

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SIXTEENTH SESSION

Official Records

SECOND COMMITTEE, 773rd
MEETING

Monday, 4 December 1961,
at 3.5 p.m.



NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda items 12, 28, 29 and 30:

Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapters II, IV, V (sections II-V), VI (paragraph 489) and VIII (paragraphs 650 and 651) (continued)

Economic development of under-developed countries (continued):

(a) Industrial development and activities of the organs of the United Nations in the in the field of industrialization;

(b) Establishment of a United Nations capital development fund: report of the Committee established by General Assembly resolution 1521 (XV);

(c) Accelerated flow of capital and technical assistance to the developing countries: report of the Secretary-General;

(d) Land reform: interim report of the Secretary-General

Questions relating to international trade and commodities (continued):

(a) Strengthening and development of the world market and improvement of the trade conditions of the economically less developed countries: report of the Economic and Social Council;

(b) Improvement of the terms of trade between the industrial and the under-developed countries: report of the Economic and Social Council

Questions relating to science and technology (continued):

(a) Development of scientific and technical co-operation and exchange of experience: report of the Secretary-General;

(b) Main trends of inquiry in the natural sciences, dissemination of scientific knowledge and application of such knowledge for peaceful ends: report of the Economic and Social Council

Consideration of draft resolutions (continued) 317

Page

(b) Establishment of a United Nations capital development fund: report of the Committee established by General Assembly resolution 1521 (XV) (A/4878, E/3514, E/AC.6/SR.305-309);

(c) Accelerated flow of capital and technical assistance to the developing countries: report of the Secretary-General (A/4906, E/3556);

(d) Land reform: interim report of the Secretary-General (A/4850)

Questions relating to international trade and commodities (A/4820 and Corr.2, E/3452/Rev.1, E/3466, E/3468, E/3486, E/3497) (continued):

(a) Strengthening and development of the world market and improvement of the trade conditions of the economically less developed countries: report of the Economic and Social Council (A/4885, E/3519, E/3520 and Add.1, E/3530);

(b) Improvement of the terms of trade between the industrial and the under-developed countries: report of the Economic and Social Council

Questions relating to science and technology (A/4820 and Corr.2) (continued):

(a) Development of scientific and technical co-operation and exchange of experience: report of the Secretary-General (A/4904, E/3515);

(b) Main trends of inquiry in the natural sciences, dissemination of scientific knowledge and application of such knowledge for peaceful ends: report of the Economic and Social Council (A/4898)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.2/L.563/REV.3) (continued)

1. Mr. SERAFIMOV (Bulgaria) said that the Western countries, which undeniably occupied a dominant position in the Economic and Social Council, had won a victory when that body had decided at its twenty-ninth session to set up a Committee for Industrial Development closely subordinated to it, and not a technical committee as the Brazilian delegation had proposed. The Second Committee was now asked to go further and establish a specialized agency for industrial development. The idea was logical, once it was admitted that faster industrialization was the most effective way for the under-developed countries to make up lost ground. Those nations which, like Bulgaria and the Soviet Union, had planned their economies and given priority to the industrial sector, and to heavy industry in particular, had achieved remarkable results. His delegation was convinced that the establishment of a specialized agency for industrial development would be of great benefit to the under-developed countries. It would therefore support the seven-Power amendments (A/C.2/L.600/

AGENDA ITEMS 12, 28, 29 AND 30

Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapters II, IV, V (sections II-V), VI (paragraph 489) and VIII (paragraphs 650 and 651)) (A/4820 and Corr.2, A/4911) (continued)

Economic development of under-developed countries (A/4820 and Corr.2) (continued):

(a) Industrial development and activities of the organs of the United Nations in the field of industrialization;

Chairman: Mr. Blasco LANZA D'AJETA (Italy).

Rev.1) and the Polish draft resolution concerning the activities of the United Nations in the field of industrial development (A/C.2/L.563/Rev.3).

