

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SIXTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



SECOND COMMITTEE, 787th
MEETING

Wednesday, 13 December 1961,
at 11.10 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda items 12, 28, 29 and 30:	
Report of the Economic and Social Council (continued)	
Economic development of under-developed countries (continued):	
(a) Industrial development and activities of the organs of the United Nations in the field of industrialization;	
(b) Establishment of a United Nations capital development fund: report of the Com- mittee 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 Eco- nomic and Social Council;	
(b) Improvement of the terms of trade be- tween the industrial and the under- developed countries: report of the Eco- nomic 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 know- ledge for peaceful ends: report of the Economic and Social Council	
Consideration of draft resolutions (continued)	397
Agenda item 28:	
Economic development of under-developed countries (continued):	
(e) Provision of food surpluses to food- deficient peoples through the United Nations system	398

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

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)

Page

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;	
(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, dissemi- nation 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.565/REV.3) (continued)

1. Mr. AMADOR (Mexico) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on the deletion of the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution on the role of patents in the transfer of technology to under-developed countries (A/C.2/L.565/Rev.3), because that paragraph took account only of Economic and Social Council resolution 375 (XIII). Mexico had voted for the retention of operative paragraph (d) as amended by the sponsors because that paragraph took into account the legal questions that had been raised by Mexico (779th meeting). The Mexican delegation had abstained from voting on the amendment submitted by Denmark (A/C.2/L.627) because the idea expressed in it was implicitly included in the first part of the operative paragraph, which called for

consultation with appropriate international and national institutions. Mexico had voted for the draft resolution as a whole, since the studies to be undertaken in virtue of the resolution would take into account the provisions of the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, to which Mexico was a party.

2. Mr. BRILLANTES (Philippines) said that his delegation had voted against the Netherlands amendments (A/C.2/L.618) because the initial wording of the draft resolution took sufficient account of commitments undertaken by States parties to existing conventions. He hoped that the questions raised by the Philippines would be examined at the eighteenth session of the General Assembly, when the studies to be made in implementation of the resolution and the Secretary-General's recommendation on the advisability of holding an international conference would be available.

3. Mr. ERROCK (United Kingdom) recalled the statements which he had already made on the general position of his Government and which explained why the United Kingdom delegation had abstained from voting both on the amendment submitted by Denmark, and on the draft resolution as a whole. The United Kingdom still thought that technical questions should first be brought up in the appropriate functional organs of the United Nations. Their work programmes had been approved by the Economic and Social Council and ought not to be changed by the General Assembly unless absolutely necessary. The General Assembly must also proceed with caution when considering questions relating to conventions freely negotiated by sovereign States, some of which might not be Members of the United Nations.

4. Mr. ZADOTTI (Italy) said that his delegation had voted for the amendments submitted by the Netherlands because it felt that they were likely to make it easier for the draft resolution to be adopted unanimously. Italy had voted for the Danish amendment as being an improvement on the initial text. Although the Italian delegation was not entirely satisfied with the final text, it had voted for the draft resolution as a whole because the study to be undertaken by the Secretary-General might be useful to some countries. The fact none the less remained that the holding of an international conference could not be considered unless account was taken of the international conventions and other treaties to which Italy was a party. He reserved his delegation's position regarding the financial implications of the draft resolution.

5. Miss SELLERS (Canada) said that her Government took the same position as Italy, and she reserved its position regarding the financial implications. Canada had felt it necessary to vote for the amendment submitted by Denmark, and it was only because that amendment had been adopted that the Canadian delegation had been able to vote for the draft resolution as a whole.

6. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that his country had abstained for two reasons. The first was a substantive matter of a legal nature, and in that connexion it would be difficult for France to support a resolution under which there was a risk of the General Assembly intervening in a field in which France had contracted international obligations. The second reason concerned the procedure which had

been followed, for France, like the United Kingdom, considered that the sponsors should have brought up the question in the Economic and Social Council; the General Assembly would have found it easier to take a decision if the question had first been divested of its essentially technical aspects. France had thus preferred to abstain in order to indicate its disagreement with that procedure.

