

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

FIFTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**SECOND COMMITTEE, 658th  
MEETING**

Wednesday, 26 October 1960,  
at 3.15 p.m.

**NEW YORK**

**CONTENTS**

*Agenda items 12, 29 and 74:*

*Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapters II (sections I, II and III A, except paragraphs 189-198), III, IV and VII (section I and paragraph 645)) (continued)*

*Economic development of under-developed countries (continued):*

(a) *International flow of private capital: report of the Secretary-General and recommendations thereon by the Economic and Social Council;*

(b) *Question of the establishment of a United Nations capital development fund: report of the Secretary-General;*

(c) *Methods and techniques for carrying out a study of world economic development: report of the Secretary-General and comments thereon by the Economic and Social Council;*

(d) *Promotion of wider trade co-operation among States: report of the Secretary-General*

*Land reform (continued)*

*Draft resolution on the provision of food surpluses to needy peoples through the United Nations system (concluded) . . . . .*

Page

79

**Land reform (A/4439) (continued)**

**DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE PROVISION OF FOOD SURPLUSES TO NEEDY PEOPLES THROUGH THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM (A/C.2/L.459/REV.2 AND CORR.1) (concluded)**

1. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to the amendments proposed by Czechoslovakia (A/C.2/L.464) and Guinea (A/C.2/L.467). It no longer had before it the amendment of Afghanistan and the United Arab Republic (A/C.2/L.463), which had been incorporated in a revised draft resolution (A/C.2/L.459/Rev. 2 and Corr.1).

2. Mr. PAYNE (United States of America) said that the sponsors were gratified by the sympathetic reception the resolution had received and the fact that no member of the Committee had objected to the aims of the proposal. The sponsors had accepted most of the suggestions proposed, in particular, most of the Argentine representative's suggestions. The second preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 3 had been deleted, and references to General Assembly resolution 827 (IX) and Economic and Social Council resolution 621 (XXII) had been included in the third preambular paragraph. A new paragraph, which helped to spell out what had always been the intention of the co-sponsors, had been added as the sixth preambular paragraph. The sponsors had again taken account of the Argentine representative's viewpoint by inserting the word "transitional" in operative paragraph 3 and by adding the phrase "as a short-term measure against hunger" in operative paragraph 4. They regretted that they could not accept his suggestion to delete operative paragraphs 5, 6 and 7, as the arrangements referred to in paragraph 5 would be different from the procedures mentioned in paragraph 4, and the sponsors believed that the thoughts expressed by several delegations, notably Canada, the United Arab Republic and Yugoslavia, concerning the possibility of concluding additional arrangements, should be covered in the draft resolution. No delegation should feel that, by voting for the draft resolution, it would be committing itself to accepting any sort of arrangement which might arise out of the FAO study mentioned in paragraph 5. The sponsors were unable to delete paragraph 6, because they believed the United Nations should be informed through the Economic and Social Council of any action taken under the resolution by FAO. It also seemed essential, as recommended in operative paragraph 7, to find out how the United Nations and the specialized agencies could facilitate the best possible use of food surpluses in assisting the economic development of the less developed countries. The studies in question, to be carried out by the Secretary-General in consultation with the Director-General of FAO, obviously would not duplicate any work that had been done before by these same secretariats. Finally, paragraph 8 was essentially the text which had been proposed by the Argentine representa-

**Chairman:** Mr. Janez STANOVIK (Yugoslavia).

**AGENDA ITEMS 12, 29 AND 74**

**Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapters II (sections I, II and III A, except paragraphs 189-198), III, IV and VII (section I and paragraph 645)) (A/4415) (continued)**

**Economic development of under-developed countries (A/C.2/L.459/Rev.2 and Corr.1) (continued)**

(a) **International flow of private capital: report of the Secretary-General and recommendations thereon by the Economic and Social Council (A/4487, E/3325 and Corr.1-3);**

(b) **Question of the establishment of a United Nations capital development fund: report of the Secretary-General (A/4488, E/3393, E/3393/Add.1-4);**

(c) **Methods and techniques for carrying out a study of world economic development: report of the Secretary-General and comments thereon by the Economic and Social Council (A/4489, E/3379, E/3379/Add.1-6);**

(d) **Promotion of wider trade co-operation among States: report of the Secretary-General (A/4490, E/3389)**

tive. The paragraph did not, of course, mean that the action called for in paragraphs 4, 5, 6 and 7 could not be taken until after the joint meeting in 1962, mentioned in it.