2. Mr. NATORF (Poland) noted with satisfaction that many representatives had supported the idea that industrial development was the only remedy for the economic backwardness of the under-developed countries and thanked all those who had welcomed the draft resolution submitted by his delegation. In order to allow for the various comments made during the debate, his delegation was submitting a new revised version of its proposal (A/C.2/L.563/Rev.3). The fifth and sixth preambular paragraphs had been altered in line with the first and second Japanese amendments (A/C.2/L.606). In the eighth preambular paragraph, his delegation had replaced the words "economic and commercial" by "economic, commercial and social", thus accepting the first amendment submitted by the Netherlands, Norway and Sweden (A/C.2/L.604). On the other hand, it had not been able to accept the third Japanese amendment to the ninth preambular paragraph. As interpreted by the Japanese representative the amendment was acceptable, and Poland was prepared to admit that aid to the regional economic commissions was desirable. Nevertheless, it had preferred not to add the proposed words, because they could be interpreted differently, particularly in a political context, in view of the great variety of existing regional organizations.

3. In the operative part, the former paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 had been regrouped as Japan had proposed. In the new paragraph 2 (a), the words "normally acting through regional economic commissions" had been replaced by the words "in co-operation with the regional economic commissions" in order to meet the objections raised. It was important that the Industrial Development Centre should be able to draw on the valuable experience of the regional economic commissions, which had already established relations with the various national bodies concerned with industrialization. The Centre would also be able to enter directly into relations with the countries which were not members of the regional economic commissions, notably the Arab countries. According to the representative of France, the text would place the Centre under an obligation to establish contact with all the bodies existing in all countries. In point of fact, the Centre would be able to do so if it saw fit, but, like Governments, it would have complete freedom of decision. The last words of sub-paragraph (a) had been altered to take into account the comments made by the New Zealand representative. The Polish delegation had not, however, been able to meet the wishes of the representative of Italy. In the economic and social fields, the United Nations had to collaborate with all States and it was important to apply the principle of universality. It would be very unfortunate if certain delegations introduced purely political issues into the debate by seeking to limit international co-operation. He urged those delegations not to press their demands, so that the vote could take place in a peaceful atmosphere.

4. The changes made to sub-paragraph (b) were purely formal. However, a reference to IAEA had been introduced, as the representative of Japan had suggested. The Polish delegation interpreted the sub-paragraph in the same way as the representative of New Zealand. So far as sub-paragraph (c) was concerned, the Committee for Industrial Development had been invited by the General Assembly and the

Economic and Social Council to study the problems of financing. Admittedly, at its first session, it had decided to give particular attention to the problem of organizing and planning industrial development and there was no question of altering the order of priority it had adopted in its work. Nevertheless, if it wished to undertake a programme, it would of necessity soon have to embark on a study of the means of financing it. His delegation therefore thought it essential to specify that industrialization should be financed mainly from internal savings.

5. The Netherlands, Norway and Sweden proposed adding a new paragraph 5 to the operative part on the social implications of the industrialization process (A/C.2/L.604). That was certainly an important problem to which the Committee for Industrial Development would have to give close attention. It would not be a good idea, however, to shift the emphasis and make it the Committee's principal subject of study. The best thing would be to do no more than refer to the matter in the eighth preambular paragraph. To go further might provoke heated discussions on relatively minor problems, such as, for example, the conditions in which industrialization had taken place in the nineteenth century. He hoped therefore that the three Powers would not press that amendment. The representative of India, for his part, had proposed that the inter-sessional working group should be asked to meet more often; that was a good idea, but the instructions given by the General Assembly should not be too detailed; the working group, moreover, did not need instructions from the Assembly in order to meet.

6. In operative paragraph 3, a reference to IAEA had been included to bring that paragraph into line with paragraph 2 (b). In the information which they would furnish to the Committee for Industrial Development, the Secretary-General, the Executive Chairman of TAB, the Managing Director of the Special Fund and the heads of the specialized agencies and the IAEA would indicate how the amount of assistance given in industrial development compared with the assistance given in other fields. The Committee for Industrial Development would then be in a position to take a decision.

7. His delegation reserved the right to give its views on the revised seven-Power amendments (A/C.2/L.600/Rev.1) at a later stage, when they had been submitted officially.

8. Mr. LINGAM (India) said that, since resolutions 1431 (XIV) and 1525 (XV) had recently been adopted, it seemed at first sight that it might be premature to extend the industrial development activities of the United Nations. However, the revised draft resolution and the seven-Power revised amendment were acceptable in so far as they only requested the Economic and Social Council to direct the Committee for Industrial Development to give further consideration to the question. It was important that the Committee for Industrial Development should gain more experience before giving its opinion. If it then thought it necessary to take new steps to accelerate progress, for instance by the establishment of a specialized agency, India would have no objection.