AGENDA ITEM 28

Economic development of under-developed countries (continued):

(e) Provision of food surpluses to food-deficient peoples through the United Nations system (A/4820 and Corr.2, chapter II, section III; A/4907 and Add.1 and Add.1/Corr.1 and Add.2, E/3509, A/C.2/L.617/Add.2, A/C.2/L.617/Rev.3)

7. Mr. WILSON (Canada) introduced the new revised version of the draft resolution on a world food programme (A/C.2/L.617/Rev.3).

8. Mr. REGO MONTEIRO (Brazil) said that the sponsors of the amendments contained in document A/C.2/L.626/Rev.2 were withdrawing their first amendment, as it had been taken into account by the sponsors of the draft resolution in their revised text. On the other hand, they were maintaining their two other amendments, which now applied to paragraphs 7 and 9, respectively, of the new revised text and were regarded by them as important because they were in conformity with the spirit of Article 58 of the United Nations Charter and because, if included, those amendments would ensure that the paragraphs in question would be appropriately worded.

9. Mr. MAHDAVI (Iran) pointed out that the new paragraph 18 did not incorporate the whole of the amendment submitted by his delegation (A/C.2/L.630). Iran's only reason for insisting on the second part of that amendment was to achieve a well-balanced text. The Iranian delegation still felt that, because of the increase in consumption, attention had to be paid to the necessity of improving and increasing local food production and that that objective should be clearly stated in the draft resolution. He asked for a separate vote on the second part of the Iranian amendment.

10. Mr. VIAUD (France) said that his delegation was withdrawing the amendments it had submitted in document A/C.2/L.629/Rev.1. He proposed changing the French version of the revised draft resolution by deleting from the third preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1 of part I the words "à titre d'essai" and replacing them, in the appropriate place, by the expression "de caractère expérimental".

11. With regard to operative paragraph 5, his delegation felt it necessary to point out that it concerned problems of co-ordination which must be thoroughly studied beforehand and that it was essential not to prejudice subsequent decisions on that question. The French delegation reserved its position on that point as well as on the use of the expression "including the Special Fund".

12. Mr. GREEN (New Zealand) expressed his gratification that most of his proposals had been incorporated in the revised text and said that he was

consequently withdrawing his amendments (A/C.2/L.631/Rev.1). With regard to paragraph 16, he queried the advisability of speaking of the future development of multilateral food programmes as though proposals for the latter already existed. The New Zealand delegation intended to speak again in the debate at a later stage, when he would explain his delegation's interpretation of that reference and also of certain other questions.

13. Mr. VEJJAIVA (Thailand) wished to stress that, so far as his delegation was concerned, the world food programme was being undertaken on an experimental basis and should be devoted mainly to the relief of hunger. The delegation of Thailand welcomed the assurances given by the Canadian and Danish representatives that the programme would not be regarded as a convenient way of disposing of surplus food products. He thanked the sponsors of the draft resolution for having incorporated the amendments submitted by Burma and Thailand (A/C.2/L.633/Rev.1), which were consequently being withdrawn. He also thanked those representatives, in particular the Malayan representative, who had spoken in favour of his amendments. As pointed out by the representative of the Federation of Malaya, Burma, Malaya and Thailand were located in the "rice-bowl" area of South-East Asia. Those three countries had kept and would continue to keep the "rice-bowl" in existence and make it prosper for the mutual benefit and well-being of their peoples in the region.

14. Mr. BERNARDO (Argentina) explained that he had done his best to arrive at a compromise during his talks with the sponsors of the draft resolution and noted with satisfaction that the new revised text was an improvement on its predecessor; he thanked the sponsors, in particular the delegations of Panama and Peru which had been very understanding. However, he was compelled to maintain the first of his delegation's amendments (A/C.2/L.636) because operative paragraph 5, which had given rise to so many difficulties, had been retained. By its reference to the use of food "as an aid to economic and social development", the paragraph tended to make international civil servants responsible for directing the national development programmes by means of so-called pilot projects. The United States position was, of course, the same as that adopted by its delegation at the Inter-American Economic Conference held at Punta del Este in connexion with the establishment of a committee of experts with very wide powers. The Argentine delegation, however, could not now accept what it had rejected then.

