The Uganda Government welcomes and strongly supports the Action Programme. We accordingly thank the representatives of the developed countries who have expressed unequivocal support for the adoption and implementation of the Programme. The problems facing the developing countries in expanding their economies have been repeated ad nauseam, and therefore I will not go over them again. Taking into account the Declaration of 1961 and the general awareness of these problems, my delegation hoped that unanimous and unqualified support would be given to the proposals in the Action Programme. We are, however, disappointed to see that some of the developed industrialized countries have been able to give only qualified support to this Programme. This support has been qualified by such words as "broad", "subject to some exceptions", "exigent". These qualifications appear to us to be very significant, particularly as their content and extent are still obscure. In the result, it still appears as if the Action Programme cannot and will not go through the mill of this conference unaltered and unmutilated. We sincerely hope that our fears will prove to be utterly unjustified. Some of the leading countries, developed countries, have expressed their inability to reduce the internal charges on tropical products on physical and other grounds. For any government to balance the budget, that is generally a necessary objective, but we do regard as being excessive those duties and charges, on coffee, for instance, which are of the order of 123 per cent ad valorem. We doubt whether these highly developed countries and, by ordinary standards, wealthy countries, would really face financial bankruptcy if they were to forego revenues which accrue to their exchequers as proceeds.
of consumption taxes. And yet, for many of the less-developed countries the fate of the export market for one or two of their products is decisive with regard to whether or not these countries will be able to carry on their economic development programmes and, indeed, to give their people the social services which their people need. This is certainly true of Uganda, where coffee and cotton, the two products, account for about 80 per cent of the total value of our exports. There is one vital factor which needs to be emphasized, I am afraid to the extent of being repetitive. This is the question of aid. Reference has been made to the fact that since the industrialized countries give aid to the less-developed countries, it is all the more difficult for these countries to abolish consumption taxes or fiscal charges and levies, on coffee for instance, which so adversely restrict the consumption of this product. I would not be ashamed to say that we need this aid, but we regard aid as a temporary palliative which cannot eradicate our economic maladies. And so I would reiterate that aid cannot be a substitute for expanding markets if our economies are to grow and achieve a balanced growth. There is thus need to examine the desirability of giving aid of the kind that adversely affects the export opportunities of the developing countries.

I would like to add in this regard that we in Uganda support the International Coffee Agreement although we would like to say that perhaps a formula could be found whereby if a certain quota cannot be satisfied by a particular country because of some adverse circumstances affecting the supply, another country should be allowed to supply the market and so satisfy the demand.

One of the points on the Action Programme is to eliminate quantitative restrictions. May I mention in passing, but nonetheless emphatically, that we in Uganda are very unhappy about United States Public Law 480, the Bulk Surpluses Cotton Disposal Law, which operates in such a way as to limit our selling powers in some of our cotton markets. We sincerely hope that the United States Government will soon take appropriate measures to rectify this situation. For how can we walk progressively forward if we simultaneously take steps to pull ourselves backwards? We should not let GATT become a mere parlement, a mere talking body. At least we of the less-developed countries would like to see actions and not words.

Could you please grant me indulgence to make three further remarks? The Action Group Programme appears to call for differential treatment in favour of the less-developed countries. I know that to accept differential treatment is to accept discrimination, but I think in this particular case it is discrimination for a good purpose. Unless we get this sort of treatment which is envisaged under this Programme we are going, I think, for a long time to remain where we are, we will not develop when we should develop. The result is that we shall continue probably to depend on foreign aid from some of the industrial countries, and these countries perhaps will continue to say: "We are going to tax your commodities in order to give you aid", and I think the result will be very frustrating for all of us.
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