9. One defect of the draft resolution was that it did not seem to lay sufficient stress on the need to establish a sound economic infra-structure before industrialization, in order to avoid the risk that development might be held up by the inadequacy of administrative services, transport and, in particular,

technical knowledge. Hence the suggested specialized agency, or the body to be set up in its place, should help under-developed countries to undertake the kind of industrialization best suited to their particular conditions, so that they might quickly reach the stage of self-sustaining economic growth. It should not recommend uniform remedies, because it would clearly be absurd to press all agricultural countries, for example, New Zealand, to become industrialized. The other weak point related to problems of finance. The draft referred to the use of internal resources for formation of capital. Such resources were often insufficient to meet all needs, and even austerity measures often could do little to improve the situation. The draft went far beyond the possibilities of the United Nations, and it would be dangerous to arouse the under-developed countries' enthusiasm for industrialization and then to disappoint them by failing to satisfy their demands.

10. Mr. APPIAH (Ghana) said no one could deny that the gap between the rich and poor countries had widened because of the deterioration in the terms of trade, which had turned against the under-developed countries in recent years. As a result, almost all those countries had put their one hope in industrialization. That was why they were grateful to the Polish delegation for submitting its draft resolution, which the Ghanaian delegation would support.

11. The sponsors of the amendments in document A/C.2/L.600/Rev.1 wanted the proposed system for promoting the industrial development of the under-developed countries to be made more efficient. Certainly any measure designed to make industrialization easier would be welcome, and Ghana would not oppose the establishment of a specialized agency if the Committee for Industrial Development thought it necessary. However, he thought that that Committee's decision should not be prejudged, and he was glad that, in the new version of the proposed operative paragraph 6, the word "necessity" had been replaced by "advisability". It was also good that the Economic and Social Council would have an opportunity to consider the conclusions of the Committee for Industrial Development. The delegation of Ghana would vote in favour of that amendment.

12. Mr. AZIZ (Federation of Malaya) thought that the debate had lasted long enough to give every delegation an opportunity to form an opinion of the draft resolution and the amendments to it. Since the Committee was behindhand in its work, he formally moved the closure of the debate, if necessary after a short suspension of the meeting to enable the representative of Poland to reach agreement with the sponsors of the amendments.

13. Mr. DANGEARD (France) and Mr. GREEN (New Zealand), speaking on a point of order, said that they wished, before the closure of the debate, to submit their delegations' sub-amendments (A/C.2/L.603/Rev.1 and A/C.2/L.602/Rev.1) to the seven-Power amendments (A/C.2/L.600/Rev.1).

14. Mr. CHAMMAS (Lebanon) agreed that the sub-amendments of France and New Zealand should be considered before the closure of the debate.

15. Mr. AZIZ (Federation of Malaya) withdrew his motion, but said he hoped that the Committee would vote in the course of the day.

16. Mr. ALI (Pakistan) said that the sponsors of the amendments in document A/C.2/L.600/Rev.1 were

grateful to the many delegations which had tried to find a solution acceptable to all. It was agreed that it was important to intensify and extend the activities of the United Nations designed to promote the industrialization of under-developed countries, without neglecting the problems of organization involved. Certain delegations had been afraid that the creation of a new specialized agency might lead to duplication and had stressed that the present work of the Committee for Industrial Development and the future activities of the Industrial Development Centre should be taken into account. The delegations of New Zealand, France, Nigeria and Tunisia had made constructive suggestions, in order to define in more detail the ideas on which unanimity might be reached. The sponsors of the amendments had not been able to accept all those suggestions as they stood, since to do so would be to go against their fundamental purpose, which was to intensify United Nations aid to countries intent on industrialization.

17. The seven Powers had therefore submitted a new version of their amendments (A/C.2/L.600/Rev.1), which they hoped the Committee would adopt unanimously. The first amendment was designed to stress the importance of avoiding duplication with the work of specialized agencies already active in the field of industrialization. The terms of the second amendment had all been weighed with the greatest care, in order to reflect the various views expressed in the debate. The sponsors had wished to make it clear that the Economic and Social Council, of which the Committee for Industrial Development was only a subsidiary organ, was mainly responsible in that connexion, and that it should not only give instructions to the Committee for Industrial Development, but should also guide it in its work. The word "further" showed that the Committee for Industrial Development was already studying the expansion of the industrial development activities of the United Nations. That expansion must necessarily take place under the auspices of the United Nations, which was required by the Charter to promote the economic development of under-developed countries. The sponsors had laid special stress on the possibility of a specialized agency, not because they wished to exclude any other possibility, but because they thought that form of organization had proved its value in several fields of United Nations activity, and that its structure, qualities and defects were well known. The sponsors had inserted the words "if need be", although they thought them unnecessary, only because those words had been used in some of the suggestions made to them. While they did not expect to please everyone, they hoped that the new wording of operative paragraph 6 would satisfy as many delegations as possible.