3. The co-sponsors had incorporated in their text the Afghan and United Arab Republic representatives' amendment, and had added the words "which do not infringe on the FAO principles", in order to take into account the views expressed so many times during the debate by the representatives of food-exporting nations. As the sponsors of the amendment had subsequently indicated that they would prefer the phrase to be replaced by the words "and compatible with the FAO principles", the sponsors of the draft resolution had accepted that proposal.

4. Although the FAO principles and actions were designed to prevent exactly such disruptive and harmful actions as dumping, the sponsors believed that, since some Members of the United Nations were not members of the FAO, it would be useful for the General Assembly to be on record against dumping in the draft resolution. Accordingly they had agreed to add the words "against dumping and" after the words "adequate safeguards" in operative paragraph 9.

5. The sponsors accepted all the amendments proposed by the delegation of Guinea (A/C.2/L.467). They proposed only to add the words "food-deficient" before the word "peoples" in the second preambular paragraph as well as in the eighth preambular paragraph as modified in accordance with the amendment of Guinea. They also agreed to change the words "needy people" in operative paragraph 2 to "food-deficient peoples".

6. The sponsors wished to make it clear that, in their view, nothing in the resolution could be considered as an instruction to Governments to change existing national legislation, nor could it be considered as an endorsement of such legislation.

7. He trusted that the Committee would vote as soon as possible on the draft resolution, so that it could reach the FAO Council before the Council completed its work on 28 October.

8. Mr. SMID (Czechoslovakia) said that he welcomed the changes made in paragraph 4 and the addition of the new paragraph 6 but regretted that the sponsors had not accepted his delegation's amendment. Many delegations, in particular those representing under-developed countries, were concerned about the possible adverse repercussions on world food markets of the action called for in the draft resolution. The sponsors' decision to include a reference to dumping in operative paragraph 9 did not satisfy his delegation. He continued to believe that it was necessary to emphasize the need for elaborating further positive measures against the dumping to which the resolution might give rise and would therefore maintain his delegation's amendment. He hoped that agreement would be reached on the point and would therefore urge the sponsors of the resolution to reconsider the amendment in view of the fact that the gap between the respective positions had been considerably narrowed.

9. Mr. CAMARA SIKHÉ (Guinea) said that he would vote for the draft resolution in view of the sponsors' acceptance of his amendment. He would however again emphasize that the provision of surplus foodstuffs to the food-deficient peoples was not sufficient to solve

the problems of under-development. It was only a form of supplementary assistance and could not replace action within the under-developed countries themselves to foster economic development.

10. Mr. BERNARDO (Argentina) said that he was grateful to the sponsors for accepting the majority of his suggestions, but that, as his delegation had not received instructions from its Government concerning operative paragraphs 5 and 6, he would prefer the Committee not to vote on the draft resolution until the next meeting.

11. In operative paragraph 2 in the Spanish text, the word "Pide" should be replaced by the word "Invita", and the word "personas" should be replaced by the word "poblaciones" to make it clear that it was nations which were being assisted in their efforts towards economic development.

12. Mr. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the reference to dumping which had been included by the sponsors in operative paragraph 9 did not really meet the point raised by the Czechoslovak delegation, which was anxious that FAO should elaborate further measures against dumping of agricultural surpluses. The United States and Canadian representatives had argued that FAO had already taken such steps, and the New Zealand representative had quoted section I, paragraph 2 of the FAO principles.<sup>1/</sup> Those principles, however, had been adopted in 1954, and might even have been prepared before the United States Congress had passed Public Law 480 of 1954 on aid to foreign countries, which also dealt with the disposal of food surpluses. In any case, in 1954 the FAO could not have foreseen the possible results of the resolution before the Committee. The fact that FAO had already elaborated measures against dumping was not a sufficient reason for rejecting the Czechoslovak amendment, which requested FAO to elaborate further appropriate measures. In fact, dumping had continued, in spite of the measures taken by FAO. The representatives of Ceylon and Thailand had cited examples at an earlier meeting.

