

I should state in all candour that even if our two amendments should fail -- amendments to which we attach the greatest importance -- we shall still vote for the resolution. We shall do so, however, with a heavy heart and with much less conviction that the United Nations is launching itself on an initiative which will ultimately result, not only in success for the immediate objectives of the Conference, but in greatly strengthening this Organization, in which we have all placed our faith for the future.

I think there is no need, Mr. President, to deal at length with the text of the amendments now before us. This Assembly will recognize that there is no ^{major} difference between the paragraphs proposed by Canada and Peru, in Document A/L408, and the comparable paragraphs 3 and 5(c) in the text of the resolution recommended for adoption in Document A/5316. The difference is largely a difference in wording. The wording of these paragraphs in the text approved in Committee did not carry the full support of the member states represented here. I need only refer you to pages 10 to 13 of the report on Item 36 for the melancholy evidence that this is so. The wording now suggested for approval by Canada and Peru makes no departure from the substance of these paragraphs, but we hope -- and have reason to believe -- that it will command wide support. We believe, in short, that the changes in wording that we have proposed will enable 33 more countries to go on record as supporting the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.

In conclusion I would appeal to my good friends and colleagues -- to the 35 co-sponsors of the original resolution who worked and are still working so hard to make a reality of their hope to convene a UN conference to discuss their problems of trade and development, and to all other delegations who have accepted the imperative need for this conference -- to support without change the amendments we have proposed.

These amendments, in the fullest sense of the word, represent compromises of divergent views. They lack a certain elegance of phrasing. Perhaps one of the things to be said in their favour