18. Mr. GREEN (New Zealand) thanked the representative of Poland for taking some of his arguments into account in the new version of his text, and particularly for stressing the importance of co-ordination. He suggested that, at the end of operative paragraph 2 (a), the words "all countries, at different stages of their development" should be replaced by "countries at all stages of development". He also observed that, since the Committee for Industrial Development had to spend much of its time studying questions of finance, it should possess information which was not now available to it, since many countries, including those with planned economies, provided information only about their commitments and not about their net exports of capital; the draft reso-

lution should therefore contain a clause asking States to make available to the Committee for Industrial Development any information it might need for its study. With regard to the second seven-Power amendment (A/C.2/L.600/Rev.1), to which New Zealand had submitted sub-amendments (A/C.2/L.602/Rev.1), he thought that, when the Committee for Industrial Development had studied the reports requested, it would be able to make a realistic appraisal of what had already been done and of what could be done in the future; the Economic and Social Council could then take that appraisal into account in considering whether a specialized agency should be established.

19. Mr. DANGEARD (France) thanked the sponsors of the amendments in document A/C.2/L.600/Rev.1 for taking into account some of the fears expressed by his delegation with regard to operative paragraph 6. But he noted that the Committee for Industrial Development was requested only to consider the advisability of establishing a specialized agency, and that no other possibility was mentioned. The French delegation thought that the expansion of the industrial development activities of the United Nations should accompany the development of other economic and social activities, the importance of which had just been re-emphasized by the Secretary-General in his first Press conference. The Committee for Industrial Development should therefore study any possible means of promoting the achievement of that purpose. To that end, the French delegation proposed a revised sub-amendment (A/C.2/L.603/Rev.1) to the effect that the words "or any other appropriate body" should be added after "for industrial development" in the seven-Power amendment to operative paragraph 6. The French delegation, moreover, renewed its opposition to the idea of establishing a specialized agency.

20. Mr. AYARI (Tunisia) thought that the new version of the seven-Power amendments met some of the objections advanced against the establishment of a specialized agency for industrial development. He agreed, however, with the French representative that the Committee for Industrial Development should be allowed full freedom in studying the most appropriate method of solving the problem of industrialization and that it should not, therefore, be asked to envisage only the establishment of a specialized agency. Since the decisions which the Committee might take should not be prejudged, the amendment to operative paragraph 6 (A/C.2/L.600/Rev.1) could speak of "the advisability of establishing a specialized agency or any other appropriate body for industrial development". Again, it would be extremely difficult to present a report to the Economic and Social Council at its thirty-third session, as stipulated in the third amendment in document A/C.2/L.600/Rev.1, since the Council would meet at the beginning of April, when the March session of the Committee for Industrial Development, whose agenda was already very full, might not yet have finished. He therefore thought that the Committee should be requested to present its report to the Economic and Social Council at the thirty-fourth session.

21. Mr. KORTEWEG (Netherlands) thanked the Polish delegation, on behalf of his own delegation and the delegations of Norway and Sweden, for the spirit of co-operation which it had shown in accepting the first amendment proposed in document A/C.2/L.604. He regretted that the Polish delegation had felt unable to accept his second amendment, for he could not agree with the Polish representative that it was liable to

provoke a discussion between countries of different economic levels. The amendment was only designed to emphasize the social consequences of the industrialization process, of which everyone was aware; it was indeed universally recognized that industrialization must be accompanied by measures of a social nature. He therefore saw no reason to withdraw the amendment. If the Polish delegation, however, feared that too much stress placed on social questions would destroy the balance of the draft resolution, he was prepared to replace the words "devote particular attention to the ... implications" by the words "take into account the ... implications".