13. Contrary to what the New Zealand representative had said, the socialist countries had never dumped agricultural or other commodities on the markets of other countries, and certainly not on the New Zealand market. The countries which exported agricultural commodities certainly suffered losses because of price fluctuations in the world market and because of the deterioration of their terms of trade, but the socialist countries were not involved; those losses were caused by the workings of the capitalist system. His delegation's position on the draft resolution would depend on the position the Committee took with regard to the Czechoslovak amendment.

14. His delegation had always supported the principle of universality in the interests of the under-developed countries themselves and considered that it would be wholly unreasonable and illogical not to respect that principle in making an appeal for support for a world campaign against hunger. He would therefore propose that the words "Members of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies" should be replaced in operative paragraph 1 by the word "States" and in operative paragraph 2 by the words "all States". The Committee

<sup>1/</sup> Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Commodity Policy Studies No. 10: *Functions of a world food reserve — scope and limitations*, Rome, 1956, appendix III.

surely would not wish to deny countries which were not Members of the United Nations or of the specialized agencies the right to fight hunger and to help the hungry.

15. He also proposed that the word "multilateral" in operative paragraph 9 should be replaced by the word "mutually advantageous". The important thing was not that trading practices should be triangular or quadrilateral, but that they should not be prejudicial to the interests of the under-developed countries. That was the construction his delegation placed on the words "on mutually agreeable terms" in operative paragraph 4. His delegation understood the phrase to mean that aid given to the under-developed countries under the resolution would be offered on terms that would not jeopardize their economic development, but would further that development, instead of serving the strategic and foreign policy interests of the donor country in the manner contemplated in Public Law 480 of the United States Congress.

16. The CHAIRMAN asked the Byelorussian representative to hand the text of his amendment in writing to the Secretariat in accordance with rule 121 of the rules of procedure.<sup>2/</sup>

17. Mr. DUDLEY (United Kingdom) observed that in the English language the adverb "mutually" implied reciprocity between two parties. He wondered whether the Byelorussian representative did not wish simply to substitute the adjective "bilateral" for "multilateral".

18. Mr. OMAR (Afghanistan) thanked the sponsors for accepting the amendment submitted by his and the United Arab Republic delegations. At the previous meeting, the FAO representative had quoted the conclusions of the pilot study made in India, showing that agricultural surpluses could be used to help the economic development of under-developed countries without dislocating the markets of food-producing countries. In view of the FAO representative's explanations and the fact that the FAO Conference had accepted the conclusions of the pilot study made in India, there was no need for the insertion of the additional phrase "and compatible with FAO principles". Since the addition of the words "and compatible with FAO principles" did not change the essence of bilateral arrangements, his delegation and that of the United Arab Republic accepted the language in that spirit.

19. Mr. ABDEL-GHANI (United Arab Republic) thought that the position of the sponsors of the draft resolution and that of the Czechoslovak delegation were not so widely separated as might appear. The sponsors wished to provide for safeguards against dumping, while the Czechoslovak delegation wanted specific measures to be elaborated to prevent dumping. As a compromise proposal which might be acceptable to both parties, he would suggest that the words "and appropriate measures against dumping of agricultural surpluses on the international markets and" be added after the words "adequate safeguards". The remainder of the paragraph would be unchanged.

20. Mr. ORTIZ (Uruguay) said it was important to define what was meant by surpluses. Surpluses were not the additional stocks of a commodity which a country might have after a particularly abundant harvest. A country could have surpluses only if the Government

permanently encouraged and subsidized production which it could not dispose of on the domestic or world markets. Because certain Governments permanently followed such a policy of subsidizing production, the draft resolution should emphasize the temporary and provisional nature of the procedures mentioned in operative paragraph 4. He therefore proposed that the word "transitional" should be substituted for the word "short-term" in paragraph 4. The important thing for the under-developed countries was not that someone should try to feed their peoples by sending them food surpluses, but that they should be enabled to export their commodities at fair and equitable prices in order to earn foreign currency to buy the capital goods they needed. Inequities in the distribution of wealth and income could have the same consequences internationally as they had within individual countries. States should show mutual understanding, and efforts should be made to promote the redistribution of wealth between developed and under-developed countries as a means of safeguarding world peace.

