roll call.

Iceland, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Iceland, India, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Greece.

Against: Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary.

Abstaining: Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sudan, Syria, Tanganyika, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Bolivia, Brazil, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Costa Rica, Cuba, Dahomey, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras.

The Greek amendment was adopted by 32 votes to 12, with 59 abstentions.

27. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Danish amendment (A/C.2/L.676) to operative paragraph 3.

At the request of the representative of Burma, a vote was taken by roll call.

The United States of America, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: United States of America, Upper Volta, Austria, Belgium, Cameroon, Canada, Central African

Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Cyprus, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mauritania, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Against: Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Chile, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Ghana, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Mali, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syria, Tanganyika, Thailand, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Australia, Cambodia, El Salvador, India, Ivory Coast, Libya, Mexico, Senegal, Togo.

The Danish amendment (A/C.2/L.676) was rejected by 50 votes to 43, with 10 abstentions.

28. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the sub-amendment submitted by Colombia and Italy (A/C.2/L.674/Rev.1) to the amendment of Bulgaria and the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic (A/C.2/L.672/Rev.1).

The sub-amendment (A/C.2/L.674/Rev.1) was adopted by 59 votes to 26, with 14 abstentions.

The amendment of Bulgaria and the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic (A/C.2/L.672/Rev.1), as amended, was adopted by 79 votes to 8, with 11 abstentions.

29. The CHAIRMAN requested the Committee to vote on the amendment submitted by Belgium, France, Italy, Luxembourg and the Netherlands (A/C.2/L.675) to paragraph 5 (c) of the draft resolution.

At the request of the representative of Ethiopia, a vote was taken by roll call.

Mali, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Mauritania, Netherlands, Niger, Norway, Portugal, Rwanda, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Austria, Belgium, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Congo (Brazzaville), Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Finland, France, Gabon, Greece, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Luxembourg, Madagascar.

Against: Mexico, Mongolia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syria, Tanganyika, Thailand, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia.

Abstaining: Mali, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Senegal, Togo, Tunisia,

Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Afghanistan, Australia, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Cyprus, Honduras, Libya.

The amendment (A/C.2/L.675) was rejected by 46 votes to 37, with 21 abstentions.

30. Mr. KLUTZNICK (United States of America), supported by Mr. PATIÑO (Colombia) announced that he no longer requested a separate vote on operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution.

31. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the thirty-five-Power draft resolution as a whole (A/C.2/L.648/Rev.2 and Corr.1), as amended.

At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a vote was taken by roll call.

Romania, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Syria, Tanganyika, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, Colombia, Congo (Leopoldville), Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Israel, Jamaica, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland.

Against: Rwanda, South Africa, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Belgium, France, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg.

Abstaining: Sweden, Turkey, Upper Volta, Austria, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Congo (Brazzaville), Dahomey, Denmark, Finland, Gabon, Greece, Iceland, Iran, Ivory Coast, Japan, Madagascar, Netherlands, Niger, Norway, Portugal.

The draft resolution as a whole (A/C.2/L.648/Rev.2 and Corr.1), as amended, was adopted by 73 votes to 10, with 23 abstentions.

32. Mr. LUQMAN (Mauritania) explained that his delegation had abstained from voting on the two-Power amendment (A/C.2/L.672/Rev.1) because it thought that certain States should have the possibility of attending the Conference if the majority of Member States of the United Nations so wished. That was a question for the majority to decide. Every country, great or small, should be able to attend the Conference, in keeping with the United Nations Charter. On the other hand, Mauritania had voted for the Danish amendment, which had served a very useful purpose because a great many highly developed countries had regarded it as a compromise formula. Lastly, Mauritania had voted for the draft resolution as a whole because it believed the Conference would be of use not only to the developing but also to the developed countries.

33. His delegation's vote for some amendments and against others did not mean that Mauritania was taking sides; its attitude had been dictated solely by the desire to obtain the best results from the Conference.

34. Mr. TARDOS (Hungary) explained that he had voted for the draft resolution, although it was not entirely satisfactory, because his country was in favour of a trade conference. He had voted for subparagraph 5 (d) with the understanding that it represented an invitation to the Preparatory Committee to consider setting up a new trade organization. That had also been the view of the Yugoslav and United States representatives. Hungary agreed with Bulgaria on the question of which countries should be invited to the Conference, for any attempt to prevent a group from attending could be motivated only by obvious political considerations. The Hungarian delegation had therefore voted against the Colombian-Italian amendment (A/C.2/L.674/Rev.1).

35. Mr. PRIMELLES (Cuba) thought that the draft resolution just adopted expressed the urgent wish of all under-developed countries for a conference which would produce definitive solutions to trade problems. That text was the outcome of much work both by the Economic and Social Council and by the Cairo Conference. He regretted that the Bulgarian amendment had not been adopted in its original form, for he thought that all countries wishing to attend the Conference should be invited. Lastly, he was glad that September 1963 had been kept as the latest date for the Conference and hoped that the countries which had said they could not in that case take part would change their minds and give their full support in the interest of the whole world.

36. Mr. SMID (Czechoslovakia) said he would have preferred the problem of East-West trade to be explicitly mentioned in the draft resolution; but, in view of the interpretation of operative paragraph 5 (d), given by the Yugoslav representative on behalf of the co-sponsors at the 835th meeting, the Czechoslovak delegation thought that the Conference could still discuss that question even if it had to deal primarily with the problems of developing countries. The wording of the draft was too vague concerning the desirability of setting up a new trade organization, but the Czechoslovak delegation hoped that, in view of the Yugoslav representative's interpretation, the Conference would give that problem the full attention it deserved. Czechoslovakia had supported all the efforts to convene the Conference as soon as possible in 1963 and would be ready to attend at any time, for it was sure that all technical difficulties could be overcome. For those reasons, it had voted for the draft resolution and against the Danish amendment (A/C.2/L.676). It regretted that the Bulgarian and Byelorussian amendment (A/C.2/L.672/Rev.1) had not been adopted and it expressed the opinion that the political motives which had been behind the rejection of that amendment should have been excluded from the subject of the proposed Conference.

37. Mr. BLOIS (Canada) said again that his country was very anxious for the Conference to take place as soon as possible, but was even more anxious for its success. Canada therefore urged that the Conference should be adequately prepared. That was why the Canadian delegation would have voted against operative paragraph 3 if it had been put to the vote separately; but, while it would have preferred no time-limit to be fixed, Canada had voted for the draft resolution as a whole because, in its opinion, the reference to the time-limit was no more than a recommendation. The final decision still lay with the Economic and Social Council, which could always reopen

the question if circumstances made it impossible to organize the Conference before September 1963.

38. Mr. AGOLLI (Albania) explained that he had voted against the Bulgarian and Byelorussian amendment (A/C.2/L.672/Rev.1) because the adoption of sub-amend-

ment A/C.2/L.674/Rev.1, to which he was opposed, had deprived the former text of one of its essential provisions.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.