

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

SIXTH SESSION

Official Records

SECOND COMMITTEE 172nd

MEETING

Wednesday, 2 January 1952, at 10.30 a. m.

Palais de Chaillot, Paris

CONTENTS

	Page
Economic development of under-developed countries : report of the Economic and Social Council (chapter III) (A/1884 and A/1924) (<i>continued</i>)	
(d) General aspects of economic development (A/C.2/L.81 and Corr.1, A/C.2/L.95, A/C.2/L.119 and A/C.2/L.120) (<i>continued</i>).....	167

Chairman : Prince WAN WAITHAYAKON (Thailand).

Economic development of under-developed countries : report of the Economic and Social Council (chapter III) (A/1884¹ and A/1924) (*continued*)

(d) General aspects of economic development A/C.2/L.81 and Corr. 1, A/C.2/L.95, A/C.2/L.119 and A/C.2/L.120) (*continued*)

[Item 26]*

DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY HAITI. (A/C.2/L.95)

1. Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) said that the amendments submitted by the United States and contained in document A/C.2/L.119 did not modify the sense of the Haitian draft resolution (A/C.2/L.95). Instead of listing the various means of national action with regard to which the Economic and Social Council was requested to submit recommendations, as had been done in the original text of the draft resolution, the United States amendments defined the subject of such recommendations in more general terms. The United States delegation also felt that, as the Council would be holding only one session in 1952, it would not be in a position to submit its recommendations to the General Assembly at its seventh session. He accordingly proposed that the Council should be requested to report to an early session of the General Assembly.

2. Mr. CHAUVET (Haiti) said that the United States amendments contained nothing inconsistent with the spirit of the Haitian draft resolution. They even gave it added force. For that reason, and in order to save the Committee's time, he would accept the amendments.

3. He would prefer, however, to replace the words "to an early session", in paragraph 5 (c) of the third amendment, by the words "to the seventh session", as the ori-

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixth Session, Supplement No. 3*.

* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

ginal draft resolution had provided. If the question was referred to an early session of the Assembly—which was a very vague term—it might in effect be postponed indefinitely.

4. He noted that Chapter III of the Secretary-General's last annual report² contained hardly any production statistics. It was true that it mentioned development plans, but it did not give enough detail, in particular on the economic development of the Trust Territories. The impression was given that the measures referred to in the report were more or less academic in character and that the progress achieved was not even worth mentioning. By asking the Economic and Social Council to submit a report on the progress made towards increasing world productivity to the seventh session of the General Assembly, it might be possible to obtain production statistics more rapidly. That would enable economists and delegations to the United Nations to familiarize themselves with the actual progress in economic development and not merely with administrative measures, as was the case at the present time.

5. He did not agree with members of the Committee who wished to limit the number of suggestions to be made or the scope of the studies entrusted to the Economic and Social Council on the grounds that the Council was over-burdened, that it could, itself, take any necessary initiative, and that the members of the Council were entitled to submit schemes to the Council themselves. That argument was invalid because the forty-two Members of the United Nations which were not members of the Economic and Social Council could only express their views through the Second Committee of the General Assembly.

6. The representatives of some industrialized countries had expressed the view that the influence of the General Assembly on the Economic and Social Council ought to be limited. That attitude might give the impression that the highly developed countries had framed a concerted plan to confuse the under-developed coun-

² *Ibid.*, Supplement No. 1.

tries. Fortunately the United States had not joined the movement and the impression had been dispelled. The Haitian delegation was for its part persuaded that the highly industrialized countries which had hitherto assisted the under-developed countries would continue to do so in the future as they had done in the past.

7. Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) certainly did not mean to suggest adjourning consideration of the question indefinitely and agreed with the representative of Haiti that the Economic and Social Council should report to the General Assembly as soon as possible. His amendment was precisely intended to achieve that, but could be re-drafted as follows: "report to the seventh session of the General Assembly on the progress made under this resolution".

8. Mr. CHAUVET (Haiti) accepted the text of the United States representative.

9. The CHAIRMAN observed that, since the representative of Haiti had accepted the United States representative's amendments, the amendments formed part of the initial draft resolution submitted by the Haitian delegation.

10. Mr. ARUTIUNIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist republics) drew the Committee's attention to the irregular situation resulting from the introduction by the United States delegation of amendments which were in fact not amendments, since they did not leave unmodified any of the paragraphs or even the title of the original Haitian draft resolution, but represented a complete substitute for it. There existed in fact an entirely new draft resolution, surreptitiously introduced after the time-limit for the submission of draft resolutions. Since the document had been submitted as an amendment, the United States delegation could doubtless maintain that it had the formal right to proceed thus, but the rules of procedure ought to be observed both in letter and in spirit, and consequently, either a time-limit for the submission of draft resolutions should be abandoned or be genuinely respected.

11. Also, whereas the Haitian draft resolution, whatever the criticisms that might be levelled against it, dealt with the development of the under-developed countries, the United States amendment departed from that problem, which was the only one on the agenda, and envisaged the economic development of the world as a whole. The use of such methods, which took account neither of normal procedure nor of the Committee's agenda, was inadmissible.

12. Mr. LUBIN (United States of America) pointed out that the Haitian representative had himself recognized that the United States amendments had the same objec-

tive as his own draft resolution. It could not therefore be claimed that the amendments completely departed from the intention of the initial draft. Further, none of the provisions or paragraphs of the Haitian draft resolution referred specifically to the under-developed countries. The basic idea of the text as the United States delegation had understood it, was to raise standards of living by increased productivity in all the countries of the world, including, naturally, the under-developed countries.

13. The CHAIRMAN observed that the USSR representative had not formally proposed that the three United States amendments should be declared inadmissible. Furthermore, they fulfilled the conditions laid down in rule 129 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. He had therefore no decision to take in that respect.

14. Mr. ARUTIUNIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that he had not formally requested the rejection of the United States delegation's amendments out of respect for the representative of Haiti, who had accepted them. It was nevertheless true that the amendments did not conform to the provisions of rule 129 of the rules of procedure. In fact, an entirely new text, from the title to the last sentence, had been substituted for the original draft resolution. It was essential, in future, to avoid such a flagrant violation of the established and recognized procedure, as otherwise the Committee would be working in the dark. He protested strongly against the procedure adopted by the United States representative and his delegation would be unable to vote for the new text.

15. Mr. CHAUVET (Haiti) said that he had accepted the United States amendments because they were in no way contrary to his original draft and also in order to save the Committee's time. It would have been idle to hold a long discussion on drafting changes which had no substantive effect, such as that, for example, which had been made to the title of the draft resolution.

16. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution of Haiti (A/C.2/L.95) as amended by the United States of America (A/C.2/L.119).

The draft resolution was adopted by 26 votes to none with 14 abstentions.

17. The CHAIRMAN recalled that, at the preceding meeting, the Polish representative had expressed the wish that discussion of his draft resolution (A/C.2/L.81 and Corr.1) should not be begun in his absence. Mr. Katz-Suchy's aeroplane had been delayed and, in the circumstances, the Committee would postpone consideration of the draft resolution until the next morning.

The meeting rose at 11.30 a.m.