15. Moreover, by bringing in the Special Fund, the sponsors were calling into question that body's whole structure. Naturally they had every right to want to change the Special Fund, but they should do so openly in a draft resolution to that effect and not in a roundabout way by means of a paragraph inserted in a resolution dealing with something altogether different. General Assembly resolution 1240 (XIII) which laid down the powers of the Special Fund provided, in paragraph 11 of part B, that immediate inter-governmental control of the policies and operations of the Special Fund should be exercised by the Governing Council. If the General Assembly was to decide that the Special Fund should undertake pilot projects, it would tie the Governing Council's hands by prejudging its deci-

sion on the matter. Moreover, by accepting contributions other than cash, the Special Fund would be contravening paragraphs 45 *et seq.* of part B of resolution 1240 (XIII). It was also rather difficult to see how the Special Fund, which already had difficulty in utilizing contributions paid in non-convertible currencies, could use contributions in kind. Thus, operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution raised a multiplicity of constitutional and legal problems and he trusted that the sponsors would not insist on retaining it. Why depart from the compromise that had been reached at Rome and risk reopening a debate which had often been stormy? Those who defended the paragraph averred that the Secretary-General could be authorized to represent the Special Fund. On the other hand, it was very doubtful whether the Governing Council, which was very jealous of its prerogatives, would consent to that and waive its right to prior consultation vested in it by paragraph 22 of resolution 1240 (XIII).

16. The second Argentine amendment had not been maintained but the text of part II of the draft resolution had been amended. Although the changes were not quite as far-reaching as it would have liked, the Argentine delegation was willing not to press its amendment if the sponsors would agree to bring the text of paragraphs 16 and 17 and more into line with the compromise reached at Rome. A number of suggestions had been made to that effect. He reserved the right to revert to that point at a later stage. In conclusion, he said that his delegation would vote in favour of the Iranian amendment.

17. Mr. CRITCHLEY (Australia) said that his delegation was withdrawing its amendments (A/C.2/L.637) but understood that the co-sponsors were willing to agree to add the word "expert" before the word "studies" and the words "consideration of the" before the word "future" in operative paragraph 16.

18. Mr. AZIZ (Federation of Malaya) thanked the co-sponsors for accepting several of the amendments that had been submitted and his own suggestion in regard to part II. He also noted with satisfaction, since he would have voted for them, that the amendments submitted by Burma and Thailand had been incorporated. He was sure that the new text would receive the Committee's full support.

19. Mr. DOE (Liberia) said that the sole aim of the sponsors in operative paragraph 5 was to ensure that the programme would be undertaken under United Nations auspices. They attached great importance to the part to be played by the United Nations and they were anxious to retain the paragraph. They had, nevertheless, done their best to respond to the constructive criticism that had been made and had agreed to alter the text even at the risk of distorting it. He urged the Argentine representative to take up a less rigid position.

20. Mr. GARDNER (United States of America) thought that the Iranian amendment would involve too great a dispersal of the programme's resources and the uses to which they were put. It would be better not to go into too much detail, or else it would be necessary to ask also for a report on the amount spent on other things, such as emergency relief or school meals. Operative paragraph 5 was simply intended to guarantee full participation by the United Nations and its appropriate agencies in the implementation

of pilot projects for economic and social development. The representative of Argentina had expressed reservations regarding the use of the programme's resources for economic and social development. However, that point should not have been raised again because it had been made quite clear in paragraph 10 of the FAO resolution—annexed to the draft resolution under consideration—that, in administering the programme, it would be necessary to take into consideration not only emergency food needs and school and pre-school feeding programmes but also the implementation of pilot projects for economic and social development, particularly in the case of large-scale development programmes involving intensive labour use and rural welfare programmes. The question was important and should be covered in the draft resolution.

21. The representative of Argentina argued that the Special Fund was not the appropriate agency. That was not a very valid objection, particularly when it was remembered that the Special Fund had very wide terms of reference. The wording of operative paragraph 5 had been decided on after a series of difficult negotiations with many delegations and any amendment, far from offering a solution, would only create further problems.

22. Mr. BERNARDO (Argentina) expressed his complete disagreement with the way in which the United States representative interpreted the FAO resolution. Nor did he think a change in operative paragraph 5 would have the consequences he had described, since there were many delegations which shared Argentina's anxiety. In the first place, the FAO resolution did not stress development problems. The use of food for development and its use in emergencies were on an equal footing. It was exactly that balance which was the result of a compromise, because many delegations, including that of Argentina, had opposed the use of food for development.