21. Mr. ENCINAS (Peru) said that in various critical situations his country had received assistance under United States Public Law 480 on foreign aid, and could appreciate the value of such help. The idea of making arrangements, under the auspices of the United Nations, to help food-deficient countries had, therefore, his delegation's whole-hearted support. However, the question of food surpluses posed serious problems for the countries possessing surpluses, for the countries economically dependent on exports of foodstuffs, and even for countries like Peru, which were in an intermediate position. It was therefore essential to relate the short-term problem of assisting needy countries to the long-term problem of strengthening the economic development of under-developed countries. His delegation would support the six-Power draft resolution, which made a useful contribution to the solution of those problems, provided it was not regarded as setting a precedent for other primary commodities which required different treatment. The provisions of the draft resolution should be considered as an attempt to deal with a critical situation. His delegation would have preferred to deal with the question in more detail at the inter-governmental level before referring it to FAO.

22. In the revised text, it would have been more logical to combine operative paragraphs 4 and 5. He also thought that the words "desirable agricultural development" in operative paragraph 4 should be replaced by the words "economic development". It would be wrong to refer only to agricultural development since economic development had other aspects, in particular industrial and social development. It would be better to refer to development in general, since the present text would give the impression that the agricultural sector was considered more important than the others.

23. Mr. GALLEGOS (Ecuador) said that the purposes of the draft resolution were indisputably humanitarian and it was gratifying that the differences of opinion in the Committee had generally related only to questions of form. Measures to distribute food must not adversely affect the economies of producing countries. It was also important that the under-developed countries should be helped to increase their productivity and develop their economies, since they could not live on charity. The draft resolution seemed to take into account the under-developed countries' real needs and

<sup>2/</sup> This amendment was subsequently circulated as document A/C.2/L.468.

also their aspirations. He hoped that no further amendments would be submitted and that all delegations would set aside political controversies and adopt the draft resolution unanimously.

24. Mr. PANYARACHUN (Thailand) said that his remarks at the 656th meeting on the subject of dumping had been misinterpreted by the Byelorussian representative. He had wished to draw attention to the fact that the distribution of foodstuffs on special terms might involve some risk when they were not carried out in accordance with the FAO principles. In the present instance he was confident that the sponsors of the draft resolution were concerned only with helping the poorer countries and had no intention of engaging in operations that could be regarded as dumping.

25. Mr. RAJAPATIRANA (Ceylon) observed that, as he had said at the 656th meeting, the distribution of food surpluses could not be considered a contribution to the economic development of a country and could not be compared to capital investments. The fact that the importing countries had to finance such food imports in local currency created fiscal and monetary problems. If the foodstuffs were supplied as a gift, the problem had to be approached from an entirely different angle.

26. The amendments to the draft resolution improved it considerably. He noted with satisfaction, for example, the statement in the preamble that the ultimate solution to the problem of hunger lay in an effective acceleration of economic development in the under-developed countries. He thought that the records of the Committee's debates should be transmitted to FAO, which might find them useful in making the studies requested.

27. Mr. GREEN (New Zealand) recalled that he had asked the Czechoslovak representative the previous day to make clear what he meant by "further appropriate measures" against dumping. He had also asked whether acceptance of this aspect of the FAO principles meant that Czechoslovakia and the other countries of the Soviet bloc intended to subscribe to the whole of the FAO principles. The Czechoslovak representative had spoken of "active measures" but had not said whether they were to be undertaken in the light of the FAO principles and the work of GATT in that field. The Byelorussian representative had said earlier in the meeting that it was seven years since the FAO principles had been adopted and that conditions were no longer the same. Had his country been a member of FAO, he would have been aware that during the past twelve months FAO had undertaken a full review, on the basis of a report from its subsidiary organs, of the application of the principles of surplus disposal. The principles were found to be fully applicable in the changed circumstances, and the FAO Conference had decided that they did not require revision. As the Czechoslovak representative had been unable to give an assurance that the Soviet bloc would subscribe not only to the dumping aspect but also to the other questions raised in the FAO principles, the New Zealand delegation would be unable to support the Czechoslovak amendment (A/C.2/L.464) if it was put to the vote. However it would vote in favour of the revised draft resolution, as it now incorporated a more appropriate reference to dumping.

