



Thursday, 10 January 1952, at 10.30 a.m.

Official Records

Palais de Chaillot, Paris

	<i>Page</i>
Economic development of under-developed countries : report of the Economic and Social Council (chapter III) (A/1884 and A/1924) (<i>concluded</i>).	
(b) Land reform (A/C.2/L.76/Rev.2, A/C.2/L.82 and A/C.2/L.133) (<i>concluded</i>).	215

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) (*concluded*)

(b) Land reform (A/C.2/L.76/Rev.2, A/C.2/L.82 and A/C.2/L.133) (*concluded*)

[Item 26]*

1. The CHAIRMAN said the informal working party which had been set up to try to prepare a joint draft resolution had met the previous day and worked out document A/C.2/L.76/Rev.2, which was a compromise likely to meet with unanimous acceptance as an agreed text relating to land reform. That was the document now before the Committee.

2. In addition there was before the Committee an amendment which the representative of Czechoslovakia had proposed to move to the text as contained in document A/C.2/L.76/Rev.1 and which in a slightly amended form had been incorporated in the draft resolution as it appeared in document A/C.2/L.76/Rev.2.

3. Thirdly the representative of Poland, who had felt unable to associate himself with the sponsors of the revised text, wished his own draft resolution (A/C.2/L.82) to be put to the vote, though he agreed to admit the revised text as prepared by the working party for sub-paragraphs (a), (b), (d), (e) and (f) of paragraph 2 of his original draft.

4. The Chairman suggested to the representative of Poland that Poland's name might be added last among the sponsors and not in alphabetical order; in that way it could be brought out that the Polish draft

resolution had been incorporated in the new text, and the initiative Mr. Katz-Suchy had taken in submitting a separate text could receive recognition.

5. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) said that in view of the new situation which had arisen and since the working party had not seen its way clear to incorporate paragraph 2 (c) of the Polish draft resolution into its revised draft, he would withdraw his amendment (A/C.2/L.133).

6. Mr. AMARAL MURTINHO (Brazil) said the working party which had been set up on the Chairman's suggestion had endeavoured in a spirit of great friendliness to work out an agreed draft resolution. If its object had merely been to prepare a new text for the Polish draft resolution the working party would never have met. Nor had there been any intention of working out two different texts.

7. During their informal exchanges of views the members of the working party had reached agreement on all points of the Polish draft with the exception of paragraph 2 (c). All the points on which agreement had been reached had been incorporated in the revised draft which the working party was now submitting as the agreed text which it had been instructed to prepare.

8. He pointed out that Mr. Katz-Suchy was free to re-submit paragraph 2 (c) of his draft resolution as an amendment to the working party's revised text. In that way the procedure would be greatly simplified.

9. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) acknowledged the friendly and co-operative spirit which had prevailed in the working party. In a similarly co-operative spirit he had agreed to the changes which the other members of the working party had proposed for the five paragraphs of the Polish draft, even though those changes somewhat weakened the original purpose of the text.

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

* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

10. The question now was whether the unanimous approval for which all the Committee members were so anxious should be given to a single or to two separate draft resolutions. His personal feeling was that what mattered was a unanimous vote and not the number of texts to be voted on. Accordingly, he proposed that the Committee should approve both the agreed text, with the exception of the new paragraph 9, and the Polish draft resolution. That would be much more consistent with the procedure followed when resolutions relating to integrated economic development and commercial agreements had been considered than the procedure proposed by the working party. It would also be more in keeping with normal parliamentary practice for it was not correct for the sponsors of a draft resolution to incorporate in their draft a text taken from another draft resolution without its author's consent.

11. If the Committee agreed to his proposal he would be prepared to incorporate the working party's draft of sub-paragraphs (a), (b), (d), (e), and (f) into his text; sub-paragraph (c) might be put to the vote as it stood. He would accept the ruling of the majority.

12. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile), said that to avoid unnecessary procedural discussion the rules of procedure should be followed strictly. There were two texts before the Committee; the Polish draft and the joint revised draft. They ought therefore be put to the vote in the order in which they had been submitted.

13. He saw no reason for deleting paragraph 9 of the joint draft resolution for it had been inserted in the text precisely at the request of the supporters of the Polish draft resolution.

14. Commenting on the question of the authorship of the draft he felt that the Committee should adopt whichever draft resolution it thought best. All draft resolutions adopted by the Committee in the past had originated in proposals by more than one delegation, the original authors having subsequently waived their privilege as authors and agreed to amalgamate their texts in joint drafts.

15. Mr. JACOME (Ecuador) concurred with Mr. Santa Cruz. Rule 130 of the rules of procedure should be applied and the draft resolutions put to the vote in the order in which they had been submitted, in which case the joint draft resolution would be voted on first.