22. Mr. NATORF (Poland) said that, in changing the second part of operative paragraph 2 (a) of his draft resolution, he had tried to meet the wishes of the New Zealand representative; but not having succeeded, he would propose a return to the wording in the second revision (A/C.2/L.563/Rev.2), namely, "regardless of their stage of development". He thanked the Netherlands representative for the spirit of compromise which he had manifested with regard to his second amendment (A/C.2/L.604), the new version of which the Polish delegation accepted with pleasure.

23. So far as the revised seven-Power amendments were concerned, the sponsors had changed their original text considerably and the Polish delegation was prepared to accept the new version. Since some delegations apparently wished to have an informal discussion on the revised amendments, the meeting might perhaps be briefly suspended with a view to arriving at unanimous agreement.

24. Mr. ALI (Pakistan) said that, in order to preclude any misunderstanding regarding the revised text of the amendments, the sponsors agreed to the insertion, after the words "specialized agency" in the second amendment, of the words "or any other appropriate body". He also suggested that, in the third amendment, the words "thirty-third session" should be changed to read "thirty-fourth session", in order to give the Committee and the Council all the time necessary to study the question. The sponsors could not, however, accept in their present form the amendments proposed by France and New Zealand.

25. Mr. KLUTZNICK (United States of America) again stressed that the United States was anxious to speed the industrial development of the underdeveloped countries and that the reservations which it might entertain regarding one or two points did not extend to the draft resolution as a whole. The United States delegation could not, however, see the need to refer in operative paragraph 2 (a) to "all countries". It was Poland that, by so doing, had introduced a political factor into the text, since it was a United Nations tradition to speak only of States Members of the United Nations and members of the specialized agencies.

26. Mr. NATORF (Poland) repeated that he agreed to the incorporation in the draft resolution of the second amendment proposed by Norway, the Netherlands and Sweden (A/C.2/L.604). It would appear in operative paragraph 2 as a sub-paragraph (d), worded as follows: "(b) To take into account, with the assistance of the United Nations institutions concerned, the social implications of the industrialization process". As to the seven-Power amendments (A/C.2/L.600/Rev.1), Poland was prepared to accept them and would therefore add a new sub-paragraph to the preamble and

two operative paragraphs, the last reflecting the change proposed by Pakistan.

27. With respect to the remarks of the United States representative, he believed that those who proposed restrictive formulas were the first to introduce political considerations into the debate. He appealed to the United States to ensure that the prevailing spirit of co-operation and mutual understanding continued to ease the Committee's work until its conclusion.

28. Mr. MAHDAVI (Iran) thanked the Polish delegation for having accepted the amendments which his delegation had co-sponsored. As to the sub-amendments proposed by New Zealand, which had not been accepted, all were agreed on the need to secure the industrial development of the under-developed countries and such disagreement as existed centred only on the means to be employed. Since the ultimate objectives were unanimously endorsed, he would appeal to New Zealand not to insist on its sub-amendments and thus to enable the Committee to conclude its consideration of the question at the present meeting.

29. Mr. EL-MUTWALLI (Iraq) also agreed that Poland had shown co-operation in incorporating in the revised text of the original draft resolution many of the views advanced by other delegations. He formally proposed that the debate be closed and that the Committee proceed to vote.

30. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece), speaking on a point of order, requested a suspension of the meeting, in conformity with rule 78 of the rules of procedure, in order to enable the various delegations to form a final opinion on the amendments which had been presented.

31. The CHAIRMAN gave priority to the motion presented by Greece, in conformity with rule 120 of the rules of procedure.

The meeting was suspended at 5.45 p.m. and resumed at 6.5 p.m.

32. Mr. ZADOTTI (Italy) presented an amendment (A/C.2/L.607) proposing that the words "in all countries" in operative paragraph 2 (a) should be superseded by the words "in States members of the United Nations system".

33. Mr. FIGUERERO ANTEQUEDA (Argentina) said that the sponsors of document A/C.2/L.600/Rev.1 had decided not to change their text any further. They understood the point of view of the New Zealand delegation, but their own proposal clearly showed that they could not share that opinion.