28. Mr. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) thanked the representative of Thailand for his clarification but assured him that he had fully

understood the meaning of his remarks. He recalled that the Government of Thailand had recently protested against the disposal of United States surpluses. With regard to the New Zealand representative's remarks concerning the FAO principles, it could not but be regretted that FAO, realizing the ineffectiveness of its principles, had decided that they need not be revised and that the situation could not be improved. That would appear to be an argument in favour of the Czechoslovak amendment.

29. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the meeting should be suspended to enable the sponsors of the draft resolution and the delegations submitting amendments to consult with each other and draw up a new text.

*The meeting was suspended at 5.15 p.m. and resumed at 5.45 p.m.*

30. Mr. PHILLIPS (United States of America) said that the sponsors had been able to revise the draft resolution to take into consideration the suggestions of the representatives of the United Arab Republic, Peru and Uruguay. The United Arab Republic representative having tried to find a compromise which would make it possible to accept the Czechoslovak amendment, the sponsors had decided to insert in operative paragraph 9 the phrase proposed by that representative. The Peruvian representative had proposed that the words "desirable agricultural development" in paragraph 4 should be replaced by the words "economic development". The sponsors had tried to find a wording which would be satisfactory to him and had decided to delete the words "in the less developed countries" after the word "development" and replace them with the words "as a contribution to the economic development of the less developed countries". They had also accepted the amendment of the Uruguayan representative to operative paragraph 4.

31. The sponsors had been unable to accept the first two of the Byelorussian representative's amendments since they referred to a political issue which had been raised repeatedly and had nothing to do with the subject of the draft. The third amendment, to substitute the words "mutually advantageous" for the word "multilateral", was highly ambiguous. If the term "mutually advantageous" could be interpreted as meaning "bilateral" it could not be accepted since certain bilateral exchanges were harmful to the trade of certain countries.

32. Finally, the sponsors agreed with the representative of Ceylon that the Secretary-General might be requested to transmit the records of the meetings in which the Committee had considered the draft resolution to the Director-General of FAO.

33. Mr. SMID (Czechoslovakia) thanked the representative of the United Arab Republic for supporting his delegation's position. The United Arab Republic amendment accurately reflected the position of the Czechoslovak delegation, which was anxious that positive steps should be taken to prevent dumping. As the sponsors of the draft resolution had accepted the United Arab Republic amendment he would withdraw his own (A/C.2/L.464).

34. The Byelorussian amendments, which were based on the principle of universality, would have great importance in a draft resolution dealing with the Freedom from Hunger Campaign. His delegation supported the



amendments and regretted that the sponsors had not accepted them.

35. Mr. ENCINAS (Peru) thanked the sponsors for taking his remarks into consideration. Although he could have wished that the draft resolution had not appeared to lay special emphasis on agriculture, he would accept the text proposed by the United States representative.

36. Mr. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), referring to his third amendment, said that the United Kingdom representative's remarks had given rise to a misunderstanding. The words "mutually advantageous" did not mean "bilateral". He regretted that his first two amendments had not been accepted, since they did not in fact raise any political issue but simply upheld the principle of universality. Countries could not be prohibited from helping other countries simply because they were not Members of the United Nations or the specialized agencies. All nations should contribute to the effort to free the world from hunger. He asked that his amendments should be put to the vote.

37. Mr. RAJAPATIRANA (Ceylon) thought that the Committee should be provided with a new revised text before it voted on the draft resolution.

38. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee of the 28 October target date, which took into account the date on which the FAO Council was to complete its work. As the Committee had to submit a report on the question to the General Assembly, it was desirable that it should vote on the draft resolution at the current meeting.

39. Mr. PHILLIPS (United States of America) expressed the hope that the Committee could take a vote before the meeting was adjourned.

40. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti), supporting the position of the United States representative, emphasized the importance and the humanitarian aims of the draft resolution and appealed to the members of the Committee not to insist upon the strict application of rule 121 of the rules of procedure.

41. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should proceed to a vote during the current meeting.

*It was so decided.*

42. Mr. RAJAPATIRANA (Ceylon) said that he could not see in what respect the first two amendments proposed by the Byelorussian delegation were of a political nature. The task to be accomplished was a humanitarian one, as paragraphs 1 and 2 of the draft resolution indicated. He saw no reason why all the countries should not participate in that great effort.

43. Mr. CAMARA Sikhé (Guinea) said that his delegation found itself in some difficulty with regard to the Byelorussian amendments. The Byelorussian representative stated that the amendments were not of a political nature, whereas the United States representative said that they were. He wondered whether the United States representative could explain in what way the amendments were of a political nature and why the sponsors had refused to accept them.

44. Mr. PHILLIPS (United States of America) again pointed out that the question raised in the two Byelorussian amendments had no connexion with the subject dealt with in the draft resolution. The principle of uni-

versality was a matter which was discussed in plenary and had no bearing on the draft resolution.

45. Mr. CAMARA Sikhé (Guinea) said that he would vote for the Byelorussian amendments (A/C.2/L.468). The assistance of all States should be enlisted in carrying out a humanitarian undertaking such as the one proposed in the draft resolution.

46. Mr. AMADOR (Mexico) considered that some corrections should be made to the Spanish text of the draft resolution in order to bring it into line with the English original. In the sixth preambular paragraph the word "eficaz" should be replaced by the word "efectiva". In operative paragraph 1, the expression "Hace suya" should be altered to read "Apoya". At the beginning of operative paragraph 2, the word "Invita" would be preferable to "Pide"; further, the words "las medidas indicadas para" should be replaced by "las medidas encaminadas a"; finally it would also be better to say "y ayudar a estas" than "y para ayudarles", so as to indicate clearly that the reference was to the nations. The text of operative paragraph 4, after the words "el desarrollo agrícola", should be altered to read: "deseable de los países menos desarrollados y sin perjuicio de los acuerdos bilaterales concertados con ese fin ...". At the end of operative paragraph 6, the phrase "sobre las medidas tomadas" should be replaced by "sobre la acción que haya emprendido". In operative paragraph 9, the word "esencialmente" should be replaced by the words "en grado importante", and the word "perjuicios" should be replaced by the word "daños".

47. His delegation was prepared to vote for the draft resolution and would assume, when it voted, that the above changes had been taken into account.

48. The CHAIRMAN having read the draft resolution with the amendments accepted by its sponsors, Mr. RAJAPATIRANA (Ceylon) proposed that, having regard to the change made in operative paragraph 2, the word "needy" in the title of the English text of the draft resolution should be replaced by the expression "food-deficient".

*It was so decided.*

49. Mr. DORSINVILLE (Haiti) said that in view of the need for an early decision, the Committee might vote on the draft resolution and on the amendments to it during the meeting in progress, leaving explanations of vote until the following meeting.

50. Mr. GREEN (New Zealand), speaking on a point of order, proposed the deletion of the word "and" before the word "compatible" in operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution as amended.

51. Mr. PHILLIPS (United States of America) said his delegation was prepared to accept that change.

*It was so decided.*

52. Mrs. WRIGHT (Denmark) endorsed the initiative taken by the sponsors of the draft resolution. As the Danish Minister for Foreign Affairs had stated in the General Assembly (875th plenary meeting), her country was wholeheartedly in favour of increased aid to developing countries and of effective co-ordination of the assistance rendered. Her delegation would therefore vote for the draft resolution, though it would have preferred a text clearly indicating that the aid in question would take the form of a gift, which would

virtually have precluded its use to the advantage or to the disadvantage of particular commercial interests.