16. Mr. NARIELWALA (India) expressed surprise at the Polish representative's attitude. He had been under the impression that the Czechoslovak representative by agreement with his Polish colleague had submitted the amendment to insert in the joint draft resolution the provisions of paragraph 2 of the Polish draft resolution, in which case the Polish text would have been dropped. He hoped that Mr. Katz-Suchy would become a co-sponsor of the joint draft resolution and that the name of Poland would be added to the sponsoring delegations; in that way, as the Chairman had said, the manner in which the draft resolution had been worked out would be accurately reflected.

17. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) said he would like to correct two misconceptions. First the Chairman and the representatives of Chile and India were mistaken in their apparent belief that he was anxious to protect his delegation's right of authorship or that

he attached great importance to the manner in which the text had been worked out. What he had meant to do was to safeguard the principles underlying his draft which set forth the recommendations that ought to be made to enable land reform to be carried out in the under-developed countries.

18. He had accepted the Czechoslovak proposal to insert all those recommendations in the joint draft resolution but could not support a text that omitted one of the principal clauses which his delegation regarded as essential for dealing with the problem of land reform.

19. There was no evidence for the Chilean representative's view that he (Mr. Katz-Suchy) wished to depart from normal practice. On the contrary, to insert, despite his own objection, five sub-paragraphs of his draft resolution in the joint draft constituted irregular practice. The working party ought to have allowed both drafts to stand and not destroyed the identity of the Polish text by lifting certain passages out of it and embodying them in the joint draft. Admittedly that did not infringe the rules of procedure which did not cover cases of that kind, but it was not in keeping with accepted United Nations usage or with the practice of other international organizations.

20. The situation was very simple: the Committee had to choose between two solutions. Either it could vote on the joint draft resolution as revised (A/C.2/L.76/Rev.2) and thereafter on the Polish draft; or else, as a conciliatory gesture and as had been proposed earlier, vote on two draft resolutions both of which might surely meet with unanimous acceptance. He left it to the sponsors of the joint draft resolution and to the Committee to decide which of the two solutions was most likely to further the Committee's proceedings.

21. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that his suggestion to put Poland's name last among the sponsors of the joint draft resolution had been meant to satisfy the Polish representative because in that way it would be made clear that Mr. Katz-Suchy had been the author of a proposal which was amalgamated with the joint draft.

22. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said the question of land reform had been amply debated in Committee; the discussion should now be wound up with a vote. Of the two drafts before the Committee, the USSR delegation preferred the Polish text which contained precise recommendations and expressed the wish to improve the position of the rural population through land reform. However, the draft resolution originally introduced by the United States delegation had been so markedly improved through the amendments submitted chiefly by the under-developed countries that the USSR delegation was prepared to vote for it. Accordingly he proposed that the draft resolutions should be voted on in the order in which they had been submitted, and he hoped that both might be adopted unanimously or by a large majority.

23. He felt that the representative of Poland, whose delegation had introduced a draft resolution and had taken the initiative in putting the question of land reform before the General Assembly at the previous session, was justified in asking that his draft should be allowed to stand and put to the vote.

24. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) supported Mr. Saksin's suggestion. In view of the attitude adopted by the representative of Chile, one of the sponsors of the joint draft resolution, there seemed little point of continuing the discussion. So far as the question of authorship was concerned it was known which country had taken the initiative in placing the question of land reform on the Assembly's agenda; it was also generally realized what motives had prompted the United States delegation belatedly to endorse certain parts of that question.

25. Mr. NARIELWALA (India) proposed certain amendments to the language of paragraph 11 of document A/C.2/L.76/Rev.2. The words "for development projects" should be added after the words "loan applications from under-developed countries"; the word "projects" should be replaced by "programmes"; after the word "institutions" the word "make" should be deleted and the following passage inserted instead: "consistent with their maintenance as self-supporting entities, to consider making", at the end of the paragraph those words should be deleted. He added that the representatives of the United Kingdom and of the United States had agreed to those changes.

26. Mr. ORMSBY GORE (United Kingdom) proposed amending paragraph 9 of the joint draft resolution by omitting the word "agricultural" in sub-paragraph (e) after the words "in organizing new"; he also proposed that in the English text the word "to" at the beginning of the sub-paragraph before the word "assist" should be deleted.

27. Mr. MARINO PEREZ (Cuba) said that paragraph 9 (c) of the joint draft resolution conveyed a most important and entirely novel idea. The clause should receive priority, for so long as farmers were indebted the other measures indispensable to land reform could not be put into effect. He proposed two changes in paragraph (c): firstly, the reference to "agricultural workers" should be dropped for they were not land-owners and hence could not incur debts in respect of land; secondly, the words "and unduly high prices paid" should be inserted after the words "usurious rates of interest".

28. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) pointed out to the representative of Cuba that, although the terms of sub-paragraph (c) would in most cases apply to farmers, the Secretary-General's report referred to certain forms of land tenure under which agricultural workers had certain rights with respect to parcels of land. Accordingly the reference to agricultural workers in the sub-paragraph was not superfluous; if the reference were omitted they might be left without protection. He asked the Cuban representative not to press his first amendment, but he agreed to the second.