23. Moreover, the United States representative had not made any reply to the constitutional problem raised by the Argentine delegation. It was not a question of considering the scope of the Special Fund's operations, but rather of deciding very specifically whether or not to change the mandate of the Special Fund through the resolution. The Argentine delegation would be ready to yield to convincing arguments, for its attitude was not determined by obstinacy or mere wilfulness but by reasons of law and by the experience it had acquired in its three years of participating in the work of the Special Fund's Governing Council. The summary records of past meetings of the Governing Council showed that the adoption of paragraph 5 would raise a storm in its midst. It would probably willingly agree to the expansion of its terms of reference by a specific resolution, but it would be loath to see the structure of the Special Fund radically altered by the adoption of a resolution on an entirely different matter.

24. The absence of any conciliatory formula or any reasonable explanation from the United States representative merely strengthened his own misgivings regarding the real purposes of operative paragraph 5.

25. Mr. LINGAM (India) did not think that the Iranian amendment would be likely to involve too wide a dispersal of the programme's resources or to make the programme too rigid. General Assembly resolution 1496 (XV) specified that one of

the programme's objectives was to improve and increase local food production. Members of the Second Committee had taken up that idea at the current session, stressing the fact that that interim measure should above all promote economic development. In stating that they were unable to accept the Iranian amendment, the sponsors were overlooking the use of food surpluses as a means of increasing the agricultural production of the recipient countries.

26. Since the programme would be of an experimental nature, the General Assembly would ultimately have to judge its usefulness. That would be difficult if it did not know how the resources had been utilized. As it had already been established that 25 per cent of the funds should be devoted to emergency needs, the General Assembly would be entitled to ask how the remainder had been distributed among the other activities. He hoped, therefore, that the sponsors would find it possible to accept the Iranian amendment or at least the essential idea that a certain part of the funds should be devoted to raising local food production. The programme was admittedly of a short-term nature, but it should be carried out to the best advantage, namely, for agricultural development.

27. He agreed with the representative of Argentina that it would cause unnecessary complications to bring the Special Fund into the picture. The reference to the Special Fund was superfluous since it was specified elsewhere that the programme would be undertaken jointly by the United Nations and FAO in co-operation with other interested United Nations agencies. To make particular mention of the Special Fund would be to attribute undue importance to it. It would be better to leave it to the Secretary-General and the Director-General of FAO to hold whatever consultations they deemed advisable.

28. Subject to those observations, his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution.

29. Mr. MAHDAVI (Iran) said that his delegation had endeavoured, in a spirit of compromise, to find a suitable wording which would be acceptable to the sponsors of the draft resolution and yet express the ideas set forth in that part of the Iranian amendments (A/C.2/L.630) which had not so far been incorporated in the draft resolution and was directed principally towards the improvement and increase of local food production. He therefore proposed that the following words should be added at the end of operative paragraph 18 of the revised draft resolution: "and to include, where appropriate, reference to this subject in the reports mentioned above, and requests the United Nations/FAO Inter-Governmental Committee to consider the possibility of applying a reasonable proportion of resources resulting from the World Food Programme to this purpose".

30. Mr. GARDNER (United States of America) said that the sponsors of the draft resolution could accept the modified version of the Iranian amendment, although they considered that the second preambular paragraph of part II of the draft resolution dealt fully with the imperative necessity of increasing food production in the under-developed countries. The United States had supported the Freedom from Hunger Campaign launched by FAO and had contributed to the development of the production of food-stuffs under both bilateral and multilateral

arrangements. He was not aware of any decision concerning allocation of the resources resulting from the programme to various purposes such as emergency aid programmes. The sponsors also accepted the amendment to operative paragraph 16 which Australia had proposed orally. As for the question of the Special Fund's mandate, raised by the representative of Argentina, he recalled that under part B of resolution 1240 (XIII), which had established the Special Fund, the Fund was to direct its operations towards enlarging the scope of the United Nations programmes of technical assistance so as to include special projects in certain basic fields; it was envisaged as a constructive advance in United Nations assistance to the less developed countries, which should be of immediate significance in accelerating their economic development by, inter alia, facilitating new capital investments of all types by creating conditions which would make such investments either feasible or more effective. In paragraph 5 of part B of that resolution, it was stipulated that the Special Fund should assist projects in various fields, which included that of agriculture. In his view, those provisions were ample justification for the mention of the Special Fund in operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution, a mention which had, incidentally, been made only after consultation with various delegations and with the representatives of the Special Fund and the specialized agencies.