53. It was encouraging to note that the sponsors of the draft resolution had taken into account not only the suggestions made to the General Assembly by President Eisenhower (868th plenary meeting) and the Prime Minister of Canada (871st plenary meeting) but also the views expressed by countries like her own, whose livelihood depended on the production and export of agricultural products. Her delegation subscribed in particular to three principles embodied in the text. First, as was implied in the preamble, the utilization of agricultural surpluses for the benefit of the hungry was only a short-term measure, and if the problem was to be finally resolved, it was necessary to promote the economic development of countries whose agricultural production was inadequate so that they could import the necessary foodstuffs on normal terms. Secondly, it followed from operative paragraph 9 that the disposal of surplus commodities should not hamper the economic development of the under-developed countries or do injury to normal trade or the interests of other Member countries. Lastly, the wording of operative paragraph 9, with the substitution of the words "normal trading" for the words "normal trade", would ensure that the surplus foodstuffs would be transported under normal conditions.

54. Her delegation would therefore vote for the draft resolution, on the understanding that no specific arrangement made under its provisions would affect normal competition in the field of agricultural commodities and international transport; the resolution could not then be used to favour the agriculture or shipping interests of any country.

55. Mr. BREIVIK (Norway) endorsed the principles underlying the draft resolution. In his delegation's view, the new wording of operative paragraph 9 meant that there would be no encroachment on freedom of trade or transport in regard to foodstuffs and it was on that assumption that his delegation would vote for the draft resolution.

56. Mr. DUDLEY (United Kingdom) supported the draft resolution and endorsed the idea that food surpluses should be used to feed the hungry. His delegation sympathized with the difficulties of the food exporting countries and was glad to note that the co-sponsors had accepted a number of amendments, particularly in operative paragraph 9. It was essential that normal shipping and transport services should not be prejudiced or damaged by action taken under this resolution and his delegation was satisfied that the substitution of the words "normal trading" for "normal trade" in that paragraph settled that point satisfactorily since "trading" included the transport of food.

57. In addition, the references in operative paragraph 3 to "international assistance" should not be construed as a recommendation for extra expenditure by FAO. His delegation also understood the phrase "multilateral arrangements" in operative paragraph 5 simply as a request for a study by FAO which would not involve extra expenditure.

58. Mr. HASSAN (Sudan) said that he would vote for the draft resolution as amended, because of the humanitarian purpose it set out to achieve. A programme of that kind was, moreover, completely consistent with the economic advancement of the developing countries,

as the experience of India had shown. There was also no danger of its interfering with trade in foodstuffs.

59. Mr. BERNARDO (Argentina) said that, although he had not yet received instructions from his Government, in view of the urgency of the matter, he would not press for the vote on the draft resolution to be postponed until the next meeting. Generally speaking, he supported the draft resolution, but he would like a separate vote on operative paragraphs 4, 5 and 6.

60. He entirely agreed with the changes in the Spanish text proposed by the Mexican representative.

61. Mr. OMAR (Afghanistan) requested the New Zealand representative to reconsider his proposal, so that the word "and" could be retained before the word "compatible" at the end of operative paragraph 4. For two separate thoughts were involved: the one being "without prejudice to bilateral arrangements" and the other "and compatible with FAO principles". One principle should not be made dependent on the other. It would be logical to keep them separate and independent, without one prejudicing the other.

62. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Committee had already approved the deletion of that word.

63. Mr. GREEN (New Zealand) said that the deletion of the word made a radical change in the meaning of the sentence. With the deletion, the text indicated that the procedures contemplated should be established without prejudice to bilateral arrangements which were compatible with the FAO principles. All exporting countries could accept that formulation. On the other hand, if the word "and" was restored before the word "compatible", it would mean that the procedures themselves would have to be compatible with the FAO principles; but there was no point in spelling that out, since several paragraphs of the draft resolution served that very purpose. He consequently urged that the word "and" should not be restored.

64. Mr. ABDEL-GHANI (United Arab Republic) formally proposed that the word "and" should be inserted between the words "purpose" and "compatible" in operative paragraph 4.

65. Mr. GEORGIEV (Bulgaria) agreed with the representative of New Zealand that the deletion of the word "and" changed the meaning of the sentence.

66. Mr. BOIKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) pointed out that the Russian text of the draft resolution did not include the word "and". That word would, therefore, have to be inserted in the Russian version of the draft resolution if it were restored in the other texts.

67. Mr. KAUFMANN (Netherlands) asked the representative of the United Arab Republic not to press his amendment. He recalled that the words "compatible with the FAO principles" had been substituted for the words "which do not infringe on the FAO principles". It was logical to make it clear that the bilateral agreements that were not to be prejudiced by the procedures provided for in paragraph 4 of the draft resolution were agreements compatible with the FAO principles.