34. He felt bound to observe before the vote that, while the French attitude had been constructive, that of the United States remained disappointing. His delegation had been pleased to recognize that, during the general debate, the United States had favoured the notion of accelerated progress; the present discussion, on the other hand, had rekindled the doubts which Argentina had entertained since the Inter-American Economic Conference of Punta del Este, where the United States had presented an agenda containing, at first, no mention of industrial development. Later, the first text proposed by the United States for the Charter of Punta del Este had also not contained any reference to industrial development. In the eyes of the under-developed countries, industrial diversification represented the solution of their problems; Argentina hoped that that position would be understood and supported by countries in the same situation as itself.

35. Mr. NATORF (Poland) reviewed all the changes introduced in his delegation's revised draft resolution (A/C.2/L.563/Rev.3) and proposed that the text, as amended, should be put to the vote.

36. Mr. FERNANDINI (Peru) said he would vote for the draft resolution of Poland, as amended. There was no reason to be uneasy about a study that contemplated the possible establishment of a specialized agency for industrial development, for it was a logical step, which had the additional advantage of not entailing any expenditure.

37. Mr. GREEN (New Zealand) said he would maintain his sub-amendments since it was for the Economic and Social Council to decide whether a specialized agency for industrial development would be useful.

38. Mr. CHAMMAS (Lebanon) requested a separate vote on the words "should it so wish" in the second sub-amendment of New Zealand (A/C.2/L.602/Rev.1) when that text came to be voted on.

39. Mr. KAKITSUBO (Japan) thanked the delegation of Poland for the spirit of conciliation it had shown, and withdrew his amendments (A/C.2/L.606). He desired, however, to stress the fact that heretofore it had always been the customary practice of the United Nations to employ formulas such as "States members of the United Nations system", rather than to speak of "all countries".

40. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Italian amendment (A/C.2/L.607).

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

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

In favour: Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand.

Against: Togo, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Ghana, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Mali, Mongolia, Nigeria, Poland, Romania.

Abstaining: Tunisia, Venezuela, Austria, India, Lebanon, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan.

The Italian amendment was adopted by 43 votes to 24, with 11 abstentions.

41. The CHAIRMAN said that at the request of the representative of Lebanon, a separate vote would be taken on the words "should it so wish" in the second of the sub-amendments submitted by New Zealand (A/C.2/L.602/Rev.1), which now referred to the text of the Polish draft resolution (A/C.2/L.563/Rev.3), as amended by the sponsor.

The clause was rejected by 44 votes to 20, with 12 abstentions.

At the request of the representative of Iraq, a vote was taken by roll-call on the New Zealand sub-amendments, as amended (A/C.2/L.602/Rev.1).

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

In favour: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Sweden.

Against: Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Albania, Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ghana, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Mali, Mongolia, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Romania, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Togo.

Abstaining: Tunisia, Afghanistan, Chile, China, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Guatemala, India, Japan, Liberia, Mexico, Nepal, Nicaragua, Panama, Philippines, Senegal, Spain, Thailand.

The New Zealand sub-amendments were rejected by 40 votes to 19, with 19 abstentions.

42. The CHAIRMAN said that at the request of the representatives of the United States of America and the United Kingdom, a separate vote would be taken on operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution (A/C.2/L.563/Rev.3).

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

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

In favour: Sierra Leone, Spain, Sudan, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, China, Colombia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Ghana, Guatemala, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Senegal.

Against: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Belgium, New Zealand.

Abstaining: Sweden, Togo, Austria, Canada, Chile, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal.

Operative paragraph 5 was adopted by 57 votes to 5, with 16 abstentions.

At the request of the representative of Argentina, a vote was taken by roll-call on the draft resolution (A/C.2/L.563/Rev.3) as a whole, as amended.

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

In favour: India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Netherlands, New Zealand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Belgium.

The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 74 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

43. Mr. LAVRICHENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered that so unanimous a vote augured well for the United Nations Development Decade. If the industrialization of the under-developed countries was to be encouraged, all political motives should be eliminated, and that was why some States, although not members of United Nations bodies, were aiding the under-developed countries and would continue to aid them no matter what happened.

44. It had already been stated that the under-developed countries had suffered a loss of \$10,000 million in 1960 as a result of the deterioration of the terms of trade for them, in consequence of the inequitable conditions on the international market, and that they would probably suffer the same loss in 1961. That was why the additional resources available from disarmament should not be neglected, for, as had been stated by a professor of the University of Michigan on 3 December 1960 at a conference held at Columbia University, disarmament would make it possible to double or triple the rate of economic growth during the next ten years.

The meeting rose at 7.35 p.m.