29. Mr. ALLANA (Pakistan) agreed with Mr. Santa Cruz and said that in Pakistan such cases might arise.

30. Mr. MARINO PEREZ (Cuba) said he would withdraw his first amendment on the understanding that the term "agricultural workers" did not apply exclusively to wage-earners.

31. The CHAIRMAN said that as the second Cuban amendment and the changes proposed by India and the United Kingdom had not met with any objections they now formed part of the joint draft resolution.

32. He then put the revised text to the vote (A/C.2/L.76/Rev.2) as amended.

The joint draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 43 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

33. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) asked that sub-paragraph (c) of paragraph 2 should be put to the vote first and thereafter the remainder of the Polish draft resolution.

34. The CHAIRMAN put sub-paragraph (c) of paragraph 2 of the Polish draft resolution (A/C.2/L.82) to the vote.

Sub-paragraph (c) of paragraph 2 of the draft resolution was rejected by 22 votes to 7, with 18 abstentions.

35. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) said that sub-paragraph (c) of paragraph 2 of the draft resolution—the only one in which the draft differed in substance from the joint draft—having been rejected, the remainder of the Polish draft ought not to be put to the vote for its various points had been embodied in a very slightly altered form in the joint draft resolution which had been adopted. Accordingly, under rule 130 of the rules of procedure he moved that the remainder of the Polish draft should not be put to the vote.

36. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) pointed out that as the voting on his draft had already begun Mr. Santa Cruz was not entitled to ask for the application of rule 130. The voting ought therefore to continue.

37. Mr. SAKSIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) also requested that the voting should continue. The remainder of the draft resolution would presumably be accepted by all the Committee members since the only paragraph on which opinions were divided had been rejected. He personally would vote in favour of the draft.

38. The CHAIRMAN ruled that the Chilean representative's motion was not receivable since the vote taken on sub-paragraph (c) was not a vote on an amendment but on part of a proposal, the voting on which had already begun.

39. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) said he accepted the ruling of the Chair. He pointed out, however, that the only reason why he had refrained from asking for the application of rule 130 before the vote on sub-paragraph (c) had been to enable the Polish representative to obtain a decision from the Committee on that sub-paragraph. The General Assembly ought not to be placed in a position where it would have to vote on two separate but almost identical texts. Rule 130 had been added to the rules of procedure in 1948 precisely to avoid that difficulty. However if the Chairman directed the voting to continue, he (Mr. Santa Cruz) would also ask for a separate vote on sub-paragraph (d) of paragraph 2.

40. Mr. DULIN (France) agreed with Mr. Santa Cruz. The French delegation would vote against the Polish draft resolution for it duplicated the text just adopted by the Committee.

41. The CHAIRMAN put sub-paragraph (d) of paragraph 2 of the Polish draft resolution to the vote.

The sub-paragraph was rejected by 24 votes to 7, with 17 abstentions.

42. The CHAIRMAN put the remainder of the Polish draft resolution to the vote.

The remainder of the draft resolution was rejected by 24 votes to 9, with 15 abstentions.

43. Mr. MARAMIS (Indonesia) explained that, while admitting that in principle it was a desirable clause, his delegation had abstained from voting on sub-paragraph (c) of paragraph 2 of the draft resolution. In Indonesia the area of cultivable land was so vast that the land held by foreign companies hardly affected the areas which the local population could use. Moreover, those lands were let on seventy-five year leases and would sooner or later revert to the Indonesian Government. Well-managed land was a valuable asset for the country which still badly needed foreign investments for its development. The Government had redeemed large holdings which the owners had failed to maintain or cultivate properly, and it had also taken many measures to improve the position of agricultural workers.

44. Mr. MATTOS (Uruguay) explained that he had voted against the Polish draft resolution because its principal clauses appeared in the resolution adopted earlier by the Committee.

45. Mr. GALVEZ (Guatemala) explained that he had voted in favour of sub-paragraph (c) because it contained

provisions which would have been highly conducive to the improvement of the position of agricultural workers in under-developed countries.

46. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) explained that he had voted against sub-paragraph (c) because under Chilean legislation foreigners enjoyed the same right as Chilean nationals. The remainder of the draft merely duplicated the draft resolution adopted by the Committee.

47. Mr. HALIQ (Saudi Arabia) said he would have liked to vote for both draft resolutions but owing to the procedural difficulties raised in the debate his delegation had abstained in the vote on the Polish text. And so far as the joint draft resolution was concerned, his delegation had had to abstain also, because among its co-sponsors was the representative of a State, three quarters of whose land belonged to displaced Arabs whose right of ownership had been recognized by a decision of the General Assembly.

48. Mr. NARIELWALA (India) explained that he had voted against sub-paragraph (c) for the same reasons as the representative of Chile. His delegation had abstained from voting on the remainder of the draft resolution—though approving its purposes—to avoid duplication with the draft resolution adopted by the Committee earlier.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.