68. Mr. ABDEL-GHANI (United Arab Republic) said that the point was of some importance and maintained his proposal.

69. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should vote on the various proposals in the following

order: the first and then the second amendment of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic (A/C.2/L.468), the oral amendment of Afghanistan and the United Arab Republic to restore the word "and" between the words "purpose" and "compatible" at the end of operative paragraph 4, and the third amendment of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic (A/C.2/L.468). He would then ask for separate votes on operative paragraphs 4, 5 and 6, and finally on the draft resolution as a whole (A/C.2/L.459/Rev.2 and Corr.1), as amended.

*The first amendment of the Byelorussian SSR was rejected by 35 votes to 24, with 12 abstentions.*

*The second amendment of the Byelorussian SSR was rejected by 35 votes to 24, with 13 abstentions.*

*The oral amendment of Afghanistan and the United Arab Republic was adopted by 25 votes to 21, with 24 abstentions.*

*The third amendment of the Byelorussian SSR was rejected by 38 votes to 12, with 20 abstentions.*

*Operative paragraph 4 as amended was adopted by 60 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.*

*Operative paragraph 5 was adopted by 64 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.*

*Operative paragraph 6 was adopted by 67 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.*

*The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted unanimously.*

70. Mr. CHERNYSHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that all his previous observations on the draft resolution remained valid. However, several of the under-developed countries had demonstrated their interest in the proposal by submitting various amendments; furthermore, the adoption of the amendment of the United Arab Republic and Afghanistan appreciably modified the text. In those circumstances, the USSR had considered it possible to vote in favour of the draft resolution, though it would have preferred to see the Committee adopt the Czechoslovak amendment and also regretted that the amendments of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic had not been supported. It was to be hoped that all the countries in the world would take part in the Freedom from Hunger Campaign. Lastly, he wished to make a point of principle, which was applicable to all resolutions: in the text the Committee had just adopted, wide powers were granted to the Secretary-General. The Soviet delegation could not concur in that arrangement, for it no longer had complete confidence in the Secretary-General for the reasons Mr. Khrushchev had outlined in the General Assembly (869th plenary meeting).

71. Mr. AYARI (Tunisia) said that he had voted in favour of the amendments of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic. He thought, as did the representative of Guinea, that there had been no contradiction between the draft resolution and the first two Byelorussian amendments, for there was no need to belong to any organization in order to take part in a campaign against hunger.

72. He would also point out that multilateral trading practices might sometimes have detrimental consequences; for that reason, it would have been preferable to use the expression "mutually beneficial practices" at the end of paragraph 9.

73. Mr. PANYARACHUN (Thailand) recalled that he had voted in favour of the proposal to give priority to the examination of the draft resolution. He had abstained in the vote on operative paragraphs 4, 5 and 6, because he considered that certain practical difficulties had not yet been overcome. In view of the general agreement in the Committee, however, he had voted for the draft resolution as a whole.

74. Mr. GEORGIEV (Bulgaria) stated that his delegation had abstained from voting on operative paragraphs 4 and 5 of the draft resolution, for it shared the Argentine delegation's misgivings regarding the scope of those paragraphs.

75. The Bulgarian delegation also fully supported the USSR representative's observations.

76. Mr. HAJOUI (Morocco) said that, while Morocco appreciated the efforts of the sponsors of the draft resolution, it regretted that the amendments of the Byelorussian SSR had not been adopted. Although Morocco exported foodstuffs, he had voted for the draft resolution, because it provided adequate safeguards.

77. Mr. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) asked whether representatives would have an opportunity of studying the Committee's report before the plenary meeting at which it would be presented.

78. The CHAIRMAN stated that the Second Committee's report to the General Assembly would be distributed on the morning of 27 October; the Committee would not, therefore, undertake the examination of a draft report. He proposed that the Committee should agree to the draft resolution, as amended, being discussed at the plenary meeting of the General Assembly on the afternoon of Thursday, 27 October.

*It was so decided.*

The meeting rose at 8.10 p.m.