31. Mr. MAKEEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) endorsed the opinion of the delegations which had requested deletion of the reference to the Special Fund in paragraph 5 of the draft resolution. If that paragraph were adopted in its existing form, the effect would be to modify the rules governing the operation of the Special Fund as they had been laid down in resolution 1240 (XIII). The task of the Special Fund, which was already working very slowly and not using all its available resources, might thereby be complicated; it would be better for it to concentrate on the activities with which it was already entrusted. Furthermore, he saw no reason to give the Special Fund a place of special prominence among the United Nations organs concerned with technical assistance. Likewise it seemed to him inadvisable to enlarge the responsibilities of the Managing Director by withdrawing the execution of the programme from the Governing Council. He hoped that the sponsors would take account of those considerations, for they reflected the feelings of many countries represented on the Governing Council which were particularly familiar with the difficulties already confronting the Special Fund.

32. Mr. BERNARDO (Argentina) said that his delegation had not been convinced by the arguments advanced by the United States representative. For instance, it saw no connexion between the provision of resolution 1240 (XIII), to the effect that the Special Fund should concentrate, as far as practicable, on relatively large projects, and the World Food Programme. It would be equally absurd to try to regard food surpluses as capital investments or capital equipment. Paragraph 5 as it stood risked entrusting to the Special Fund the control of a \$100 million programme for the provision of food surpluses originating mainly in the United States. Yet it was stated in resolution 1240

(XIII) that the resources of the Special Fund itself were not likely to exceed \$100 million annually, and they had so far, in fact, reached only \$40 million. To entrust a programme of such magnitude to the Special Fund would undoubtedly endanger its equilibrium and involve the necessity of subjecting it to structural reforms.

33. Mr. BRILLANTES (Philippines), while supporting the United States contention that the whole of paragraph 5 should not be deleted, agreed with the Argentine representative as to the inappropriateness of its making particular mention of the Special Fund. He therefore requested a separate vote on the words "including the Special Fund".

34. Mr. LINGAM (India) pointed out to the United States representative that, according to the joint proposal by the United Nations and FAO regarding procedures and arrangements for multilateral utilization of surplus food, the Director-General of FAO was authorized to earmark 25 per cent of the fund for emergency use, including national and international food reserves (A/4907, section IV).

35. Mr. FERNANDINI (Peru) announced that the sponsors had accepted, as the Brazilian delegation had requested, the insertion of the words "in co-operation with" in operative paragraphs 7 and 9 of the draft resolution. He did not think it would be possible to delete the words "including the Special Fund" in paragraph 5, but proposed, in order to reconcile the various points of view, the wording: "including the Special Fund, as appropriate".

36. Mr. CARANICAS (Greece) said that his delegation favoured an enlargement of the activities of the Special Fund, including its pre-investment activities, and would vote for the draft resolution concerning the activities of the Special Fund and its association with assistance from other sources (A/C.2/L.614), which was still pending. He considered, however, that the words "including the Special Fund" went much too far, in that they assigned to the Special Fund a role which did not rightly belong to it; the addition of the words "as appropriate" made no difference. He formally proposed the deletion of the words "including the Special Fund".

37. Mr. AMADOR (Mexico) said that it was possible to modify a legal provision only by a procedure similar to that which had been applied for its adoption. Consequently, resolution 1240 (XIII) could be modified only by a special resolution of the General Assembly.

38. Mr. BERNARDO (Argentina) was grateful to the various delegations which approved his position for sharing Argentina's anxieties concerning the functions of the Special Fund. He thanked the representative of Peru for his efforts to find a compromise solution. Prompted by the same spirit, the Argentine delegation agreed to withdraw its amendment in favour of that proposed by Greece, which it would support.

39. Miss SALT (United Kingdom) suggested that the representative of Greece might modify his amendment; instead of deleting the words "including the Special Fund", it might be preferable to replace them with the words "including, where ap-

propriate, the Special Fund and the Executive Chairman of the Technical Assistance Board".

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.